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Introduction

1. As requested during the forty-first session of the ADN Safety Committee, the German delegation sent the Dutch delegation some ideas and proposals related to the desired revision of the ADN Checklist (8.6.3 of ADN) on 4 April.

Expert contribution

2. Germany would like to put its proposals, which were not considered by the delegation of the Netherlands, up for discussion in the plenary:

   • Checklist in digital form instead of on paper
     • Recognition of a purely electronic checklist (including answers to the questions as well as the signatures shore / vessel)
       - Transmission of the checklist by email only shore >> vessel
       - Storage of the checklist and retention in electronic form (vessel and shore)
     • This would lead to the checklist no longer being used in paper format and thus to a considerable saving of resources.

   • Information on previous cargo (“gas-free/degassed” status)
     • Here, evidence of the vessel’s condition of being gas free (also considering the future CDNI requirements, degassing of vessels) should also be provided.

   • No. 6.1 (unnecessary question, duplicate of 6.2 to 6.4)
     • The second question in no. 6.1 “Is it correctly connected?” should be deleted.

     Rationale: The question is redundant, as it is answered by nos. 6.2 to 6.4.
• No. 6.3 “Are all the connecting bolts fitted and tightened?” (permit other technical solutions than “connecting bolts”)
  • Moreover, we consider the following amendment useful (if this type of connection is used, see previous no.): “Are all connecting bolts fitted, tightened and do their threads project past the nuts?”

(This safety measure is sometimes ignored by the masters.)

• Nos. 12.1 and 12.2: (integration of a footnote into the body of the text, extension to include “unloading”, as gas is also returned during unloading)
  • In no. 12.1, “loading” is mentioned in the text, in no. 12.2 by means of a footnote. That should be harmonized.
  • In the current version, nos. 12.1 and 12.2 are only applicable to loading. They could be worded in a more general way to also cover unloading.

Rationale: Gases are also returned during unloading – not always, but this is covered by the wording “where required, or if it exists.”. Therefore, it is questionable why 12.1 should only be applicable to loading.

• This question also arises for no. 12.2: Gases are also returned during unloading, and the vessel is secured at the shore-side in such a way as to prevent, where possible, that the overpressure relieve valves are activated.

• Nos. 15.1 and 15.2: (confirmation both by the master and the person in charge at the loading/unloading place)
  • Both nos. should be confirmed both by the master and the loading/unloading place.

Rationale: Both nos. concern the adjustment of the vessel’s pumps (15.1) to the working pressure of the shore installation and, in 15.2, of the shore pump to the working pressure of the on-board installation. For 15.1, this is confirmed by the master only, for 15.2, by the person in charge at the loading/unloading place only.

• No. 17: (cf. no. 15)
  • No. 17 should be divided into two nos. 17.1 and 17.2 for loading and unloading, in analogy to the structure of nos. 15.1 and 15.2.

Rationale: Greater clarity