International Civil Aviation Organization

WORKING PAPER

DGP-WG/05-Flimsy 13
21/04/05

DANGEROUS GOODS PANEL (DGP)

MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP OF THE WHOLE

Montreal, 18 to 22 April 2005

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE WORKING GROUP OF THE WHOLE WG/05

(Presented by the Secretary)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The meeting of the Working Group of the Whole Dangerous Goods Panel was opened by Mr. W. Voss, Director, Air Navigation Bureau, ICAO. Mrs. J. Code was elected Chairperson of the meeting, Mr. G. Leach was elected Vice Chairperson and Dr. K. Rooney acted as Secretary.

1.2 Mr. Voss noted the absence of Dr. Rooney had caused difficulty for the previous working group meeting and assured the group that ICAO, recognizing the importance of the work of the panel, would try to ensure full secretarial support for future meetings. He took the opportunity to thank Ms. Code and Ms. McLaughlin in their roles as chair and secretary for the additional work they had undertaken at WG04.

2. ATTENDANCE

2.1 The meeting was attended by the following panel members and advisers:

Member/Adviser*	Observer	State/International Organization
P. Steele	L. Willoughby	Australia
M. Hinoul	K. Vermeersch	Belgium
J.I. Code	L. Hume-Sastre	Canada
	D. Evans	
	D. McInnes	
	H. Deo	

Member/Adviser*	Observer	State/International Organization
	M. Man	
	D. McLeod	
	D. Sylvestre	
	P. Payette	
J. Le Tonqueze		France
H. Brockhaus	R. Blumel	Germany
	M. Philippi	
	T. Seemann	
	C. Weber	
A. Ventresca	A. Furia	Italy
	K. Tateyama	Japan
	K. Shimpo	
	Y. Watanabe	
	S. Matsuo	
	K. Moriwaki	
	J. Nishimura	
	M. Sato	
	N. Sawatari	
	M. Miyahara	
	K. Muriwaki	
D. Raadgers	T. Muller	Netherlands
	S. Oosterhoff	
M.W. Evans		New Zealand
	D. Kurdchenko	Russian Federation
S.O. Sánchez Serrano		Spain
O. Alameri	N. Mohammed	United Arab Emirates
G.A. Leach	M. Castle	United Kingdom
	J. Hart	

Member/Adviser*	Observer	State/International Organization
	R. Wells	
R.A. Richard	J. Mc Laughlin	United States
	J. Nicolson	
J. Abouchaar	D. Brennan P. Oppenheimer T. Gazetas R. Jessop	IATA
W. Schuurman		IFALPA
M.E. Wangler*	A.-M. Eriksson	IAEA
	A. Altemos	DGAC
	D. Warden	
	E. Sigrist	CEFIC
	A. McCulloch	IECC
	J. Servaites	USFCC
	J. Moir	
	D. Reichert	
	J. Paterson	
	M. Mann	

3. REVIEW OF REPORT

3.1 Report of the Meeting of the Working Group of the Whole WG/04 (DGP-WG/05-WP/1)

3.1.1 It was noted by the Secretary that the paper was presented for information at this time but that it would be issued as a working paper for the panel meeting. It was agreed to reissue DGP-WG/04-10 for this meeting. The Secretary confirmed that the she was co-ordinating with the Universal Postal Union Secretariat in order to follow up discussion on UN 3373 which had taken place in March 2005.

3.2 Draft amendments to the Technical Instructions arising from WG/04 (DGP-WG/05-WP/9)

3.2.1 The Secretary presented a paper containing draft amendments to the Technical Instructions based on the amendments agreed at WG/04. It was noted that the working papers for DGP/20 would contain all approved amendments agreed at both working group meetings.

4. ISSUES RELATED TO RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL

4.1 Denial of shipments of radioactive material (DGP-WG/05-IP/4) Security during the transport of radioactive material (DGP-WG/05-IP/7) IAEA Transport Safety Activities (DGP-WG/05-IP/10)

4.1.1 The issue of denial of shipments of radioactive material is of concern to member States of the IAEA. The working group was informed of work undertaken by the IAEA since the DGP-WG/04 meeting, especially that which related to training (DGP-WG/05-IP/4). Varying training courses of differing duration and contents were proposed based on the various needs of individuals involved in radioactive material transport. The Agency asked the group to review the proposed material and to provide feedback.

