
Economic Commission for Europe**Inland Transport Committee****18 January 2014****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-fourth session**

Geneva, 27-31 January 2014

Item 6 of the provisional agenda

Proposals for amendments to the ADN:**Work of the Joint RID/ADR/ADN meeting**

Minutes of the 6th meeting**Transmitted by the ADN Recommended Classification Societies**

Date: 21 / 22-10-2013

Place: Lloyd's Register office, Rotterdam

Attendees:

Bureau Veritas: Robert Broere, Hoang-Tri Tran (partly), Rafaele Cocito (partly), Guy Jacobs (due to some miscommunication Mr. Broere and Mr. Jacobs attended the meeting of the 22nd two hours later).

Germanischer Lloyd: Torsten Dosdahl, Antje Fleischhauer (partly), Ihno Herbst

Lloyd's Register: Emiliano Austi (partly), Herbert Kaptein, Bas Joormann (chairman), Karel Vinke

Russian Maritime Register of Shipping: Sergey Legusha

Russian River Register: Ilya Gulyaev, Mikhail Kozin

Shipping Register of Ukraine: Mykola Slyozko

Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment: Jean-Paul de Maat (ADN Safety Committee observer)

On 21-10-2013 only:

BAM: Yvonne Adebahr-Lindner, Frank Krischok

BASF: Claudia Kraeh

PTB: Elisabeth Brandes

1. Opening

1. The chairman welcomes all participants.

2. This time the meeting has an additional day on special request of Mr. Krischok of the BAM in order to discuss the ADN Table C in relation to the flow chart and the product lists the classification societies issue.

2. Cargo list issues

3. Mr. Krischok explains that at BAM a complete list of all possible products has been established resulting in a table of over 12,000 rows. These rows represent all mathematical possibilities of the products which are now in Table C. This work has been undertaken to clear up things after discussions in the Working Group on Substances. It is considered by BAM that this list can be very useful for the classification societies. All agree with this point of view.

4. Mr. Kaptein explains the work BV, GL and LR have done on the clearing of the rows which include stars in it. The way the product lists are composed is based on the ship characteristics whereby any dangers from column 5 of Table C are automatically removed in case the characteristics prevent the carriage of products having such dangers. Both Mr. Chun and Mr. Dosdahl agree on this and explain they're satisfied with the chosen approach.

5. After some discussion it is decided that there are no objections on continue with the approach the classification societies have chosen.

6. Mr. Krischok agrees that the questions raised through the original proposal from the class societies in the ADN Safety Committee meeting in August are now solved (doc INF 18).

7. He states that the list provided by BAM can be available to everyone and should be considered as an informal document.

8. The chairman thanks Mr. Krischok and Mrs. Adebahr-Lindner for the great work they have done with this list, and for sharing their thoughts on this with the classification societies.

9. Mr. Vinke raises a question concerning the possible changes in the explosion group IIB into IIB-1, IIB-, and IIB-3 as expected to be in the ADN 2015. The issue with this is which transitional provision should be used?

10. Mr. Kaptein points out that transitional provisions for ships built before 1995 (which do not comply with 9.3.x.51.3) are in force until 31 December 2034. Thus ships built before 1995 formally do not need to comply with the most basal requirements. It will therefore be hard to defend that, when subdividing explosion group IIB in sub-groups, stricter transitional provisions should be used for newer and better equipped ships. Any short term transitional requirements will also complicate procedures regarding issuing cargo lists.

