

**COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE TRANSPORT OF
DANGEROUS GOODS AND ON THE GLOBALLY
HARMONIZED SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION
AND LABELLING OF CHEMICALS**

**Sub-Committee of Experts on the
Transport of Dangerous Goods**

Twenty-fourth session

Geneva, 3-10 December 2003

agenda item 2

TRANSPORT OF GASES

**Comments on ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2003/42 (United States of America)
Special provisions 190 and 191**

Transmitted by the expert from Austria

1. Austria supports the proposal transmitted by the expert from the United States of America with regard to special provision 190, i.e. to restrict the exemption for UN 1950 AEROSOLS to those containing solely Division 2.2 gases and to add a pressure limit.
2. Austria is not in the position to support the proposal with regard to special provision 191 for the following reasons:

In the first sentence of the existing text of special provision 191 retained in the proposal from the expert of the United States it is stated that "receptacles, small, containing gas may be considered as similar to aerosols except that they are not fitted with a release device". This is however not the case. In fact as can be seen from the annexed pictures receptacles, small, containing gas do have little similarity to aerosols in their design and construction elements.

In the text for the second sentence of special provision 191 the expert from United States proposes to insert a pressure limit of 1000 kPa (10 bar) that would apply also to receptacles, small, containing gas containing no constituents other than a Division 2.2 gas. For these receptacles however the proposed pressure limit may be justified in the case of air transport but cannot be based on any technical safety reason for the other transport modes.

These receptacles the internal pressure of which amounts up to 250 bar are, by the current text of special provision 191, if their capacity does not exceed 50 ml totally exempted from the UN model regulations. But also when carried in limited quantities subject to chapter 3.4 these receptacles produced, in millions of pieces, by companies operating manufacturing and distribution facilities in Austria, Hungary, Germany and the USA and exported into more than 65 countries all over the globe do not present any problem from the safety-viewpoint and would not be subject to a pressure limit in quantities not exceeding 1000 ml.

There is no reason therefore to change the requirements for these receptacles. If any change might be considered then a restriction of the exemption to Division 2.2 gases and an increase of the quantity limit reflecting the actual situation, as proposed in ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2002/57. The proposed limit of 120ml equals the limit of 4 fluid ounces (118ml) mentioned for exceptions in 49 CFR § 173.306 (a) (1).

3. Based on what is stated above the expert from Austria proposes the following revised wording for special provisions 190 and 191:

“190 Aerosol dispensers shall be provided with protection against inadvertent discharge. Aerosols with a capacity not exceeding 50 ml and with a pressure not exceeding 1000 kPa (10 bar) at 55 °C containing no constituents subject to these Regulations other than a Division 2.2 gas are not subject to these Regulations.

191 Receptacles, small, containing gas with a capacity not exceeding 120 ml containing no constituents subject to these Regulations other than a Division 2.2 gas are not subject to these Regulations.”