4.1.2 It was clarified that the training course for drivers of vehicles was aimed at those involved in land transport; it was suggested that IFALPA review the material and that the Agency would tailor it accordingly. It was queried how coordination with the training requirements from other bodies such as the UN would be achieved. It was suggested one mechanism would be the interagency coordination group. It was also suggested trade organizations would be consulted for their input.

4.1.3 It was recognized considerable effort had been devoted by the Agency in developing this material. It was agreed members should review it from an aviation perspective and would continue to cooperate with the Agency.

4.1.4 Information on the development of guidelines for security of radioactive material during transport was presented (DGP-WG/05-IP/7). It was recognized only nuclear materials had thus far been addressed thoroughly, however there was a need for a systematic evaluation of the potential consequences that could result from malicious events when categorizing materials and defining appropriate security provisions. It was further recognized that the categorization of radioactive material and the security provisions for identified categories of nuclear and other radioactive material should be harmonized.

4.1.5 A number of members welcomed the work undertaken by the IAEA but urged it be completed as quickly as possible so that provisions might be adopted in the next (15^{th}) edition of the UN Recommendations. It was noted that the thresholds presently included in the Recommendations had been developed without supporting scientific justification. The issue of confidentiality was raised; it was confirmed this paper could be distributed freely. The Secretary informed the meeting she would coordinate the issue with the Aviation Security Section, on the basis it was of interest to the two panels (Dangerous Goods and Security).

4.1.6 Transport safety activities of the IAEA were presented as information (DGP-WG/05-IP/10). It was noted that amendments to safety requirements and to safety guides had been distributed to member States and international organizations for comment.

5. ISSUES RELATED TO FUEL CELLS

5.1 Formic acid fuel cell systems (DGP-WG/05-WP/22 & IP/2)
Methanol micro fuel cell (DGP-WG/05-WP36 & IP/11)
Fuel cell cartridges containing flammable liquids (DGP-WG/05-WP/46)

5.1.1 Presentations on different fuel cell technologies were presented for information (IP/14-18).

5.1.2 A proposal to consider exemption for formic acid fuel cells in passenger and crew provisions was discussed (WP/22 & IP/2). It was noted that although formic acid when in concentrations of less than 85% was not flammable, it was corrosive which was of concern due to the possible interaction with the aluminium skin of an aircraft.

5.1.3 On the basis that the UN had just assigned an entry to fuel cell cartridges containing flammable liquid and that new technologies based on hydrides were being developed, it was suggested the UN be asked for a new entry for fuel cartridges containing corrosive liquids.

5.1.4 It was recognized that a number of different fuel cell technologies would shortly come to the marketplace and it was suggested a case by case analysis together with a risk assessment would be needed. It was suggested it would be essential to clearly identify which fuel cartridges were authorized for carriage on board so that screeners and passengers would be informed. It was suggested that the proposed fuel cartridges containing methanol was similar to exemptions already allowed, e.g. medicinal or toiletry articles.

5.1.5 A number of panel members queried whether the standard being developed by the IEC TC150 Group referred to tests (differential, drop), carbon monoxide emission and oxygen depletion. It was also queried whether the device would be hybrid in nature, i.e. battery plus fuel cartridge. It was clarified that the rate of oxygen flow would not be sufficient for the reaction to be maintained should the device be placed in checked baggage.

5.1.6 A similar proposal to exempt a fuel cell cartridge containing methanol was presented (WP36 & IP/11). A number of members supported the proposal in principal but suggested it would be premature to make a decision at this time as consultations were ongoing in a number of States. A modification to the proposal to limit the device to a fuel cell system of the direct methanol type and to refer to the standard being developed by IEC TC150 was made. It was confirmed a differentiation between spare cartridges would be allowed in checked baggage whereas cartridges contained in devices would be restricted to carry-on baggage. It was agreed that close consultation with the IEC TC150 Group was essential in order to allow adoption of an exemption at DGP/20.

