



---

**Economic Commission for Europe****Inland Transport Committee****Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods****Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the  
Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods**

Bern, 15-19 March 2021

Item 2 of the provisional agenda

**Tanks****Need for a definition of extra-large tank-containers****Information from the Secretariat of OTIF<sup>\*</sup>, <sup>\*\*</sup>, <sup>\*\*\*</sup>***Summary*

<b>Executive summary:</b>	As extra-large tank-containers are used multimodally, the question of the need for a new definition for extra-large tank-containers should be discussed at the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting's working group on tanks.
<b>Action to be taken:</b>	Specific questions to be answered.
<b>Related documents:</b>	ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2020/6 ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/158/Add.1

**Introduction**

1. The Secretariat OTIF submitted document OTIF/RID/RC/2020/6 to the last session of the Joint Meeting. It dealt with two questions arising from the discussions at the RID Committee of Experts' working group on tank and vehicle technology concerning extra-large tank-containers.
2. One of these questions concerned the mandatory fitting of 4 bar manhole covers to tank-containers. During the discussion, the International Tank-Container Organisation

---

<sup>\*</sup> A/75/6 (Sect.20), para 20.51.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2021/21.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> This document was scheduled for publication after the standard publication date owing to circumstances beyond the submitter's control.

(ITCO) proposed that this requirement should only be prescribed for tank-containers with a capacity of more than 40,000 litres.

3. Apart from this specific question, at the working group on tank and vehicle technology, the question arose as to whether a distinct definition of extra-large tank-containers should be included in RID/ADR/ADN. According to information from the chemical industry, extra-large tank-containers are also carried by road when empty, and carriage by inland waterways was also anticipated, so the working group on tank and vehicle technology agreed that the necessity of such a definition would have to be discussed at the Joint Meeting.

4. In relation to this, the Joint Meeting's working group on tanks should also check whether, in the existing definition of a tank-container, there should be a reference to a capacity limit.

5. An extract from the report of the 18<sup>th</sup> session of the working group on tank and vehicle technology is reproduced below, which recapitulates the discussion on this issue and contains specific questions in paragraph 11.

6. The Joint Meeting's working group on tanks is asked to discuss these questions.

**Extract from the report of the 18<sup>th</sup> session of the working group on tank and vehicle technology (video-conference, 6 and 7 October 2020)**

“Need for a definition of extra-large tank-containers

8. The chairman pointed out that during the discussions on the issue of the pressure resistance of manhole closures for the internal inspection of tanks (see also paragraphs 25 to 30) at the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting's working group on tanks (video-conference, 10 - 16 September 2020), the representatives of the tank-container industry had said that their operational experience in intermodal transport was only limited to tank-containers with a capacity of up to 40,000 litres. It might certainly be useful to draw a line at a capacity of 40,000 litres in order to differentiate between conventional intermodal and other tank-containers.

9. The representative of UIP supported Germany's call in document OTIF/RID/CE/GTT/2020/INF.1 to check whether a new definition should be introduced for extra-large tank-containers. He was also of the view that the intermodality of tank-containers was limited by the weight. An extra-large tank-container was not an intermodal tank-container in the usual sense, because owing to its greater weight when loaded, it could not be used like a conventional tank-container.

10. The representative of CEFIC pointed out that the extra-large tank-containers were already approved as intermodal tank-containers. They were already carried by road when empty and some had also been approved for maritime transport. However, the extra-large tank-containers approved in accordance with the IMDG Code had to meet stricter requirements in terms of the wall thickness (4.5 mm + corrosion allowance).

11. The chairman pointed out that owing to their multimodal use, the need for a new definition of extra-large tank-containers and the related issues would have to be discussed in the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting's working group on tanks. The RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting's working group on tanks should examine the following points in particular:

- On the basis of their intermodal approval, can extra-large tank-containers be treated in the same way as conventional intermodal tank-containers or are additional provisions necessary, bearing in mind the fact that the current provisions for tank-containers were developed on the basis of a tank-container with a maximum capacity of around 36,000 litres and extra-large tank-containers are more than twice as large as conventional tank-containers and are hence on a par with tank-wagons in terms of volume?
- Should the capacity of tank-containers in the existing definition be limited (e.g. to 40,000 litres or perhaps 36/40 tonnes)?

- Should a new definition be included for extra-large tank-containers so that they can be taken into account accordingly in the provisions for construction, approval, use and loading?”

\_\_\_\_\_