

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/2008-B

25 November 2008

Original: German

TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE MEMBER STATES OF OTIF

**Final report of the 46th Session of the RID Committee of Experts
(Hamburg, 21 - 23 October 2008)**

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 • Gryphenhübeliweg 30 • CH - 3006 Berne/Bern

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
Approval of the agenda	1	3
Election of bureau	2	3
Presence and quorum	3	3
Informal working group on markings in piggyback transport	4 – 11	3
Other proposals	12 – 42	5
Working group on tank and vehicle technology	43 – 55	8
European Commission's Interoperability Committee	56	10
Exchange of experiences for experts	57 – 58	10
Working group on standardized risk analysis	59 – 60	10
Information from CIT and UIC on the "e-RailFreight" project	61 – 63	11
Closure of the session	64 – 67	11

Annex 1: Adopted texts

Annex 2: List of participants Document OTIF/RID/CE/2008-B/Add.1

Annex 3: Presentation by the representative of ERA Document OTIF/RID/CE/2008-B/Add.2

Annex 4: Presentation by the representative of CIT Document OTIF/RID/CE/2008-B/Add.3

ITEM 1: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Document: A 81-03/505.2008 (Secretariat)

Informal document: INF.1 (Secretariat)

1. The meeting adopted the provisional agenda contained in invitation A 81-03/505.2008 dated 21 August 2008 with the list of documents published by the Secretariat in informal document INF.1.

ITEM 2: ELECTION OF BUREAU

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

ITEM 3: PRESENCE AND QUORUM

3. As 18 of the 39 Member States entitled to vote were represented (see Annex 2), there was a quorum in accordance with Article 20 § 1 of the Rules of Procedure ($\frac{1}{3}$ of the Member States) and the RID Committee of Experts was able to proceed with its business. The Secretariat informed the meeting that Estonia's accession to COTIF would take effect on 1 January 2009. Estonia would therefore become the 43rd Member State of OTIF.

ITEM 4: INFORMAL WORKING GROUP ON MARKINGS IN PIGGYBACK TRANSPORT

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2008/17 (UIC)

Informal document: INF.3 (France)

4. UIC document OTIF/RID/CE/2008/17 contained the results of an informal working group on the marking of carrying wagons in piggyback transport. This working group was held on 7 and 8 July 2008 on the basis of a mandate from the 44th session of the RID Committee of Experts. In the results, the working group proposed to do away with the subsequent marking on the sides of carrying wagons when the markings on the road vehicle are **in accordance with ADR**.
5. France's informal document INF.3 was based on a document that had been submitted to the working group. The informal document did not call into question the results of the informal working group, but it contained proposals for various definitions of the technologies currently used in combined transport which seemed more suitable than the definition of piggyback transport used at present. Basically, France proposed to include a definition on the basis of combined road/rail transport as referred to in Chapter 5.3 of ADR, with a distinction between accompanied and unaccompanied transport. Definitions of swap-bodies and intermodal transport units were also proposed.

Definition

6. Although in the subsequent discussion the proposal from France was welcomed, it was not considered necessary, as ultimately, the marking provisions proposed by France were the same for accompanied and unaccompanied combined transport. In addition, only the marking when carrying road vehicles caused problems, as in this case, there was a difference between the marking requirements of RID and ADR.

7. It was also pointed out that transport technology in piggyback transport (carriage of lorries, with or without trailers, on low-loader wagons, or of semi-trailers in pocket wagons) was expressed in completely different ways in different States. However, the meeting considered it useful to have a single definition in RID so that it would not be necessary to have to describe this transport technology in separate places.
8. The RID Committee of Experts decided to make the definition of piggyback transport clearer as follows, firstly so as not to have to define the term “road vehicles”, which is used in the current definition, and secondly to exclude the carriage of new vehicles:

““Piggyback transport” means the carriage of transport units or vehicles within the meaning of ADR in combined road/rail transport. This definition also includes the rolling road (loading of transport units within the meaning of ADR (accompanied or unaccompanied) onto wagons designed for this type of transport).”