5.1.7 The proposal in WP/46 to provide quantity limits and a new packing instruction for UN 3473, **Fuel cell cartridges** containing flammable liquids, was agreed following modification to the packing instruction. Amendments included replacing the word *outside* with *outer* and the deletion of the requirement for an internal pressure test on the basis that special provision A146 assigned to the entry already contained such a requirement.

6. ISSUES RELATED TO INFECTIOUS SUBSTANCES

6.1 Draft Amendments of the Technical Instructions to Align to the UN Recommendations - Part 2 (DGP-WG/05-WP/3)

Draft Amendments of the Technical Instructions to Align to the UN Recommendations - Part 4 (DGP-WG/05-WP/5)
Packaging for exempt human/animal specimens (DGP-WG/05-WP/41)
Classification of patient specimens (DGP-WG/05-WP/51)
Packing Instruction 650 (DGP-WG/05-WP/12)
Biological substance, category B with subsidiary risks - Packing Instruction 650 (DGP-WG/05-WP/50)
Guidance document for the transport of infectious substances (DGP-WG/05-IP/1)
Guidance document - infectious substances (DGP-WG/05-IP/3)
ICAO PI 602 vs UN PI 620 (DGP-WG/05-IP/5)

6.1.1 Draft amendments to the infectious substances provisions as developed by the UN were reviewed in WP/3 and WP/5. Amendments already included in the Addendum to the Instructions were explained and editorial corrections were noted.

6.1.2 The whole philosophy behind the creation of the exemption put forward in WP/3, Division 6.2, paragraph 6.3.2.3.6 was debated at length. While members noted this amendment reflected a compromise agreed at the UN, discussions focussed on two positions - the perception that industry would have difficulty applying this regulation, and the use of professional judgement with regard to classification of specimens. Unless these issues were resolved, States would pursue different applications.

6.1.3 The meeting agreed to establish an ad hoc working group to review the following questions raised on this item:: a) clarification of the term “minimal likelihood”; b) definition of “leak proof”; and c) clarification of the element of professional judgement required to make a classification as given in the Note to 6.3.2.3.6.

6.1.4 With regard to the inconsistent use of the terms human or animal specimens, clarification would be sought from UNCOE for discussion at DGP/20. One member suggested that human or animal specimens in 6.3.2.3.6 be replaced with patient specimens so as to align it with paragraph 6.3.1.4. Another suggested an editorial amendment to replace “materials”with “specimens”in 6.3.1.4. As agreed by the meeting, the Secretary sought the opinion of the UNCOE Secretary, and he indicated that [views to be discussed at meeting tomorrow].

6.1.5 The Secretary pointed out that with the introduction of the comprehensive safety oversight audits, questions have been raised related to Annex 6 and airlines authorization to carry dangerous goods. This may have consequences for operators regarding the carriage of UN 3373. The meeting was informed that the Secretariat will review this question and the outcome will be provided to DGP.

6.1.6 Following lengthy discussion, the meeting agreed that the text as proposed in WP/3 to paragraph 6.3.2.3.6, with an amendment to replace “should”with “must”, as proposed in WP/41 to ensure mandatory packaging, be included in the 2007-2008 Edition of the TIs.

6.1.7 The meeting then reviewed WP/5. Comments were raised with regard to the proposed amendment to Packing Instruction 650 that the secondary or outer packaging be rigid. One member expressed concern that it was necessary to have an outer rigid packaging as flexible packaging had failed. Another suggested that shippers should have the choice in using either a rigid secondary or outer packaging. Most felt that text should not be amended;. the meeting agreed to retain the current text as given in the 2005-2006 Edition of the TIs. It was noted that the UN proposal concerning drop height in paragraph 6 had not been included and this would be taken into account in the editorial review conducted by the Secretary.

