

DANGEROUS GOODS PANEL (DGP)

NINETEENTH MEETING

Montreal, 27 October to 7 November 2003

**Agenda Item 2: Development of recommendations for amendments to the Technical Instructions
for incorporation in the 2005/2006 edition**

**NOTES OF MEETINGS HOSTED BY ADR/RID ON 10 TO 11 JUNE 2003
AND 22 TO 23 SEPTEMBER 2003 CONCERNING THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR DANGEROUS GOODS TRANSPORT DOCUMENTS IN ALL MODES**

(Presented by G.A. Leach)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The objectives of the meetings were seen to be:

- 1) Establish differences between the different modes;
- 2) Assess these differences;
- 3) Make proposals to optimise compatibility across the modes; and
- 4) Establish whether any solutions were in accordance with RID/ADR

2. 10 TO 11 JUNE 2003, HAMBURG

2.1 The meeting was advised that problems had been experienced particularly in the marine mode with documentation; it was pointed out that no such situation existed in the air mode primarily because all documentation is subject to an acceptance check. A number of participants appeared to believe that the meeting would agree changes to RID/ADR which the other modes (including ICAO) would be expected to follow. I stated categorically that ICAO would only align with such changes if they first appeared in the UN.

2.2 There was much debate on the sequence of information with disagreement on whether this was a safety issue or not. Concern was expressed that from 1/1/07, IATA would permit only one sequence. It was felt that this issue should again be discussed by the UN with the goal of agreeing on 1 sequence.

2.3 A number of nos entries in ADR require a technical name which is not the case in UN or the Technical Instructions. The group agreed that all modes should follow UN in this matter.

2.4 It was noted that Part 5;4.1.3 of the Technical Instructions did not align with UN in that it omitted the text "The date of the Dangerous Goods Transport Document or an electronic copy of it was prepared or given to the initial carrier shall be included". Reference to this date, however, was retained in the title of the paragraph. The date of signing the shipper's certification is included in the Technical Instructions (5;4.1.6.1) and UN (5.4.1.6.1) and it was felt that to have 2 dates on the document was anomalous. It was suggested that the UN be asked to consider requiring only 1 date.

2.5 *Action for Panel*

2.5.1 The Panel needs to consider whether to align with the current UN or delete reference to date in the paragraph heading for 5;4.1.3.

2.5.2 It was noted that the new provision in Part 5;4.1.5.1 of the Technical Instructions, which is aligned to the UN, requires the total quantity of dangerous goods covered by the description of each item of dangerous goods bearing a different proper shipping name i.e. if you had, say, paint in quantities 10 x 5 litres and 5 x 10 litres, the new provision would require the total quantity of 100 litres to be quoted on the Transport Document. This replaced the previous requirement for the net quantity per package. The new provision (which it was noted IATA have not adopted), makes the completion of the NOTOC impossible because this document requires the net quantity per package to be quoted.

2.6 *Action for Panel*

2.6.1 The Panel needs to either revert to the original requirement of quantity per package (and not align with UN) or align with UN and review the NOTOC requirements (again!).

2.6.2 Concern was expressed by the meeting that the air mode was the only one which required the Packing Instruction to be quoted on the Transport Document. I advised that it was there to enable acceptance staff to verify that the correct Packing Instruction had been used by the shipper, depending on whether the consignment was to travel on a cargo or passenger aircraft, and also provided for verification that a permitted type of packaging had been used.

2.7 *Action for Panel*

2.7.1 Notwithstanding my explanation, the meeting asked that the Panel reconsider whether retention of the Packing Instruction is justified, given that no other mode requires it. With the Packing Instruction rationalisation exercise, which may result in both passenger and cargo aircraft being addressed by the same Packing Instruction, part of the justification may be removed.

2.7.2 Concern was expressed by the meeting that air mode was the only one which required the statement "overpack used". I said that I believed this stemmed from the previous requirement for the quantity per package to be stated; it would be confusing for an operator to be presented with a document stating "10 x 5kg" but only 1 package (overpack).

2.8 *Action for Panel*

2.8.1 As with the Packing Instruction, the Panel is requested to review the requirement for "overpack used" to be stated on the Transport Document.

2.8.2 It was noted that ICAO has not aligned with the UN in respect of Class 1 in 5;4.1.5.1 in that the UN requires the net explosive mass to be quoted whilst this requirement has been omitted in the Technical Instructions.

2.9 *Action for Panel*

2.9.1 Clarification from the Panel is sought in respect of why the UN text has been omitted.

3. **22-23 SEPTEMBER 2003, FRANKFURT**

3.1 It was noted that the air mode was the only one requiring a statement on the Transport Document to the effect that self reactive substances of division 4.1 and organic peroxides must be shielded from heat/ sunlight.

3.2 *Action for Panel*

3.2.1 The meeting asked the Panel to consider whether this was in fact necessary.

3.2.2 Finally, it was suggested that since road and rail mode did not require a signed certification on the Transport Document, air and sea modes should be asked to review their need for such a requirement. However, I said that I believed that air mode would wish to retain this requirement as it was particularly useful for enforcement purposes. Furthermore, I suggested that the wording of the certification could usefully be extended to include reference to the fact that all applicable modal requirements had been met; the attendees agreed this was a good idea and would be suggested to the UN.

— END —