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Item 4 of the agenda: Interpretation

Application of standards/recognized technical codes
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SUMMARY

Executive Summary: The need for recognition of a technical code requires clarification.

Action to be taken: Interpretation of the provisions in section 6.2.5 and sub-sections 6.8.2.7 and 6.8.3.7

Related documents: INF.18 (Germany)
Introduction

1. The provisions concerning pressure receptacles, tanks, battery-wagons/battery-vehicles and MEGCs not designed, constructed and tested according to referenced standards (section 6.2.5, sub-section 6.8.2.7 and 6.8.3.7 of RID/ADR) include in the first sentence (2nd option) the following wording: "..., where no standard is referenced in ..., or ..., the competent authority may recognize the use of a technical code ...". This wording is ambiguous:

   – It can be interpreted as meaning that in all cases where a technical requirement is established in the set of regulations and there is no standard which contains specifications as regards that technical requirement the respective article may not be manufactured until a relevant technical code has been recognized (i.e. one must, in practice, draw up a recognized technical code for every loophole); or

   – it can be interpreted as meaning that in such cases one may draw up, notify and apply a technical code. If no such code is prepared, the stipulations of the body responsible for type approval can be followed.

2. This issue is of considerable interest after the entry into force of RID/ADR 2011. In particular standards EN 14432:2006 and EN 14433:2006 are generally applicable to all tanks in accordance with the table in 6.8.2.6.1; however, according to their titles, they are intended only for liquid chemicals and, from a technical point of view, cannot be used at least for refrigerated liquefied gases. In case of the first interpretation, this would mean that no valves for such tanks should legally exist today and that it is imperative to establish a technical code shortly. However, if the second interpretation were correct, the current practice could be continued at the national level. Furthermore, if the first interpretation were correct, the question would arise of how detailed standards have to be.

Proposal

3. Confirm one of the two interpretations and decide on the way forward.

4. Establish criteria for distinguishing between accessories which are particularly safety-critical and should be specified in a standard/recognized technical code and accessories which may be used freely by the manufacturer (this is also relevant to the separate type approval of accessories; see INF.18 transmitted by Germany).