Marking

9. The majority of the RID Committee of Experts supported the core of the proposal from the informal working group to accept the markings used in road transport without modification, although the following points were highlighted in the discussion:
 - a) When a trailer or semi-trailer is loaded without a drawing vehicle, only the orange-coloured marking on the end of the vehicle is still visible. **The meeting expressed doubt that this could be considered as marking in accordance with ADR and that it was sufficient for piggyback transport.**
 - b) A provision similar to that in 5.3.1.3.1 and 5.3.2.1.5 was considered necessary. According to these paragraphs, the placards and orange-coloured plates must also be affixed to the carrying wagon when they are not clearly visible from outside.
 - c) **It was questioned whether the information system required in 1.4.2.2.5 and 1.4.3.6 between the carrier, the infrastructure manager and the emergency services already functioned everywhere and in such a way that it could replace the marking on a carrying wagon. For** reasons of personal protection for the fire brigade and to warn the general public, it was **in any case** considered necessary to provide an initial indication of the presence of dangerous goods.
 - d) The representative of Switzerland asked whether affixing placards to wagons carrying packages **could** also be dispensed with. However, this would have to be the subject of a separate proposal, although the representative of Austria pointed out that his country had already taken this step with multilateral special agreement RID 2/2006.
10. In order to remove any uncertainty, UIC was asked to incorporate into the proposal points a) and b) of paragraph 9 and the definition in paragraph 8. This should be done in an ad-hoc working group.

Informal document: INF.4 (UIC)

11. It was agreed to submit the results of the ad-hoc working group in informal document INF.4 to the next session of the RID Committee of Experts as an official document. In so doing, in addition to semi-trailers, 1.1.4.4.3 should take account of normal trailers. The Netherlands wished to prefigure 1.1.4.4.1 and 1.1.4.4.2 with the principle that placards and orange-coloured plates should be affixed to carrying wagons used in piggyback transport. The representative of the Netherlands was asked to submit his request in a separate document.

ITEM 5: OTHER PROPOSALS

Reference to EN standard 13094:2008

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2008/19 (Secretariat)

12. The meeting adopted the Secretariat's proposal to refer in 6.8.2.6 to EN standard 13094:2008 (Tanks for the transport of dangerous goods – Metallic tanks with a working pressure not exceeding 0.5 bar – Design and construction), and added that the same was necessary under the heading "For tanks intended for the carriage of liquid petroleum products and other dangerous substances of Class 3 which have a vapour pressure not exceeding 110 kPa at 50 °C and petrol, and which have no toxic or corrosive subsidiary hazard". This amendment to RID, which will enter into force on 1 July 2009, was unanimously approved (see Annex 1).

Introducing the concept of instructions in writing into RID

Documents: OTIF/RID/CE/2008/20 (Germany)
OTIF/RID/CE/2008/22 (UIC)

13. As announced at the last session of the RID Committee of Experts, Germany proposed in document OTIF/RID/CE/2008/20 to prescribe instructions in writing in RID for locomotive drivers.
14. In document OTIF/RID/CE/2008/22, UIC supported the principle of instructions in writing and harmonising them at international level, but ruled out action on the part of the locomotive driver in the event of fires in the load and leaks. In connection with this, the representative of UIC pointed out that the tasks the locomotive driver had to carry out were already laid down in operational safety requirements, particularly Directive 2007/59/EC (on the certification of train drivers operating locomotives and trains on the railway system in the Community). In view of the date the proposal was submitted, it had not been possible to check the correlation between the proposal and other reference texts.
15. The representative of the European Railway Agency (ERA) explained that harmonisation of the emergency situation procedures within the EU Member States should be an objective and could be achieved in the future. At present, according to the Directive on the Interoperability of the rail system within the Community (2008/57/EC) and the Technical Specification for Interoperability relating to the subsystem "Traffic Operation and Management" of the trans-European conventional rail system, it is required that railway undertakings and the infrastructure manager, in accordance with their respective responsibilities under the relevant TSI requirements (see paragraphs 4.2.1.2, 4.2.3.4.3, 4.2.3.7 and 4.3.3.12), define the "emergency situation" procedures and give them to the relevant staff (including the instructions for the driver). Also, according to the Railway Safety Directive (2004/49/EC), it might be the case that some EU Member States had already notified the Commission of their National Safety Rules (NSR) for "emergency situations", including situations involving dangerous goods. Before adopting the proposed provision and a specific procedure relating to the railway system in case of emergency, the EU Member States should check if any inconsistencies might exist between the proposed instructions in writing and the NSR. Potential inconsistencies depend also on the nature of the proposed instructions in writing, e.g. whether they are requirements or simply guidelines.
16. It was agreed that in a revised version of the document, Germany would check points 1, 2 and 5 on page 1 of the instructions in writing to ensure that they did not conflict with the TSI Operation.

