

**OTIF**



**ORGANISATION INTERGOUVERNEMENTALE POUR  
LES TRANSPORTS INTERNATIONAUX FERROVIAIRES**

**ZWISCHENSTAATLICHE ORGANISATION FÜR DEN  
INTERNATIONALEN EISENBAHNVERKEHR**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR INTER-  
NATIONAL CARRIAGE BY RAIL**

**OTIF/RID/CE/2006-A**

**27 November 2006**

Original: German

**TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE MEMBER STATES OF OTIF**

---

**Final report of the 43<sup>rd</sup> session of the  
RID Committee of Experts on the  
Transport of Dangerous Goods  
(Helsinki, 2 – 5 October 2006)**

For reasons of cost, only a limited number of copies of this document have been made. Delegates are asked to bring their own copies of documents to meetings. OTIF only has a small number of copies available.

Tel. (+41) 31 - 359 10 17 • Fax (+41) 31 - 359 10 11 • E-Mail [info@otif.org](mailto:info@otif.org) • Gryphenhübeliweg 30 • CH - 3006 Berne/Bern

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Paragraphs
Approval of the agenda	1
Election of Bureau	2
Presence and quorum	3
Working Group on tank and vehicle technology	4 – 44
Other proposals	45 – 63
Exchange of experiences for experts	64 – 79
Working Group on standardized risk analysis	80 – 81
Any other business	82 – 84
Closure of the session	85 – 88

**Annex 1:** Adopted texts

**Annex 2:** List of participants

Document OTIF/RID/CE/2006-A/Add.1

## ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

1. The agenda A 81-03/506.2006, dated 20 July 2006, which was amended in line with the availability and presence of various experts, was adopted. The following documents submitted after the invitation had been sent out were added to the various agenda items:

ITEM 4: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/5	(Finland – Barrier wagon rules)
OTIF/RID/CE/2006/9	(Belgium – Special Provision TE 22 – Reference to UIC leaflet 573)
UIC leaflet 573	(Technical conditions for the construction of tank wagons)
INF.1	(Germany – Special provision TE 22 – Energy absorption elements on tank-wagons)
ITEM 5: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/4	(UIC – Alignment of <b>Section 5</b> of UIC leaflet 471-3 <b>O</b> with the 2007 edition of RID)
OTIF/RID/CE/2006/6	(UIC – Securing folding panels to tank-wagons)
OTIF/RID/CE/2006/8	(Belgium – Securing the folding panels)
OTIF/RID/CE/2006/7	(Belgium – Rolling road)
ITEM 6: OTIF/RID/CE/EE/2006-A	(Secretariat – Final report of the exchange of experiences for recognised experts in accordance with RID 6.8.2.4.6 (Leipzig, 29 and 30 August 2006))
OTIF/RID/CE/2006/10	(Switzerland – Technical information in the tank record)

## ITEM 2: ELECTION OF BUREAU

2. Mr Helmut Rein (Germany) was re-elected Chairman. Mrs Caroline Bailleux (Belgium) was re-elected Vice-Chairman.

## ITEM 3: PRESENCE AND QUORUM

3. As 16 of the 42 Member States were represented, there was a quorum ( $\frac{1}{3}$  of the Member States) and the RID Committee of Experts was able to proceed with its business.

## ITEM 4: WORKING GROUP ON TANK AND VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY

Document: A 81-03/504.2006 (Secretariat)

4. The Chairman of the Working Group on tank and vehicle technology, Mr H.-J. Kellerhaus (Germany), described the progress that had been achieved at the working group's 7<sup>th</sup> session (London, 6 and 7 April 2006), which was set out in the report A 81-03/504.2006.