6.1.8 A question was raised as to whether items which were now exempted as being division 6.2 but which were accompanied by other dangerous goods such as for refrigerant purposes could be carried in passenger baggage onboard the aircraft. The chairperson pointed out that any other dangerous goods present would be subject to the Instructions

6.1.9 Turning to WP/51, the meeting was informed that since the publication of the Addendum to the 2005-2006 Edition of the TIs, questions had been raised by industry concerning the classification of "patient specimens" in the transport of infectious substances.

6.1.10 With the introduction of the new definition for "patient specimens", the special provision A141 linked to UN 3337 had been deleted. This special provision clearly explained that UN 3373 applied to human or animal material being transported for purposes such as research, diagnosis, investigational activities, disease treatment or prevention. Although the introduction of the new definition for "patient specimens" made special provision A141 redundant, clear guidance was not provided elsewhere in the regulations on the classification and the transport of "patient specimens". The meeting agreed to the proposed text but with reference just to 6.3.2.3. One member suggested that UN 3291 should also be included; however, others believed the definition for patient specimens precluded such a possibility. It was agreed this would be referred to the ad hoc working group for review.

6.1.11 The meeting agreed to refer to an ad hoc working group the outstanding issues raised during debate on this item:

a) the note to 6.2.3.6 referring to the term professional judgement - some felt that it should be more than providing guidance, but rather be a requirement;

b) the definition of minimal likelihood - text to be developed to avoid potential misinterpretation;

c) the insertion of UN 3291, medical waste in the amendment proposed in WP/51; and

d) the best locations to insert the amendment proposed in WP/51.

6.1.12 The meeting agreed to a proposal in WP/12 to amend Packing Instruction 650 paragraph 10) to reference the overpack marking required by Part 5;2.4.9 and to include in paragraph 11) the name and address of the shipper and consignee marked on each package as is required for all packages containing dangerous goods as per Part 5;2.4.2. In this way a shipper could be provided with a copy of Packing Instruction 650 and would not require any other reference in order to be able to prepare a consignment that complies with the provisions of the Instructions.

6.1.13 As proposed by one member, this amendment, although still to be approved at DGP/20, would be brought to the attention of the UN in the form of an IP for the upcoming UN meeting.

6.1.14 Inconsistencies between the provisions for dangerous goods of classes 3, 8 or 9 when packed with infectious substances and those permitted under the excepted quantities provisions were presented in WP/50/ These included the possibility to exceed the quantity limits for excepted quantities when shipping multiple primary receptacles and the authorization to permit both class 8 packing group I substances and substances normally forbidden on passenger aircraft.

6.1.15 Some members supported the proposal in principle but suggested further refinements to the proposed text were necessary. The proposer agreed to prepare a flimsy .

6.1.16 A possible contradiction between packing instruction 602 in the Technical Instructions and packing instruction 620 in the UN Recommendations relating to the 95 kPa pressure differential test was discussed at the Abu Dhabi meeting (DGP-WG/04-WP/02) and presented as information in IP/5. An interpretation by a national packing authority was provided as information to the meeting; members were invited to provide interpretations from their national authorities.

6.1.17 Two contrasting views were expressed - the first supporting an interpretation of conducting the pressure differential test at the two temperature extremes i.e. two conditions of pressure diffential and a temperature range whereas the second supported an alternative interpretation of conducting the test at ambient temperatures i.e. one condition. It was suggested that the purpose of the pressure differential test was to prove the quality of the packaging in the event of an explosive decompression, an event which would likely take place at high altitudes and consequentially, very low temperatures.

6.1.18 Although it was suggested that the UN be asked for clarification, it was noted that the UN would expect ICAO to provide guidance on aviation related matters. It was agreed that a survey of packing institutes would be done which would seek information as to how the requirement was interpreted together with a request for information as to what repercussion they would envisage should they be required to apply the alternative interpretation.

6.1.19 A guidance document addressing the transport of infectious substances by all modes, originally developed by the European Dangerous Goods Liaison Group, was presented in IP/1. It was noted, following the decisions relating to exemptions taken earlier, some of the guidance was no longer applicable.