17. In a discussion of principle on the need for internationally standardised instructions in writing, the Chairman was keen to point out that this harmonisation was in the interest of the rail transport undertakings, as they would no longer have to keep different instructions for international transport.
18. The representative of Switzerland drew the meeting's attention to the fact that instructions in writing did not come under the scope of RID set out in 1.1.2.
19. Finally, in a vote, 11 States supported including instructions in writing in RID and 4 States were opposed.
20. Following this vote, Germany's proposal was examined in detail.

Actions in the event of an accident or emergency

21. The representative of UIC did not agree with the first indent on page 1 of the instructions in writing, as it was too general and did not take sufficient account of the possibility of continuing the journey **and instructions** from the infrastructure manager. Germany was asked to revise this point.
22. As the locomotive driver was not in a position to switch off the source of energy, it was agreed that the second indent would be worded in accordance with the first indent of the UIC proposal.
23. In the fifth indent, it was decided to use the terminology according to the TSI Operation. In addition, the locomotive driver should still have the option of informing the emergency services directly in the event that the usual channel of communication did not work.
24. As the Note to 5.4.0 allowed the use of electronic data processing (EDP) or electronic data interchange (EDI) techniques as an aid to or instead of paper documentation, and as it was not necessarily possible for the locomotive driver to provide paper transport documents, the words "If necessary," were inserted at the beginning of the sixth indent, as proposed by UIC.
25. As railway staff must in principle wear high visibility clothing when in the vicinity of tracks, it was agreed that in the seventh indent, there should just be a reminder that the locomotive driver must put on the prescribed safety vest when leaving the locomotive.
26. The eighth and ninth indents were not changed.
27. With the agreement of the representative of Germany, the tenth and eleventh indents were deleted on the basis of UIC's proposal not to involve the locomotive driver in extinguishing a fire in the load or in containing substances that have leaked.
28. As the twelfth indent was only kept general and should not therefore contradict health and safety at work regulations, it was decided to include it with the wording proposed by UIC.

Emergency escape mask

29. The emergency escape mask proposed by Germany, which is prescribed at least in Switzerland for the safe escape from tunnels, was not considered necessary by the majority of States (10 opposed, 4 in favour).
30. As a result, "emergency escape mask" was deleted on pages 2 and 3 of the instructions in writing under danger labels 2.3 and 6.1.

Additional instructions for the locomotive driver

31. In conformity with the decision under paragraph 27, the additional guidance concerning the leaking of dangerous substances was deleted on pages 2 and 3 of the instructions in writing for danger labels 3, 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 8 and 9. Consequently, it was also possible to delete the eye rinsing liquid, protective gloves, eye protection equipment and shovel on page 4 of the instructions in writing.
32. As danger label model 7E only appears in conjunction with danger labels 7A, 7B and 7C, the instruction “[limit time of exposure]” was deleted in respect of this danger label.

Equipment for personal and general protection

33. In accordance with the proposal from UIC, a footnote was included on page 4 of the instructions in writing, according to which the equipment to be carried must, if necessary, be adapted to existing national requirements.
34. While some representatives emphasised that it would be difficult to achieve harmonisation in the case of equipment because regulations already existed in various States in other branches of the law, other representatives regretted that international transport would not be made easier by referring to national requirements.

Further danger labelling

35. Some representatives thought further danger labelling and its meaning should be included on pages 2 and 3 of the instructions in writing (e.g. label for environmentally hazardous substances, label for substances carried at elevated temperature, orange-coloured blank marking in piggyback transport (see paragraphs 4 to 11)). The Chairman pointed out that the label for substances pollutant to the aquatic environment was not relevant in rail transport, as it had already been decided that the locomotive driver did not have any tasks in connection with the containment of leaked substances (see paragraph 27). With regard to the elevated temperature label, he suggested adding “risk of burns” to danger label 3, as with danger label 9. The meaning of the orange-coloured marking could be explained during training.
36. The representative of Austria said that the main heading of pages 2 and 3 of the instructions in writing should be amended to refer to the dangers and not to the classes, as was the case everywhere else. **He announced a suitable proposal to the Joint Meeting.**

5.4.3.1 to 5.4.3.4

37. The German text of 5.4.3.1 was aligned with the text of ADR.
38. 5.4.3.2 was also aligned with the text of ADR to give the carrier the obligation to ensure that the locomotive driver understands the instructions and is in a position to carry them out properly. The representative of Germany said he would draft some wording for a new obligation for the carrier in 1.4.2.2 and submit it to the next session of the RID Committee of Experts.
39. 5.4.3.3 was reworded to **emphasise** that the carrier is responsible for informing the locomotive driver of the dangerous goods loaded. This **text** was placed in square brackets for the time being.
40. In 5.4.3.4, the majority of representatives wanted a flexible form of wording concerning the form and content, in order to make it easier to take account of national requirements.

