

**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-sixth session, 29 November – 7 December 2004,
agenda item (3 (c)))

**OUTSTANDING ISSUES OR PROPOSALS OF AMENDMENTS TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS ON
THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS**

Comments on IATA proposals ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2004/78 and 2004/81

Transmitted by the expert from the United States of America

Comments on 2004/78

1. In ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2004/78, IATA proposes to consolidate special provisions 162, 282, and 298 which require a flammable liquid subsidiary label for certain substances. The U.S. supports this consolidation but notes the following in relation to the text proposed by IATA:

- The words “60.5 °C or less” should read “not more than 60.5 °C” in keeping with the standard Model Regulations format. The cut-off value of “60.5 °C” should read “60 °C” taking into account the recent alignment with GHS.
- The term “hazard label” should read “subsidiary risk label”. While primary and subsidiary hazard labels are physically the same, the Regulations still differentiate between the two (for example for purposes of segregation and for notation of hazards on the transport document).
- the words “required by the DANGEROUS GOODS LIST” should read “required by these Regulations” as labels are not technically required by the dangerous goods list but are required by 5.2 and by special provisions such as those being consolidated.

Proposal

2. The following revised text is proposed:

XXX Where substances have a flash point of not more than 60 °C, the package(s) shall bear a FLAMMABLE LIQUID subsidiary risk label in addition to any other label(s) required by these regulations.

Comments on ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2004/81

3. In ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2004/81 IATA proposes that 5.4.1.4.1(c) be amended to clarify that when the Model Regulations require subsidiary labeling for a hazard not indicated in Table 3-1, the additional subsidiary hazard must also be noted on the transport document. The U.S. is not opposed to clarifying the intent of this paragraph, but notes that the current text does not limit the indication of subsidiary risks in transport documents to those indicated in the Dangerous goods List. The current text refers to “*Any assigned subsidiary risk*”. In our view, the intent was to address any sub-risk required by the Model Regulations. This would include subsidiary risks imposed in the classification sections, the Dangerous Goods List or through special provisions. The proposed text “corresponding to the subsidiary risk labels applied” implies that a package excepted from labeling is also excepted from the requirement to indicate the hazard on the transport document, which is not true in all cases (for example shipments of limited quantities which are excepted

from labeling but not documentation by the Model Regulations). A practical example occurs in the case of the IMDG Code, which requires that shipments of limited quantities and consumer commodities, to be properly described on the transport document irrespective of the fact that no labels are required to be applied. We do not believe that the proposed text provides sufficient clarification and in fact prefer the current text.

The expert from the United States of America. proposes that rather than amending 5.4.1.4.1(c), a note be added to 5.4.1.4.1 as follows:

Note: Assigned subsidiary hazards include those indicated in Table 3-1 and those otherwise required to be indicated by these regulations (e.g. by a special provision requiring an additional subsidiary risk label or by additional labelling provisions for specific substances, see for instance Remark 2 of the list of self-reactive substances in 2.4.2.3.2.3, and see 5.2.2.1.9).