6.1.20 A further guidance document on the transport of infectious substances was presented in IP/3. It was noted the information should be reviewed to ensure it was consistent both with the decisions taken earlier and with the Addendum.

6.1.21 A number of members stressed the urgency in disseminating such information, when finalised, on the basis that many queries for clarification had already been received from hospitals, universities and medical authorities. It was suggested that the document should address issues such as the Addendum, packagings being leakproof, other dangerous goods being used as refrigerants for infectious substances and different scenarios involving transport of infectious substances, examples of which were given in IP/1. An ad-hoc group was formed to review and finalize the text.

7. DEVELOPMENT OF PROPOSALS, IF NECESSARY, FOR AMENDMENTS TO ANNEX 18 — *THE SAFE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS BY AIR*

7.1 Annex 18, Chapter 12 — Dangerous Goods Accident and Incident Reporting (DGP-WG/05-WP/26)

7.1.1 It was explained that although there are requirements in the Technical Instructions to report dangerous goods accidents, incidents, undeclared or misdeclared dangerous goods, there is no corresponding requirement in Annex 18 for States to establish procedures for investigating and compiling information concerning undeclared and misdeclared dangerous goods in cargo. It was suggested this was a serious omission in the Annex and a proposal was made to rectify the situation. It was also proposed to make a similar requirement for forbidden dangerous goods found in baggage.

7.1.2 It was clarified that the proposed amendment regarding investigating such undeclared or misdeclared dangerous goods referred to States having procedures to investigate in place. This was in recognition of the fact that for many States, the number of investigations could be very large. It was noted that such a procedure might simply consist of reporting a discrepancy by telephone. With regard to discovery of forbidden dangerous goods in passenger baggage, it was suggested that compilation of information would be sufficient.

7.1.3 The proposals were modified to refer to cargo only and were then agreed. The proposer said he would return to DGP/20 with another proposal regarding passenger baggage.

7.1.4 Members were asked to send to the Secretary examples of investigative procedures and compilation of information procedures on undeclared and misdeclared dangerous goods found in cargo so that it could be disseminated to all.

7.2 **Additional Security Measures (DGP-WG/05-WP/37)**

7.2.1 There was no support in favour of a suggestion, as a security measure, to require material safety data sheets (MSDS) to accompany consignments of chemical products. Several difficulties were noted - security could, in fact, be compromised by making such MSDS mandatory; no standard format for MSDS existed and MSDS were more likely to be used for safety rahter than security.

7.3 **Notification of Operator Variations by States (DGP-WG/05-WP/40)**

State variations (DGP-WG/05-WP/54)

7.3.1 Clarification was sought regarding the responsibilities of States with regard to notifying operator variations to ICAO. It was noted the majority of operators adopt more restrictive variations by virtue of using the IATA Dangerous Goods Regulations and it was queried whether States had to report all such variations.

7.3.2 Clarification was also sought regarding the status of State variations. Two contrasting interpretations were presented - the first believed the variations were part of the Instructions and hence had legal status, the second believed they were of an advisory nature, informing other States of different requirements in those States. It was noted that the text of the Annex and of the Instructions could be interpreted to support both arguments.

7.3.3 The Secretary informed the meeting of recent difficulties encountered during the preparation of questions for the comprehensive safety oversight system audit where differences of interpretation regarding what was meant by a difference and by a variation together with queries regarding the status of each for both a domestic and international perspective.

7.3.4 The working group agreed with a suggestion by the Secretary to seek advice from the Legal Bureau (LEB) on all aspects pertaining to variations and differences. A working paper containing the LEB remarks would be presented in sufficient time to allow members to prepare working papers for DGP/20.

8. DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE *TECHNICAL INSTRUCTIONS* FOR INCORPORATION IN THE 2007/2008 EDITION

Part 1 — General

8.1 **Draft Amendments of the Technical Instructions to Align to the UN Recommendations - Part 1 (DGP-WG/05-WP/2)**

8.1.1 Proposed amendments to Part 1 were presented. The Chairwoman noted the Secretary would check the text against the final UN text and all paragraph references in all the relevant working papers. It was agreed that members would assist the Secretary in this task.