41. For the next session of the RID Committee of Experts, the representative of Germany would submit a proposal revised on the basis of the decisions taken at this session. The representatives of other States were asked to send him any requests they might have concerning this proposal.

Correction to 6.2.3.3.3 (c)

Informal document: INF.5 (Spain)

42. Informal document INF.5 from Spain, which had also been submitted to the 85th session of WP.15 (Geneva, 28 – 31 October 2008), pointed out a correction that should be made in the French version of 6.2.3.3.3 (c) that would enter into force on 1 January 2009. The RID Committee of Experts confirmed this alignment with the original English version (what is contained in the sentences to be deleted is already contained in the 4th and 5th sentences of 6.2.1.1.6) and asked the Secretariat to include this correction in an erratum for the 2009 edition of RID (see Annex 1).

ITEM 6: WORKING GROUP ON TANK AND VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/GT/2008-A

43. The Chairman of the working group on tank and vehicle technology, Mr Kogelheide, informed the meeting of the progress made at the last session (Berne, 14 and 15 May 2008).

Monitoring the main brake pipe/air-brake check

44. With regard to paragraphs 24 and 29 of OTIF/RID/CE/GT/2008-A, the representative of ERA explained **the legal basis and the content of the study ERA has to carry out if a request is made to examine a new proposal that includes aspects of railway safety (see also OTIF/RID/CE/GT/2008/18, Annex 5). With regard to aspects of railway safety, ERA still had to be provided with justification of the need for a specific measure and explanations of the aims for the dangerous goods sector before undertaking the corresponding examination procedure.**
45. The working group was mandated to collect together the findings from accidents that had occurred and to make them available to ERA so that it could initiate the necessary procedures.

Minimum distance of 300 mm between the headstock plane and the tank – inclusion of a provision from UIC leaflet 573

Documents: OTIF/RID/CE/2008/21 (ERA)
OTIF/RID/CE/2008/24 (United Kingdom)

46. In his document OTIF/RID/CE/2008/21, the representative of ERA explained that the **provisional** derogation from the new provision in 6.8.2.1.29, which referred to a minimum loading gauge or **the loading gauge in Great Britain**, and which the working group had adopted, should be specified in RID itself.
47. In document OTIF/RID/CE/2008/24, the representative of the United Kingdom proposed two alternatives taking into account the position of the ERA representative. The **UK** alternatives referred to UIC leaflets 505-1 and 503 respectively.
48. The representative of France asked that this alternative should not be limited to a specific freight vehicle gauge, but should also be permitted for continental Europe.

49. It was pointed out that the only aim of this exception was to compensate for drawbacks in the **reduction in** volume resulting from a smaller vehicle gauge. The representative of the United Kingdom confirmed that it was not the intention to allow tank-wagons constructed in Great Britain in accordance with the exception to operate in continental Europe. Tank-wagons constructed in Great Britain that were also intended for use in continental Europe would already have a distance of 300 mm between the headstock plane and the tank.
50. The RID Committee of Experts adopted a text drafted by the representative of the United Kingdom taking this restriction into account and referring to the TSI Freight Wagons in respect of the freight vehicle gauge G1, rather than to UIC leaflet 505-1 (see Annex 1).

Mechanical strength of tank-wagons

Documents: OTIF/RID/CE/2008/16 (UIP)
OTIF/RID/CE/2008/23 (Germany)

