

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

4 June 2013

Forty- third session

Geneva, 24 – 28 June 2013

Item 3 (b) of the provisional agenda

Listing, classification and packing:

classification inconsistencies (application of criteria versus dangerous goods list)

Classification of substances mentioned by name in the Dangerous Goods List, interpretation of the Model Regulations

Transmitted by the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC)

Summary

Document UN/SCETDG/42/INF.20 proposes three options to ship substances which are mentioned by name in the Dangerous Goods List, but new data are available which are not covered by the entry.

Due to a clear identification of every participant in a transport process and because of clear links to specific transport conditions for single entries, which may not be covered by a N.O.S.-entry, the currently used well-proven process to change the entry by a proposal to SCETDG in case of new data, should not be changed.

Background

1. Document UN/SCETDG/42/INF.20 discuss three options for transports in the interim period between the knowledge of new data and the change in the Dangerous Goods List.

- (a) The substance is shipped under its entry in the DGL.
- (b) The substance is shipped under its existing entry in the DGL and in order to communicate the hazards it is permitted to add a subsidiary risk label and/or to adapt the documentation to the actual hazards.
- (c) The substance is shipped under an appropriate N.O.S.-entry which covers the up-graded hazards.

Introduction

2. Currently there is a well proved process installed in case of the situation that new data are available for substances which are named in the Dangerous Goods List. In case of this situation a proposal must be submitted to the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods were the new knowledge is described in detail. In this situation every member in the Sub-Committee has the possibility to verify this data and to consider all changes which has to be done in the regulations in relation with this change (e.g. transport conditions or packing requirements).

Proposal

3. The currently used procedure should not be changed. In case of new data this should be submitted to the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods. After validation of this data the entry will be changed together with the requirements of the transport conditions and in consideration of all needed consequences in the regulation.

Justification

4. There has been no urgent case in the past which made the currently used process critical.

5. As mentioned before the change of a hazard validation is also linked to transport conditions which have to be changed in the same way. This leads to the conclusion that only a comprehensive consideration of all requirements in the Dangerous Goods Regulations for this change will establish a save situation.

6. Most substances in the list are already named for a long time and established. This makes it improbable that there will be a need to change an entry short term. Even for example the changes of Mercury and Iodine showed no critical aspects to change it in the approved manner.

7. If it will be possible to declare a named substance different self responsible, the system will loose reliability. All following participants inclusive the fire brigades will loose the clear information for the specific substance. Furthermore a N.O.S. declaration with only one hazard inducer which is named in the Dangerous Goods List will always cause questions of a wrong classification or wrong declaration (missing second hazard inducer). This could cause chaos in the transport chain and refusals of transports.

8. Choosing a different entry without a change in the regulation could cause tremendous safety risks because the entry in the Dangerous Goods List displays not only intrinsic risks. As an example the change of the declaration of Ethylchloride, UN 1037 by a shipper, because of some additional dangerous components in small amounts, leads to a fatal accident. The reason was that the specific packing instruction for UN 1037 was not comparable with the general one for the appropriate N.O.S. entry. After this accident the IATA-DGR has been changed by the ADDENDUM II, and the UN Modal Regulations has been adapted too to cover this kind of transportation with the specific entry instead of a N.O.S. declaration. If the proposed procedure would have been used, this would have been considered and changed before the accident. Reference documents (among others): UN/SCTDG/33/INF.16, UN/SCTDG/36/INF.29, UN/SCTDG/36/INF. 32, ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2010/45