8.1.2 A query was raised with respect to the proposed deletion of the word "international" in 1;1.4.4.2 which related to a multilateral approval. It was suggested this applied to instances when the State of shipment was different to that of the State of package design. It was agreed clarification would be sought from the IAEA.

8.1.3 With regard to the proposed new definitions, it was suggested those for CGA, IMO and UNECE were unnecessary. It was noted that reference was made to IMO in the Supplement. It was agreed the Secretary would review the definitions for possible deletion.

8.2 **Adoption of Addenda (DGP-WG/05-WP/20)**

8.2.1 There was general support for a proposal to clarify that addenda issued to the Instructions were part of those Instructions. Some members noted that , in their State, reference could only be made to an issued document. The proposal, following an editorial amendment, was agreed.

8.2.2 It was further agreed the Secretary should seek the advice of LEB regarding the word "issued". She informed the meeting that although the recent addendum had been approved by Council, further processing was required before it could be issued as an ICAO document, resulting in time lost. She noted that dissemination of information could be achieved by means other than by printed documents and suggested that other vocabulary, such as "promulgated" might be legally acceptable.

.

8.3 **Training and Definition of Cargo (DGP-WG/05-WP/27)**

8.3.1 It was explained that the present definition for cargo excluded persons loading mail from requiring dangerous goods training; it was proposed to amend the definition to address the issue. It was also believed the present definition excluded those loading COMAT.

8.3.2 Although there was general support to ensure such persons would require training, a number of difficulties with the proposed solution were observed. These included the necessity to maintain one definition for all annexes and a concern that by amending the definition other difficulties could inadvertently be caused.

8.3.3 The proposer agreed to come back with a revised paper which would take into account the comments made.

8.4 **Chemical Oxygen Generators in Protective Breathing Equipment (DGP-WG/05-WP/29)**

8.4.1 A proposal to amend the provisions for protective breathing equipment to extend the alleviation for numbers in excess of those legally required and to permit inoperative equipment to be retained on board in their approved stowage was not agreed. One member believed this issue could be addressed

through the operating or airworthiness specifications. Another pointed out that the alleviation did apply to those inoperative PBEs on the basis that 1;2.2.2 would only apply after they had been removed.

8.4.2 The proposer withdrew the paper. He asked members to consult with personnel dealing with the minimum equipment list and to consider how the issue was handled, and to provide comments so that the issue could be examined from a broader perspective.

8.5 **Excepted Quantities: Packing Requirements (DGP-WG/05-WP/38)**

8.5.1 A proposal to provide specific packing requirements for gases in excepted quantities was agreed.

Part 2 — Classification

8.6 **Draft Amendments of the Technical Instructions to Align to the UN Recommendations - Part 2 (DGP-WG/05-WP/3)**

8.6.1 Draft amendments to Part 2 Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 were proposed to reflect the decisions taken by the UN.

8.6.2 It was agreed a reference to the UN default table for fireworks was sufficient for incorporation in the Instructions.

8.6.3 It was noted the amendments relating to division 2.2 gases was an editorial rearrangement.

8.6.4 It was noted mandatory requirements were contained in two notes in 4.2.3.1.1; since this reflected the UN text, it was agreed the UN would be asked for clarification.

8.6.5 It was explained the amendments to Table 2-8 resulted from decisions taken by the UN GHS Sub-Committee.

8.6.6 With reference to the proposed change to 8.2.2, it was explained the corrosion test procedures for packing group III involved liquids, or substances which may become liquid, only and consequentially, no reference to solids was required.

Part 3 — Dangerous Goods List and Limited Quantities Exceptions

8.7 **Draft Amendments of the Technical Instructions to Align to the UN Recommendations - PART 3 (DGP-WG/05-WP/4 & IP/8)**

8.7.1 Draft amendments to Part 3 Chapter 3 were proposed to reflect the decisions taken by the UN.

8.7.2 With regard to A14, it was noted further discussion of the use of old and new organic peroxide labels would be necessary.