51. In his document OTIF/RID/CE/2008/16, the representative of UIP explained that the wording of 6.8.2.1.2 concerning the stress test to be carried out on tank-wagons caused problems of interpretation. He proposed to clarify the text by saying that the body that has to assess the railway vehicle (“notified body” according to the TSI) also has to carry out the test to determine resistance to stresses in accordance with 6.8.2.1.2. For the tests or calculations, a reference to EN standard 12663 should be included.
- 51a. The representative of ERA explained that according to the definition and the tasks of the Notified Bodies referred to in the EU railways Interoperability Directive, the tests proposed by the UIP did not fall within the present activities these bodies are required to perform. Nevertheless, it was possible that in some EU Member States, the body designated to perform the assessment against the RID rules and the Notified Bodies according to the Interoperability Directive might be the same institution. In that case, simplification of the assessment programme could be achieved by combining the tank tests (against RID) and the tests for the wagon itself (against TSI).
52. In his document OTIF/RID/CE/2008/23, the representative of Germany recognised the need to amend this text, but said that EN standard 12663 required calculations and/or tests to be carried out. In addition, it was not just the area of the points where the tank is attached to the wagon that had to be tested for sufficient strength, but also the whole area where energy might be transferred between the subframe and the shell. As an alternative, the representative of Germany suggested referring to Directive 2001/16/EC (Interoperability of the trans-European conventional rail system) and to the technical specification for interoperability (TSI) relating to the subsystem “rolling stock – freight wagons” of the trans-European conventional rail system (TSI Freight Wagons), which in turn referred to EN standard 12663.
53. The Chairman thought that in order to make things clear, a footnote to the existing text of 6.8.2.1.2 referring to the TSI Freight Wagons would have to suffice, because under 4.2.2.6 Dangerous Goods of this TSI, 4.2.2.6.1 already said that wagons for dangerous goods have to meet the requirements of both RID and the TSI.
54. A provisional text was adopted in square brackets (see Annex 1), which could be re-examined at the next session of the RID Committee of Experts on the basis of a proposal.

Revision of the TSI Freight Wagons

Informal document: INF.2 (Belgium)

55. The RID Committee of Experts noted the document reproduced in Belgium's informal document INF.2 to the "TSI Freight Wagon" working group, in which it was proposed to remove requirements that were dealt with in RID from the TSI. In particular, the reference to standards that have to be applied because they are already referred to in RID should be deleted.

ITEM 7: EUROPEAN COMMISSION'S INTEROPERABILITY COMMITTEE

56. In a presentation, the representative of ERA explained the **study** his Agency has to carry out in connection with the introduction of derailment detectors **provisionally** decided by the RID Committee of Experts **at its 44th session**. **This study follows the EC Guidelines on Impact Assessments, which requires** an assessment of the effectiveness in the social, environmental and economic **fields of the potential options to improve the present situation**. In addition, a cost/benefit analysis would have to be carried out. **On this basis, ERA will issue a recommendation to the European Commission after consulting the social partners**. The complete presentation is attached to this report in Annex 3 (OTIF/RID/CE/2008-B/Add.2).

ITEM 8: EXCHANGE OF EXPERIENCES FOR EXPERTS

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/EE/2008-A

57. The Chairman of the exchange of experiences for recognised experts, Mr Dernbach, summarised the results of the third meeting of this exchange of experiences (Berne, 13 May 2008), as set out in report OTIF/RID/CE/EE/2008-A.
58. Provided the Secretariat received a sufficient number of suggestions for topics to put together an agenda, it was agreed to hold a one-day exchange of experiences for experts in accordance with 6.8.2.4.6 on 10 June **2009** before the next session of the working group on tank and vehicle technology in Brussels.

ITEM 9: WORKING GROUP ON STANDARDIZED RISK ANALYSIS

Document: OTIF/RID/CE/2008/18 and Annexes (Netherlands)

59. The representative of the Netherlands outlined the conclusions and comments of the 5th session of the working group on standardized risk analysis held on 19 and 20 June 2008, as set out in report OTIF/RID/CE/2008/18. He referred in particular to the fact that in different countries, a risk analysis could lead to different results, because there were national differences in assessing external safety. He welcomed UIC's offer to provide figures on accidents and transport services, on the basis of which the calculations could be further improved.
60. The RID Committee of Experts supported the Chairman's proposal to ask the Joint Meeting to continue the work of the working group, taking into account the results achieved and information provided so far, now that WP.15 would probably also decide to use the guidelines developed by the working group for road transport as well (*Addition by the Secretariat: This was decided at the 85th session of WP.15 (see report ECE/TRANS/WP.15/199, paragraphs 52 and 53)*). The original aim of the working group to standardize procedures had not yet been achieved. In view of a renewed discussion to make transport facilities and premises subject to the Seveso Directive, in order to maintain the status quo, it would be necessary to have similar tools available that could provide the same level of safety.