### **Derailment detection**

Document: A 81-03/504.2006, paragraphs 5 to 8

5. The representative of Switzerland explained that there would not yet be any results from the extended operational trial using modified derailment detectors as announced in document INF. CH 1 for the seventh session of the Working Group on tank and vehicle technology. Information should be provided by the manufacturer, Oerlikon-Knorr Eisenbahntechnik AG (OKE), at the working group's next session. As the RID Committee of Experts had decided to describe the objectives of derailment detectors in RID by 2009, at the next session of the working group, the manufacturers of derailment detectors should provide information on the extent to which the various systems are ready for use. **The representative of Belgium in-**

**formed the meeting that the Belgian company Macq Electronique was interested in the research project on electronic derailment detectors.**

### **Measures to prevent and limit damage from the overriding of buffers**

Documents: A 81-03/504.2006, paragraph 9  
OTIF/RID/CE/2006/3 (Germany)

6. The representative of Germany explained his document, which contained thoughts on an alternative to the quasi-static test method used in standard EN 13094. Tests carried out so far had shown that a sandwich construction consisting of a sheet of austenitic steel 3 mm thick, a 50 mm thick hard foam polyurethane and a cover sheet made of 0.7 mm thick austenitic steel provides the same energy absorption capacity as 6 mm thick mild steel. In his view, opting for a sandwich cover was only suitable in those cases where, for the substance to be carried, insulation of the shell was necessary. He did not consider the use of mild steel for the sandwich construction to be worthwhile, as in this case, the “protective shield” option would use less material.
7. In reply to a question from the representative of France, he explained that according to special provision TE 25, the energy absorption capacity of the sandwich cover must correspond to the energy absorption capacity of a wall thickness of 6 mm mild steel. It was not a question of comparing the energy absorption capacity of the increased wall thickness of 12 mm mild steel described in alternative (b) of special provision TE 25 with the energy absorption capacity of a tank end consisting of 6 mm mild steel and an additional sandwich construction.
8. The representative of the United Kingdom confirmed this assessment, as otherwise it would also have to be checked whether the equivalence formula in 6.8.2.1.18, which was referred to in special provision TE 25, had to be adapted.
9. The representative of France expressed doubt concerning the meaningfulness of a static test method. In his view, a dynamic test method should be prescribed in special provision TE 25 (c).
10. As the work of the Federal Institute for Materials Research and Testing (BAM) would be continued, it was agreed not to change the wording adopted for special provision TE 25 at the moment. In particular, the construction of the sandwich cover should not be described more precisely, as requested by the representative of France, as different constructions were able to satisfy the aim (equivalent energy absorption capacity).
11. The Chairman suggested that when updating document OTIF/RID/CE/2006/3, different formulations in this document that had led to differing interpretations should be made clearer.

### **Telematics**

Document: A 81-03/504.2006, paragraphs 11 to 13

12. The Chairman recalled that the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting had also now been informed of the EU Project MITRA (see report OTIF/RID/RC/2006-B, paragraphs 73 to 75). A workshop was being held in Brussels on 25.10.2006 at which the results of the project would be presented.
13. The representative of Germany informed the RID Committee of Experts that in Germany, a research project was to be awarded by the end of October, the aim of which would be to examine how the stand-alone solutions available for telematics applications, for example in various forwarding companies, could also be used for safety aspects in the carriage of dangerous goods (e.g. linking up with emergency services and other participants). All previous studies that have been carried out in this area, e.g. MITRA, should be incorporated into this

project. He asked the other Member States to provide him with any other studies. In order to ensure that the project was carried out in a manner that reflected practice as closely as possible, he suggested having a discussion at the next session of the working group on tank and vehicle technology.

### **Reducing the speed of complete train-loads of dangerous goods and by-passing built-up areas and stations**

Document: A 81-03/504.2006, paragraphs 14 to 17

14. The RID Committee of Experts agreed with the working group's recommendation to come back to these two topics again only when specific documents had been submitted.