11. Mrs. Brandes states that also for vessels built after 1995 transitional provisions should be included.

3. Minutes of meeting March 2013 (doc 5.IG.06)

12. The action points of the minutes of meeting of the last meeting are discussed.

13. Actions 3a, 3b, 4b, and 6 are completed by sending these documents to the ADN Safety Committee.

14. Action 3d is on the agenda at point 5a (harmonisation of computer loading instruments).

15. Action 4a is on the agenda at point 5e (pressure drop calculation).

16. Action 4d is explained by Mr. Vinke. In the list of dangerous cargoes (Part 3, Table C of the ADN), the relative density for the majority of substances has been specified. This relative density serves as a basis for calculating the allowable filling rate of the cargo tanks in the list of defined cargoes issued by Lloyd's Register. There are however a number of substances which have a range of possible relative densities. In that case the highest value is used in the calculation of the allowable filling rate as specified in the cargo list. It will be apparent that in cases where the actual relative density is lower, that value may be used in the calculation of the permissible filling rate. LR has discussed this with the Dutch authorities and has informed the ship owners.

Action 5b is on the agenda at point 5c (flame arresters in side tanks).

4. Updated documents from last ADN Safety Committee meeting

4a. Definition of cargo tanks:

17. Mr. Kaptein proposes some editorial changes which will be included in the document by Mr. Broere.

4b. Venting piping:

18. All agree on the document.

4c. Refrigeration system:

19. BV has sent in a new version of the document (17-10-2013). Mr. Jacobs explains that the original document is updated with the inclusion of parts of the existing text of the ADN. Mr. Dosdahl asks if the proposal is also applicable on integrated tanks. It is. All agree on the document.

4d. Access to cofferdam:

20. All agree on the document.

21. All documents will be sent in to the ADN Safety Committee ([action BV](#)).

5. Technical issues

5a. Harmonization approval procedures computer loading instruments

22. Mr. Austi explains the approval procedure which is set up by LR. This procedure is written based upon the already existing procedure for seagoing vessels. The experience so far with inland waterway approvals has shown that the procedure is satisfactory. Up till now only 2 software programs have been approved, but these two are installed on the majority of the LR classed fleet. Some other software programs are being approved in the near future.

23. Also at BV and GL the established procedures are taken from the procedure for seagoing vessels, and both have approved 2 software programs.

24. Mrs. Fleischhauer believes that installing the software on 1 computer on board is sufficient. All agree. The location of this computer should be the wheelhouse.
25. Mr. Austi asks if the approved software should be checked on board each vessel, and all agree. It is noted however that ship owners up till now are not all complying with this. A surveyor of the class society should check on board 4 loading conditions.
26. Mrs. Fleischhauer raises the issue of definitions of watertight and weathertight openings, but after some discussion this is solved as on IWW vessels the definitions from the SOLAS are being used.
27. Mr. Dosdahl states that the longitudinal strength should also be included in the software. Mr. Cocito explains that BV estimates the weight distribution for calculating the longitudinal strength, as this is not known.
28. Mr. Vinke asks whether the cargo densities which are in the product list also need to be included. This is already done, and BV and GL include a note to the master in the stability booklet.
29. Mrs. Fleischhauer asks about the criteria for the intermediate stages of flooding. After some discussion this is solved as the same criteria as for the final stage can be used.
30. Mr. Cochito states that an agreement on harmonisation of the procedures also means that the software programmes approved by each society should be accepted by the other societies. Not all societies agree on this, but as this isn't applicable immediately this can be discussed when such cases arise.
31. It is decided that LR will prepare a document with a list of all items which are agreed. In this document also the items which need to be discussed further will be included (action LR).

5b. Transitional provisions (doc.6.IG.05)

32. The document is discussed and some editorial changes are discussed. It will be sent to the ADN Safety Committee (action BV).

5c. Flame arresters in side tanks

33. The issue of the flame arresters has been discussed before, but no solution has been found before. The general feeling is that an obligation to install flame arresters on vent pipes of side tanks is too much. It is discussed whether installing flame arresters on vent pipes of cofferdams is really necessary. The obligation dates back from the time of riveted ships with leakage into the cofferdam was likely to occur.
34. Mr. Broere proposes to prepare a document on this with the pros and cons (action BV).

5d. Position of class societies concerning safe haven

35. At the ADN Safety Committee meeting it was assumed that classification societies should come up with requirements for safe havens. This seems to be a somewhat easy assumption.
36. It is agreed that land-based safe havens are completely outside the scope of classification societies.