ITEM 10: INFORMATION FROM CIT AND UIC ON THE "E-RAILFREIGHT" PROJECT

61. The representative of CIT provided the RID Committee of Experts with information on the CIT/UIC/Raildata e-RailFreight project. The aim of the project was to save money and meet customs requirements by having paperless transport. The complete presentation is attached to this report in Annex 4 (OTIF/RID/CE/2008-B/Add.3).
62. In concluding his presentation, he asked the RID Committee of Experts whether it might be conceivable in future to dispense with marking and labelling and to consider the EDP procedure as the main procedure, with paper-based transport as a fallback option.
63. The RID Committee of Experts did not think it was in a position to answer this question, as this was an intermodal issue that would have to be dealt with by the Joint Meeting.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

Mr Jean-Daniel Déneraud's last RID Committee of Experts

64. The Chairman warmly thanked Mr Jean-Daniel Déneraud for his many years of work in the RID Committee of Experts as a Secretary of OTIF. Over the years, he had contributed to decisions which **had further improved the position of the railways in competition with the other modes of transport, without losing sight of their economic interests**. Through his articles in the Bulletin of International Carriage by Rail, he had always been a critical follower of the decisions. On behalf of the RID Committee of Experts, he wished him a happy and healthy retirement.

Next session

65. The 47th session of the RID Committee of Experts would be held from 16 to 20 November 2009.

Thanks

66. The Chairman thanked the representative of UIP for organising this session and the associated events. He thanked the interpreters for their excellent work.
67. **On behalf of all the participants, the Vice-Chair** thanked the Chairman for his efficient handling of the meeting.

Texts adopted by the 46th session of the RID Committee of Experts

A. To be included in an erratum to the 2009 French edition of RID

6.2.3.3.3 c) Delete the second and third sentences.

[Reference document: INF.5]

B. Amendments for a date of entry into force of 1 July 2009

6.8.2.6 Under the headings

- "For tanks with a maximum working pressure not exceeding 50 kPa and intended for the carriage of substances for which a tank code with the letter "G" is given in column (12) of Table A of Chapter 3.2" and
- "For tanks intended for the carriage of liquid petroleum products and other dangerous substances of Class 3 which have a vapour pressure not exceeding 110 kPa at 50 °C and petrol, and which have no toxic or corrosive subsidiary hazard"

the reference to EN standard 13094:2004 should read as follows:

Applicable subsections and paragraphs	Reference	Title of document	Mandatory application for tanks constructed	Application authorized for tanks constructed
6.8.2.1	EN 13094:2004	Tanks for the transport of dangerous goods – Metallic tanks with a working pressure not exceeding 0.5 bars – Design and construction		Between 1 January 2005 and 31 December 2009
6.8.2.1	EN 13094:2008	Tanks for the transport of dangerous goods – Metallic tanks with a working pressure not exceeding 0.5 bars – Design and construction	As from 1 January 2010	Before 1 January 2010

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/2008/19 as amended]

C. Amendments for a date of entry into force of 1 January 2011

Add a new transitional provision to 1.6.3 as follows:

"1.6.3.x Tank-wagons constructed before 1 January 2011 in accordance with the requirements in force up to 31 December 2010, but which do not conform to the requirements of 6.8.2.1.29 applicable as from 1 January 2011, may still be used."

[Reference document: OTIF/RID/CE/GT/2008/1]

Insert a new 6.8.2.1.29 as follows:

"6.8.2.1.29 The minimum distance between the headstock plane and the most protruding point at the shell extremity on tank-wagons shall be 300 mm.

Alternatively for tank-wagons for substances other than those for which the requirements of special provision TE 25 of 6.8.4 (b) apply, buffer override protection of a design approved by the competent authority shall be provided. This alternative is only applicable to tank-wagons **used solely on railway infrastructure requiring a freight vehicle gauge smaller than G1***.

* — The **G1 gauge** is referenced in the technical specification for interoperability (TSI) relating to the subsystem "rolling stock – freight wagons" of the trans-European conventional rail system (Commission decision 2006/861/EC of 28 July 2006, published in the Official Journal L 344, 8 December 2006)."

[Reference document: INF.7 (9th session of the working group on tank and vehicle technology) + OTIF/RID/CE/2008/24 as amended]

[6.8.2.1.2 At the end, add a reference to the following footnote:

**) These requirements shall be deemed to be met if the competent body in accordance with the technical specification for interoperability (TSI) relating to the subsystem "rolling stock – freight wagons" of the trans-European conventional rail system (Commission decision 2006/861/EC of 28 July 2006, published in the Official Journal L 344, 8 December 2006) has carried out this assessment in the framework of the EC conformity assessment of the wagon."]