### **Emergency management and dangerous goods atlas**

Document: A 81-03/504.2006, paragraphs 18 to 20

15. The Chairman regretted that the working group had interpreted paragraph 1.4.2.2.5 and subsection 1.4.3.6 quite broadly. It had not been the intention of the RID Committee of Experts that carriers must provide the railway infrastructure manager with all the data on the basis of which a dangerous goods atlas could later be produced.
16. The representative of France wondered whether the use of telematics in future could not also achieve the same aim as that of a dangerous goods atlas.
17. The representative of UIC pointed out that for purposes of environmental and civil protection, not only rail transport data, but also road transport data were necessary in order to form a complete picture.
18. The representative of the Netherlands explained that the dangerous goods atlas produced in the Netherlands was used not only by the rescue services, but also by local authorities affected by the carriage of dangerous goods. In addition, these data could also be used for a risk analysis.
19. At the moment, the RID Committee of Experts did not consider it necessary to include a mandatory requirement in RID for the production of a dangerous goods atlas. The working group's work on this subject would therefore be discontinued.

### **Drip leaks**

Document: A 81-03/504.2006, paragraphs 21 to 25

20. The Chairman explained that the discussions in the working group had shown that it was not absolutely necessary to seek to change the requirements as long as no systematic causes were identifiable.
21. The representative of UIC explained that drip leaks had consequences for the entire operation of a railway. He would try to submit more precise statistical data concerning drip leaks.
22. The representative of the Netherlands was of the view that in addition to the testing and repair of tank-wagons, the filling of tank-wagons should also be given closer consideration. In his view, the problem was one of quality assurance.
23. The representative of Germany explained that the problem of drip leaks also existed in Germany. In order to improve the situation, the Petroleum Industry Association had commissioned a research project, and information about this would be provided at the next meeting of the working group.

## Position of the wagon in the train (barrier wagon rule)

Documents: A 81-03/504.2006, paragraphs 26 to 29  
OTIF/RID/CE/2006/5 (Finland)

24. The aim of Finland's document was to extend the barrier wagon rule of section 7.5.3 to tank-wagons for toxic gases and in view of the risk of a BLEVE, to initiate a discussion on extending the rule further to cover LPG tank-wagons. In addition to the existing provisions of 7.5.3, the proposal was to require a barrier wagon between the locomotive and the tank-wagon and at the end of the train.
25. The consultancy firm contracted by the Government of Finland to carry out a study gave the RID Committee of Experts a presentation on the basic principles and conclusions of its study.
  - The research was carried out on the basis of statistical surveys on rail freight and rail passenger traffic **in Finland** from 1996 to 2005.
  - Taking into account the frequency of accidents, it was established that 17 % of the damaged or derailed wagons, and 20 % of the severely damaged or derailed and overturned wagons were positioned behind the locomotive or at the end of the train (barrier wagon position).
  - While the effects of barrier wagons are low or negligible in derailments and accidents at level crossings, in collisions, barrier wagons can minimise the possible consequences of an accident by absorbing part of the energy themselves. In addition, barrier wagons can limit the effects of an accident as they enable groups of wagons to be uncoupled and improve access for the rescue services, and they can prevent a fire spreading to other wagons that are at risk.
26. In the subsequent discussion, it became clear that the requirements concerning barrier wagons should be better defined in order to avoid their creating an increased risk. For instance, it could be prescribed that only four-axle loaded (minimum 8 tons **load**?) barrier wagons are permitted, and the load itself must not be the source of an increased risk (e.g. no steel girders). In addition, conditions could be laid down for the running characteristics and energy absorption capacity of barrier wagons.
27. The representative of UIC reminded the meeting that at the last meeting of the working group on tank and vehicle technology, he had said he was prepared to carry out a study on the advantages and disadvantages of barrier wagons in a train. The representatives of UIC and UIP pointed out that the cost effectiveness of such transport operations would be further reduced by the use of barrier wagons. They were of the view that barrier wagons were not advantageous from the cost/benefit perspective.
28. The representative of the European Commission noted that in various EU Member States, barrier wagon rules existed that went beyond the requirements of RID, and according to the RID Framework Directive, these should be notified to the Commission. For reasons of harmonisation of the barrier wagon rules, he supported Finland's proposal, but considered it essential that a cost/benefit analysis be carried out.
29. A straw poll on barrier wagon rules that go beyond the requirements of RID 7.5.3 revealed the following:
  - Denmark: additional provisions for tunnels;
  - Latvia and Lithuania: additional provisions for transport with third countries (SMGS);
  - United Kingdom: additional provisions;

