

**Economic and Social Council**Distr.: General
8 June 2016

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe**Inland Transport Committee****Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods****Joint Meeting of Experts on the Regulations annexed to the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Inland Waterways (ADN) (ADN Safety Committee)****Twenty-ninth session**

Geneva, 22–26 August 2016

Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda

**Proposals for amendments to the Regulations annexed to ADN:
other proposals****Proposal to amend 7.2.4.25.5****Transmitted by the governments of the Netherlands and France^{1,2}***Summary*

Executive summary:	Following-up on the initial proposals made during the August 2015 ADN Safety Committee meeting and taking into account the discussion in the January 2016 ADN Safety Committee
Action to be taken:	See paragraph 8.
Related documents:	ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2015/18 ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/56 (paragraphs 16 and 17) ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/58 (paragraphs 55 - 57)

¹ Distributed in German by the Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine under the symbol CCNR-ZKR/ADN/WP.15/AC.2/2016/44.

² In accordance with the programme of work of the Inland Transport Committee for 2016–2017 (ECE/TRANS/2016/28/Add.1 (9.3.)).

I. Introduction

1. At the 27th session of the ADN Safety Committee (August 2015), the Netherlands submitted for consideration document ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2015/18, containing a national (Dutch) interpretation relating to 7.2.4.25.5.
2. The Dutch proposal intended to apply also the provisions of the current 7.2.4.25.5 in the case where the previous cargo also required a “closed type vessel” according to column (7) of Table C of Chapter 3.2.
3. The Committee asked the Netherlands and France to submit a proposal to amend 7.2.4.25.5 of the Regulations annexed to ADN (see ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/56, paragraphs 16 and 17).
4. Nevertheless, at the 28th session, the Committee could not take a decision on the proposal, and the representative of the Netherlands offered to submit a new proposal that would take into account the problems encountered in practice (see ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/58, paragraphs 55 – 57).
5. The governments of France and the Netherlands came to the conclusion that the remark made by the representative of CEFIC contradicts the essence of the proposal. Therefore the only possible adjustment to the proposal, which would converge the positions of France and the Netherlands and CEFIC, is to replace “gas free” by “degassed below 10% of the LEL and no significant concentration of dangerous substance”. This means that if a shore facility is not equipped to take residual gas from tanks before a cargo is loaded, it is not necessary to degas the tank completely:
6. As an additional remark to the final proposal, it is to be noted that column (7) of Table C of Chapter 3.2 deals with cargo tanks design and does not deal with vessels, and that the wording “closed type vessel” is improper and a misuse of language.

II. Proposed amendments

7. The proposed amendments take into account the remark in paragraph 4 above, and the Dutch proposal contained in document ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.2/2015/18 (cancelled text is ~~strikeout~~, additional text is in **bold underlined**):

"7.2.4.25.5 The gas/air mixtures shall be returned ashore through a vapour return piping during loading operations when:

- a closed ~~type vessel~~ **cargo tank** is required according to column (7) of Table C of Chapter 3.2.

or

- **a closed cargo tank according to column (7) of Table C of Chapter 3.2 was required for the previous cargo and, after unloading the previous cargo, the concentration of flammable gases in the cargo tank is above 10% of the LEL or the cargo tank contains a significant concentration of other dangerous gases.**"

III. Follow-up

8. The Safety Committee is invited to consider the proposals in paragraph 7 above, and to take action as it deems appropriate.
-