37. Mr. Dosdahl states that the ADN Safety Committee should set up some criteria concerning safe havens on board before the classification societies can discuss this some more to draw up requirements. It was discussed that setting up a small informal working group with classification societies, EBU, and for instance the German BSBG would be helpful to develop these technical requirements. GL will take the lead on this (action GL).

5e. Pressure drop calculations

38. Mr. Jacobs informs the group about the expert meeting held at the BV office. This expert meeting was organised to have a general discussion rather than discussing a solution. The discussion however has given enough food for thought. Mr. Jacobs explains that for instance the flow rate is heavily depending on the temperature and vapour density, and this isn't always correctly taken into account in the calculations. Sometimes calculations are carried out using assumptions which are on the safe side and in that case they are not representative for more favourable situations. In other cases products may have even higher vapour densities in which case lower allowable loading rates will apply.

39. The conclusion is that the loading rate which is included on the Certificate of Fitness isn't really an adequate number. With this in mind Mr. Dosdahl likes to be better informed about the goal of the whole exercise before putting more effort in it. Mr. Jacobs will prepare a document on this subject and sent it to the members of the expert group. The members of this group will indicate if they wish another meeting to discuss the subject (action BV).

5f. Use of fire-fighting lines for ballasting

40. Mr. Jacobs asks if it will be acceptable to use an ATEX approved fire-fighting and ballast pump situated outside the cargo area when this pump is used for ballasting purposes inside the cargo area. All agree that this isn't acceptable as the ADN is quite clear on this. In the fire-fighting lines a non-return valve has to be fitted at the boundary of the cargo area.

5g. Withdrawal of class

41. Mr. Broere asks what other classification societies do when class of a vessel is withdrawn.

42. GL and LR do not inform the authorities when it's not known which authority has issued the Certificate of Fitness. Mr. Joormann explains that in the contract LR has with the Netherlands Shipping Inspectorate there is an obligation about this. When LR has issued the Certificate of Fitness on behalf of NSI, LR is obliged to inform NSI about the withdrawal of class. But this only applies to The Netherlands.

43. Mr. Slyozko says that SRU always informs the Ukrainian authorities in case of withdrawal of class.

5h. Definition of first inspection (ADN 1.16.8)

44. Mr. Broere asks how the other classification societies apply this article when an existing vessel has a certificate which is more than 6 months expired.

45. It is agreed that the article is clear and that in this cases the vessel should be considered as a new building. However, special consideration can be given in specific cases when this is agreed upon with the national authorities.

5i. References to LNG in class rules

46. The question was raised by the Swiss delegation in the ADN Safety Committee if the classification societies could send their rules on the carriage of LNG.

47. Mr. Joormann proposes that all societies will send this direct to the Swiss delegation and the secretary of the Safety Committee. All agree (action all).

6. Any other business

48. Mr. Broere asks if the water spray system which is prescribed at the new LNG regulations can be the same system as the cooling system of the deck area.

49. After some discussion it is agreed that this can indeed be the same system.

50. Mr. De Maat informs the group that in the last week of November a small working group chaired by Germany will discuss the application of RINA as recommended classification society. Mr. Joormann requests Mr. De Maat to draw the attention of RINA to the existence of this Informal Group.

51. Mr. Kaptein asks how the other societies handle the higher cargo temperatures.

52. Both BV and GL accept cargo temperatures up till 90 degrees without special thermal stress calculations. When cargoes with temperatures above 90 degrees are carried these calculations are obliged according Mr. Dossdahl. LR currently uses a limit of 80 degrees in line with the ADN but will consider to follow the same approach.

53. Mr. Kaptein explains that within LR there is some discussion about the cargo heating equipment on type C tankers. He asks whether sampling of the thermal heating oil is an obligation at the other classification societies. As no one is aware of these details, it is decided that LR will prepare a document (action LR).

7. Next meeting.

54. Next meeting will be held on Tuesday March 18th in Rotterdam.