- Sweden: **when a two-axle wagon is used as barrier wagon in domestic carriage this has to be loaded (N.B. This supplement will be excluded from the Swedish version of RID 2007).**

Informal documents: INF.3 (Russian Federation)  
INF.4 (OSJD)

30. Informal documents INF. 3 and INF. 4 contained the barrier wagon rules that apply in the Russian Federation and in accordance with Annex 2 of SMGS. The representative of the Russian Federation said that Table A of Annex 2 to SMGS contained a column showing, in a coded form, the barrier wagon required for each substance.

This code provided information on the number of barrier wagons between the dangerous goods wagon and

- a steam locomotive;
- a diesel or electric locomotive;
- a shunting locomotive;
- a passenger car;
- a **shunting** locomotive.

31. The representative of the Russian Federation referred to the special situation of Russian Railways and to the increased risk potential that resulted from unsecured rail crossings, transit through numerous marshalling yards and from technical defects in wagons and infrastructure. He said that barrier wagons within a train formation were not considered to be useful. As a rule, loaded wagons whose load posed no risk were used as barrier wagons. To some extent though, empty wagons that had to be returned were also used. As Russian Railways were themselves responsible for the consequences of accidents, economic considerations would take a back seat.
32. In connection with this, the representative of Finland welcomed the alignment of the structure of SMGS Annex 2 with RID. In reply to a question from the representative of Finland, the representative of the Russian Federation confirmed that the intention was to align the stricter provisions that applied to domestic transport in the Russian Federation with Annex 2 of SMGS.
33. The representative of CIT pointed out that the harmonisation of Annex 2 of SMGS with RID was also of great importance for the uniform CIM-SMGS consignment note.
34. At the request of the representative of Finland, following the discussion there was an indicative vote to ascertain which Member States currently supported extending the barrier wagon rules to other substances. This was supported by Denmark, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway (according to a message received by the Secretariat), Sweden and the United Kingdom.
35. It was agreed that the working group on tank and vehicle technology should first look at this problem. The representatives of Finland and the Russian Federation were asked to take part in these meetings of the working group.
36. The proposal by the representative of the United Kingdom to replace “in the direction of the track” by “on the same train” in the current 7.5.3 was provisionally adopted (see Annex 1).

## Special provision TE 22

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/9 (Belgium)  
Informal documents: UIC leaflet 573 (UIC)  
INF.1 (Germany)

37. The aim of Belgium's document was to include a reference at the end of special provision TE 22 (energy absorption elements) to paragraph 1.4 of UIC leaflet 573 (Technical conditions for the construction of tank-wagons). The representative of Belgium reminded the meeting that the UIC had been asked to include suitable provisions in this UIC leaflet (see also the report of the 41<sup>st</sup> session of the RID Committee of Experts, A 81-03/511.2004, paragraphs 5 to 7), on the basis of which energy absorption elements could be approved.
38. The representative of Germany supported Belgium's proposal, as it would promote legal certainty. He introduced his informal document INF. 1, which showed the procedure laid down in Germany concerning the evidence needed for the approval.
39. The representative of the United Kingdom pointed out that various references in the UIC leaflet still related to earlier editions of RID and would have to be amended (e.g. in paragraph 1.3.4, reference to Appendix VIII of RID).
40. In the discussion, it was also mentioned that the "Freight Wagons" TSI published in July 2006 **applies to new railway rolling stock in the European Union. This TSI contains provisions for buffers, but with regard to freight wagons for dangerous goods it refers to** the RID Framework Directive and **RID**.
41. The representatives of UIC and Germany suggested that the requirements for crash buffers should also be laid down in standard EN 15551 for train and impact devices.
42. Belgium's proposal was finally adopted, as at present, only UIC leaflet 573 can be referred to (see Annex 1).