8.7.3 It was noted that waste aerosols should not be transported by air and that A145 should reflect this in the form of a prohibition.

8.7.4 The Secretary noted that amendments related to A149 for environmentally hazardous substances had yet to be developed in Part 5.

8.8 Draft Amendments to the Technical Instructions to Align to the UN Recommendations — Table 3-1 (DGP-WG/05-WP/8)

8.8.1 Draft amendments to Table 3-1 were presented. It was agreed the new presentation of information was helpful.

8.8.2 It was noted information for UN 3473 would be incorporated from WP/46.

8.9 Transport of UN 3399, Organometallic Substance, Liquid, Water-reactive, Flammable (DGP-WG/05-WP/10)

8.9.1 A proposal to amend an editorial error relating to incorrect transport provisions (packing instructions and quantities) for UN 3399 **Organometallic substance, liquid, water-reactive, flammable** was agreed, together with consequential amendments. It was further agreed that the amendment would be issued by the Secretary in a corrigendum, noting that the error had caused significant problems for industry.
.

8.10 Receptacles Small, Containing Gas and Gas Cartridges (DGP-WG/05-WP/13)

8.10.1 A proposal to amend the cargo packing instruction for UN 2037, **Receptacles, small containing gas** without release device and UN 2037, **Gas cartridges** without release device was agreed. It was noted the proposal showed Y203 assigned to two entries which had an oxidizer subsidiary risk and that this had been inadvertently done.

8.11 Special Provision A20 versus Special Provision A136 (DGP-WG/05-WP/14)

8.11.1 Two proposals to amend special provision A20 and A136 were presented. A20 is assigned against self-reactive substances in Division 4.1 and Division 5.2 - Organic peroxides. It was explained the UN Model Regulations did not have a special provision equivalent to Special Provision A20 but did include similar, but not equivalent, text in Part 7 - Transport Operations that requires self-reactive substances and organic peroxides to be "protected from direct sunlight and all sources of heat and be placed in adequately ventilated areas." It was noted that minor differences in language used e.g. “sunshine” and “sunlight” had caused difficulties in training.

8.11.2 A136, based on UN special provision XXX, is assigned to four hypochlorite mixtures (UN 1748, UN 2208 UN 2880 and UN 2880). It, too, refers to the need to shade the substances “from direct sunlight and all sources of heat and be placed in adequately ventilated areas”.

8.11.3 It was suggested to align the text in A20 to that in A136 b) and to then consider adding a requirement to A136 to have a statement included on the dangerous goods transport document and a "Keep away from heat label".

8.11.4 Considerable discussion ensued in which there was general support for aligning the wording of A20 to that in A136b). Some queries were raised regarding what was the difference between "adequately" and "well" ventilated and what was mant by "cool". However, it was noted that only a small number of products were permitted for air transport; the majority requiring strict temperature control. A number of members believed the proposal to amend A136 was not necessarily a simple editorial rearrangement.

8.11.5 The first proposal to amend A20 together with a consequential amendment to 5;4.1.5.8.3 was agreed. The second proposal to amend A136 was withdrawn.

8.12 **Lithium Batteries (DGP-WG/05-WP/28 & IP/8)**

8.12.1 It was explained a significant difference existed between the Technical Instructions and the UN Recommendations in respect of the conditions which apply to lithium batteries, UN3090, specifically those stated in special provision A88. It was suggested the Instructions were less restrictive than the UN (and consequently the other modes of transport) in that untested batteries were not restricted to carriage only for the purposes of testing. Therefore, the Instructions allowed for packages containing small quantities of lithium batteries to be transported without ever being tested.

8.12.2 There was general support for the proposal but it was suggested clarification of "for testing" was required. One member indicated his belief this referred to both product development testing as well as design qualification testing. An approval showing conditions, including a short circuit test, which were imposed in one State for such transport was presented as information. It was agreed the UN would be asked for clarification of the intent and that this information would be brought to DGP/20.

8.12.3 The proposal, after minor editorial rearrangement, was agreed.