

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

27 November 2014

Forty-sixth session

Geneva, 1-9 December 2014

Item 2 (e) of the provisional agenda

**Recommendations made by the Sub-Committee on its forty-third,
forty-fourth and forty-fifth sessions and pending issues: miscellaneous pending issues**

Correction to example in ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2014/97

**Transmitted by the International Paint and Printing Ink Council
(IPPIC) and the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC)**

Discussion

1. One of the illustrative examples included in the Annex to document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2014/97 contained a small error. This does not have any material impact on the content of the proposal in that document, however for the sake of correctness an amended version of the example is provided.
2. The Annex to this document shows Example 1 with the correction in tracked changes. The Sub-Committee is invited to consider this version of the example in place of the version in the original working document.

Annex

Example 1: 5 litre jerrican



Problem (above): This packaging contains a product classified as Class 8 and Class 5.1. Two transport labels are therefore required to be displayed on the packaging. In order to affix two transport labels of 100 mm x 100 mm on the container so that they are visible simultaneously, these must overlap the mouldings and wrap around and underneath the packaging such that they are not completely visible. This increases the likelihood that the labels will lift during transport, leading to reduced legibility and, therefore, reduced safety.

Use of an alternative packaging, of larger capacity sufficient to accommodate both labels and marks on a single face, would lead to increased costs (transport of empty space in underfilled packagings) but also potential safety issues due to excessive ullage (more movement of the liquid possible, greater headspace for evaporation).

Solution (below): A small reduction in the size of the transport labels, e.g. to 70 x 70 mm, would enable these to be accommodated comfortably and securely, without prejudicing safety since such labels would still be clearly visible and legible from a single aspect. (Note: orientation arrows are ~~displayed voluntarily~~ also required on this package, ~~although not required by transport regulations~~ since it is vented at the top. The reduction enables these also to be accommodated on the same face of the package.)