## Next meeting of the working group on tank and vehicle technology

43. At the invitation of Germany, the next meeting of the working group on tank and vehicle technology will be held on 15 June 2007 during the "transport logistics" trade fair in Munich. On 14 June 2007, at the same venue, a workshop on telematics applications organised by the German Ministry of Transport will take place, to which all members of the working group are also invited.
44. The main subjects of the next meeting will be "telematics" and "derailment detectors". In addition, the subject of "barrier wagons" will be examined. The subject of "drip leaks" will be dealt with if further documents on this topic are available.

## ITEM 5: OTHER PROPOSALS

### Sub-section 7.5.1.1

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/1 (Secretariat)

45. The Secretariat's suggestion to delete the second sub-paragraph of 7.5.1.1, as what it says is now fully covered by the new sub-section 7.5.7.1 in the 2007 edition, was adopted without discussion.
46. The representative of Austria also suggested amending the remaining part of the text in sub-section 7.5.1.1 and to refer not only to the special provisions, but to all the provisions of



Chapter 7.5. In contrast, the representatives of Belgium and France preferred some form of words according to which, in principle, the provisions of the forwarding station apply, provided the provisions of Chapter 7.5 are observed.

Informal document: INF.2 (Belgium/France/Austria)

47. The proposed wording drafted by a small ad hoc working group for the first sub-paragraph of sub-section 7.5.1.1 was adopted (see Annex 1).

#### Reference to **Section 5 of UIC leaflet 471-3 O**

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/4 (UIC)

48. In the UIC's document, **Section 5 of UIC leaflet 471-3 O** was reproduced. This was revised on the basis of RID 2007. UIC requested that the reference in footnote 6) to paragraph 1.4.2.2.1 be amended by means of a corrigendum. The representative of UIC explained that UIC leaflet 471-3 O had also been revised as a whole to make the quality criteria clearer and to take account of the larger number of carriers who apply this leaflet.
49. The representative of Belgium regretted that the information in the transport document concerning the number and description of the packages, as required in accordance with 5.4.1.1.1 (e), was not part of the examinations to be carried out in accordance with UIC leaflet 471-3 O.
- 49a. In this respect, the representative of Austria was of the view that in the light of the amendment made to 5.4.1.1.1 (e) for the 2007 edition in accordance with the UN Model Regulations, clarification was needed on whether or to what extent information on materials for the description of the type of packages was prescribed in the transport document and was to be checked in examinations. However, the Chairman did not wish to hold a discussion on this particular aspect, as such a discussion would have to take place in the UN Sub-Committee of Experts.**
50. The representative of UIC was asked to include this additional point for examination in the final version of the leaflet. As in previous editions of RID, the RID Committee of Experts had no objection to the procedure of amending the reference to the UIC leaflet by means of a corrigendum (see Annex 1).

#### Securing folding panels to tank-wagons

Documents: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/6 (UIC)  
OTIF/RID/CE/2006/8 (Belgium)

51. The aim of the documents submitted by UIC and Belgium was to prescribe in RID that the folding panels used to provide information concerning the load limit for multiple use tank-wagons for gases cannot collapse or become loose from the frame during transport. Belgium's proposal also contained a provision taken from UIC leaflet 573, according to which the folding panels must be capable of being sealed. In addition, Belgium's document proposed also to include an analogous provision in 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, as similar folding panels are also used for placards and the orange-coloured plates.
52. The representative of UIC explained the aims of his document, which were firstly, to achieve the same legal position in RID and the UIC leaflet, secondly, to oblige the filler to ensure that the folding panels were sufficiently secure and thirdly, to improve the construction of folding panels to prevent them folding up during transport.

