UNITED NATIONS **E**

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2007/53
26 June 2007

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

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

Geneva, 11-21 September 2007
Agenda item 2

TANKS*

Application of the requirements of 6.8.2.1.7 to tanks intended for the carriage of refrigerated liquefied gases

Transmitted by the Government of France

SUMMARY

Summary:	The purpose of this document is to clarify the application of 6.8.2.1.7.
Action to be taken:	Amend 6.8.3.2.11.
Related document:	ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/1061/Add.1, para. 29.

* Circulated by the Intergovernmental Organisation for International Carriage by Rail (OTIF) under the symbol OTIF/RID/RC/2007/53.

Introduction

1. New requirements relating to the equipping of shells with vacuum valves were inserted in 6.8.2.1.7 of RID/ADR 2003. Since these requirements appear in section 6.8.2, they apply to all tanks, including vacuum-insulated tanks intended for the carriage of refrigerated liquefied gases.

2. This equipment does not seem appropriate for such tanks, which are equipped with a safety device that protects the inner shell in case of leakages of liquid in the space between the walls. Moreover, it does not appear to be required in most countries.

3. At the Joint Meeting held in March 2007, the Government of France sought the opinion of the working group on tanks on this matter (see document INF.35). The working group considered the issue and confirmed that the requirements of paragraph 6.8.2.1.7 should not apply to tanks for refrigerated liquefied gases; the representative of France was requested to draw up a relevant text for the following session.

Proposal

4. 6.8.3.2.11 Add the following sentence at the end of the existing text:

> "The provisions of 6.8.2.1.7 shall not apply to double-walled tanks, the space between being evacuated of air."

Justification

Safety implications: no problem.

Feasibility: no problem.

Enforcement: this clarification is needed to avoid problems of application.