53. As the majority of delegates were of the view that the UIC leaflet requires that folding panels be capable of being sealed for customs reasons, and that this was immaterial for the carriage of dangerous goods, the representative of Belgium withdrew this part of her proposal.
54. The RID Committee of Experts considered that the wording proposed in UIC's proposal for the second sentence of 4.3.3.4.1 (a), "securely fixed", was not precise enough and that in relation to this, reference should be made to the measures in accordance with 6.8.3.5.7 (see Annex 1).
55. The RID Committee of Experts amended the text proposed by UIC for 6.8.3.5.7 so that the causes that might lead to the folding panels collapsing or becoming loose from the frame are not restricted to "impacts" or "unintentional actions" (see Annex 1).
56. With regard to the inclusion of a similar provision in 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, as proposed in Belgium's document, the RID Committee of Experts was of the view that this question should be dealt with at the Joint Meeting, as these types of folding panels were also used in road transport.
57. The representative of Belgium said she would submit this part of her proposal to the Joint Meeting. The representative of Austria suggested making provision for a general paragraph for information on folding panels.

#### **Definition of "rolling road"**

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/7 (Belgium)

58. In her document, the representative of Belgium proposed to delete the explanation of "rolling road" in 5.3.1.3.2 (a) and instead to include a definition in 1.2.1, which was taken from a manual for combined transport published by the EU, UNECE and ECMT. However, to this definition should also be added the criterion that the vehicle driver accompanies this type of transport.
59. In the discussion, the following points were addressed, which would have to be taken into account in a definition in 1.2.1:
  - "Rolling road" trains included passenger carriages in which the road vehicle drivers travelled.
  - Instead of "comprising low-floor wagons throughout", a more general wording should be chosen so that subsequent technical developments could be covered.
  - As there were already "rolling road" trains where the vehicle drivers did not accompany the vehicle, the criterion that "the driver of the road vehicle accompanies this type of transport" should be worded as an option. However, in connection with this, the relaxation allowed under 5.3.1.3.2 (a) (not necessary to affix placards to carrying wagons used in the "rolling road" system) was called into question for those cases in which the vehicle is not accompanied by the vehicle driver.
60. The RID Committee of Experts considered that the term "rolling road" should correctly be defined in 1.2.1, as the term "piggyback transport" was also defined in 1.2.1. It was necessary to distinguish between "piggyback" transport and "rolling road", because relaxations applied to the "rolling road" system. Restricting the relaxation allowed under 5.3.1.3.2 (a) to those cases in which the vehicle driver accompanies the consignment would make the rule too complex. The oral proposal made by the representative of Austria to word 5.3.1.3.2 (a) positively and thus to dispense with a definition of "rolling road" should be submitted in an official proposal.

61. The representative of Belgium would submit a new proposal, taking into account the comments made.

### **New Rules of Procedure for the RID Committee of Experts**

62. The Chairman referred to Article 10 § 4 of the Rules of Procedure adopted at the last session of the RID Committee of Experts (document A 81-03/501.2006/Add.3) and regretted the wording that was chosen, "The Chairman may propose". He proposed the wording "The Chairman may decide", as according to Article 10 § 5, the Chairman's decisions could be rejected by the majority of the Members present ("The Chairman's decision shall stand if a majority of Members present do not oppose it").
63. The RID Committee of Experts adopted this amendment to the Rules of Procedure (see Annex 1).

### **ITEM 6: EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES FOR EXPERTS**

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/EE/2006-A (Secretariat)

64. The representative of Germany introduced the report on the second exchange of experiences for recognised experts in accordance with RID 6.8.2.4.6 and emphasised the aim of the exchange of experiences, which was to achieve harmonised inspection procedures in cases where RID contained provisions that were open to interpretation. This was of particular significance against the background of the liberalisation of inspection work and the pressure of competition between the various inspection bodies.
65. The representative of France asked that the remit of this exchange of experiences be better defined in order to avoid infringing upon the competencies of the RID Committee of Experts. In connection with this, he referred to paragraphs 18 to 23 of the report, in which a decision had been taken on the tolerances when determining the wall thickness.
66. The Chairman recalled that the question of principle of the wall thickness required had been addressed in the Joint Meeting at the request of UIP, but no decision had been taken. In the exchange of experiences, the experts had merely made a statement concerning the measuring tolerances that were allowed in the various States. Because of the measuring methods used, measuring tolerances would have to be allowed, but without allowing a systematic shortfall in wall thickness. If the view were that measuring tolerances should be standardised, there should be a proposal to the Joint Meeting.
67. The Chairman also recalled how the various problems brought to light by the exchange of experiences were to be dealt with (see paragraph 7 of the report).
68. The representative of the Netherlands pointed out that the test and inspection requirements for the tanks of tank-vehicles and of tank-wagons were identical, so a common platform should be sought for an exchange of experiences.
69. The Chairman reminded the meeting that an exchange of experiences for experts was only prescribed in RID (6.8.2.4.6). If similar provisions for **pressure receptacles** and tanks from the TPED Directive were transferred into RID/ADR, as had been discussed at the last RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting (see report OTIF/RID/RC/2006-B – ECE/TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/104, paragraphs 61 to 71), the existing procedure could be replaced by a new one at Joint Meeting level.

## Participation in the exchange of experiences

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/2 (Belgium)

70. Belgium's document proposing that participation in the exchange of experiences be made mandatory for recognised experts had already been discussed at the exchange of experiences (see paragraphs 53 and 54 of report OTIF/RID/CE/EE/2006-A).
71. The RID Committee of Experts supported the conclusion reached at the exchange of experiences, i.e. that there was no need to prescribe mandatory participation for all experts. Instead, it would be sufficient if a representative of the competent authority and at least one expert from each Member State were present, who would then be in a position to disseminate information in their country.

## Technical information in the tank record

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/10 (Switzerland)

72. The aim of this document was to refer to standard EN 12972 in the definition of "tank record" in 1.2.1 in relation to the technically relevant information and to prescribe that this information be available in paper form. In addition, it was suggested that there should be a discussion on how to avoid a rejected tank being taken to another testing body without eliminating the defects that had been noted.
73. The representative of Belgium supported the proposal concerning alignment of the definition, but proposed that **instead of the reference** to standard EN 12972, a list of the documents required should be made.
74. The Secretariat recalled that at the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting in September 2004, where it was decided to introduce a tank record, there had already been a discussion on the form of the tank record (see report OCTI/RID/GT-III/2004-A – TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/96, paragraphs 54 to 56).
75. The representatives of Belgium and France also **preferred** alternative (b), according to which the owner or operator of a tank has to return a document issued by the original testing body to the original testing body in due time, giving information on the reasons the tank was rejected, with the stamp of the expert **who has** ascertained that the defects have been eliminated. **The representative of Belgium emphasised that the proposal in OCTI/RID/GT-III/2005/45 – TRANS/WP.15/AC.1/2005/45 submitted to the Joint Meeting in September 2005, according to which an unsuccessful test had to be repeated at the same testing body, should be re-examined in connection with Switzerland's proposal.**
76. The representative of Switzerland would take these suggestions into account in an official proposal for the Joint Meeting.

## Holding the exchange of experiences in future

77. The RID Committee of Experts also discussed whether the exchange of experiences should be linked to the sessions of the RID Committee of Experts in order to achieve greater levels of attendance, or whether it should be held at least one month before the sessions of the RID Committee of Experts in order that any problems resulting from the work done in the exchange of experiences could be discussed in the RID Committee of Experts.
78. The majority in the RID Committee of Experts supported holding the two meetings at different times.
79. Mr Stefan Dernbach (Germany) was elected Chairman of the exchange of experiences.

## **ITEM 7: WORKING GROUP ON STANDARDIZED RISK ANALYSIS**

80. As already mentioned in the invitation to this meeting, the meeting of the working group planned for 2006 could not take place owing to the lack of time. Switzerland would probably host this meeting in April 2007.
81. Now that risk analysis had also become more significant for road transport in connection with the new tunnel regulations in ADR, the Chairman asked the representative of Switzerland also to invite the Chairman of WP.15 to this meeting.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Cooperation with the European Railway Agency (ERA)**

82. In a presentation, the representative of ERA, which was represented at the RID Committee of Experts for the first time, explained the working methods, organisation and tasks of ERA. He defined the interfaces that arise between the RID Framework Directive 96/49 on the one hand and the Interoperability Directive 2001/16 and the Safety Directive 2004/49 on the other. He also emphasised the importance of future cooperation to ensure that the various legal provisions did not contradict each other.
83. The RID Committee of Experts agreed that continual cooperation with ERA was vital, and asked that in future, a representative of ERA should take part in all sessions of the RID Committee of Experts and the working group on tank and vehicle technology. This was particularly important because in future, the TSIs would also be referred to in RID. Because of harmonisation with the other transport modes, discussions concerning the carriage of dangerous goods should take place exclusively in the RID Committee of Experts.

### **Information from the European Commission on the joint Dangerous Goods Framework Directive**

84. The representative of the European Commission explained that the draft joint Directive for rail, road and inland waterway transport had been completed and had now been submitted to the other areas of the Commission for their views. Translation of the Directive would be completed in December 2006, so it could be discussed in the Council at the beginning of 2007.

## **CLOSURE OF THE SESSION**

### **Next session**

85. The 44<sup>th</sup> session of the RID Committee of Experts would be held from 19 – 23 November 2007, possibly at the invitation of Croatia in Zagreb.

### **Departure of Mr Cees Smit (Netherlands)**

86. Mr Cees Smit had sent the Secretariat an e.mail before the meeting saying that he had left the Dutch Ministry of Transport and was now working for the Dutch Dangerous Goods Council, which drafted recommendations for the Government. The Chairman thanked Mr Smit for his many years of work in the RID Committee of Experts and wished him every success in his future role.

## **Thanks**

87. The Chairman thanked the Finnish Ministry of Transport for the excellent and perfect organisation of the session. He thanked the interpreters for their excellent work. He particularly thanked the Russian Federation and OSJD for their participation at this session and hoped that this would lead to close contact in the future.
  88. The representative of Belgium thanked the Chairman for his efficient handling of the meeting.
-

### Adopted texts

#### Corrections to the 2007 edition of RID

**1.4.2.2.1** Amend footnote 6) to read as follows:

"<sup>6)</sup> Version of the UIC leaflet applicable as from 1 January 2007."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/4]

**7.5.3.1** and

**7.5.3.2** [This amendment does not concern the English version.]

#### Amendments to RID for 2009

**4.3.3.4.1 (a)** Amend the second sentence to read as follows:

"Tank-wagons for multiple use shall especially be checked to ensure that the correct folding panels are visible and securely fixed by the means referred to in 6.8.3.5.7 on both sides of the wagon."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/6 as amended]

**6.8.3.5.7** In the left-hand column, add the following new sentence at the end:

"The folding panels shall be so designed and be capable of being secured that they cannot unfold or become loose from the frame during carriage (especially as a result of impacts or unintentional actions)."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/6 as amended]

**6.8.4** At the end of special provision TE 22, add:

"The requirements of this paragraph are considered to have been complied with if Section 1.4 of UIC leaflet 573\* (Technical conditions for the construction of tank wagons) is applied.

\* <sup>6</sup>th Edition of the UIC leaflet applicable from 1 April 2005."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/9]

**7.5.1.1** Amend the first sub-paragraph to read as follows:

"The requirements in force at the **forwarding** station shall be complied with for the loading of goods, provided they do not conflict with the requirements of this Chapter.

[Reference document: INF.2 as amended]

- 7.5.1.1** Delete the second sub-paragraph.  
[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/2006/1]
- [7.5.3** Replace "in the direction of the track" with:  
"on the same train".]

**Amendment to the Rules of Procedure (document A 81-03/501.2006/Add.3)**

In Article 10 § 4, amend the beginning to read as follows:

"The Chairman may decide ...".

---