



**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****Fifty-seventh session**

Geneva, 29 June-8 July 2020

Item 6 (b) of the provisional agenda

**Miscellaneous proposals for amendments to the Model Regulations
on the Transport of Dangerous Goods:
packagings****Alternative methods of testing of packagings - Consequential
amendments resulting from ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/112, para. 80
and Annex I and para. 81****Transmitted by the experts from Belgium and Germany*****Introduction**

1. At the fifty-sixth session the Sub-Committee adopted an amendment to 6.5.1.1.2 based on ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/5 and informal document INF.13 (56th session). The amended text, regarding alternative service equipment, arrangements and methods of inspection and testing of IBCs (see ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/112, para. 80 and Annex I) is as follows (relevant text is underlined):

“6.5.1.1.2 The requirements for IBCs in 6.5.3 are based on IBCs currently in use. In order to take into account progress in science and technology, there is no objection to the use of IBCs having specifications different from those in 6.5.3 and 6.5.5, provided that they are equally effective, acceptable to the competent authority and able to successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.5.4 and 6.5.6. Methods of inspection and testing other than those described in these Regulations are acceptable, provided they are equivalent.”

2. As suggested by Germany, the wording “to successfully fulfil the requirements” could be used instead of “successfully to withstand the tests” in sub-sections 6.1.1.2, 6.3.2.1 and 6.6.1.3 to align the wording with sub-section 6.5.1.1.2 (see informal document INF.13 (56th session)).

3. As mentioned in ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/112, para. 81, and proposed by Belgium these consequential amendments should also be considered for the definitions in Chapter 1.2 (“Repaired IBC”, “Reused packaging” and “Reused large packaging”) and to paragraph 4.1.1.9.

* 2020 (A/74/6 (Sect.20) and Supplementary, Subprogramme 2)

Proposal

4. Amend 6.1.1.2 as follows (deleted text is ~~struck through~~; new text is underlined):

“6.1.1.2 The requirements for packagings in 6.1.4 are based on packagings currently used. In order to take into account progress in science and technology, there is no objection to the use of packagings having specifications different from those in 6.1.4, provided that they are equally effective, acceptable to the competent authority and able ~~successfully to withstand the tests~~ to successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.5. Methods of testing other than those described in these Regulations are acceptable, provided they are equivalent.”
5. Amend 6.3.2.1 as follows (deleted text is ~~struck through~~; new text is underlined):

“6.3.2.1 The requirements for packagings in this section are based on packagings, as specified in 6.1.4, currently used. In order to take into account progress in science and technology, there is no objection to the use of packagings having specifications different from those in this Chapter provided that they are equally effective, acceptable to the competent authority and able ~~successfully to withstand the tests~~ to successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.3.5. Methods of testing other than those described in these Regulations are acceptable provided they are equivalent.”
6. Amend 6.6.1.3 as follows (deleted text is ~~struck through~~; new text is underlined):

“6.6.1.3 The specific requirements for large packagings in 6.6.4 are based on large packagings currently used. In order to take into account progress in science and technology, there is no objection to the use of large packagings having specifications different from those in 6.6.4 provided they are equally effective, acceptable to the competent authority and able ~~successfully to withstand the tests~~ to successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.6.5. Methods of testing other than those described in these Regulations are acceptable provided they are equivalent.”
7. Amend the definition “Repaired IBC” in Chapter 1.2 as follows (deleted text is ~~struck through~~; new text is underlined):

“*Repaired IBC* means a metal, rigid plastics or composite IBC that, as a result of impact or for any other cause (e.g. corrosion, embrittlement or other evidence of reduced strength as compared to the design type) is restored so as to conform to the design type and to be able to ~~withstand the design type tests~~ successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.5.4.5 and 6.5.6. For the purposes of these Regulations, the replacement of the rigid inner receptacle of a composite IBC with a receptacle conforming to the original design type from the same manufacturer is considered repair. However, routine maintenance of rigid IBCs (see definition below) is not considered repair. The bodies of rigid plastics IBCs and the inner receptacles of composite IBCs are not repairable. Flexible IBCs are not repairable unless approved by the competent authority;”
8. Amend the definition of “Reused packaging” in Chapter 1.2 as follows (deleted text is ~~struck through~~; new text is underlined):

“*Reused packaging* means a packaging to be refilled which has been examined and found free of defects affecting the ability to ~~withstand the performance tests~~ successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.5; the term includes those which are refilled with the same or similar compatible contents and are transported within distribution chains controlled by the consignor of the product;”

9. Amend the definition of “Reused large packaging” in Chapter 1.2 as follows (deleted text is ~~struck through~~; new text is underlined):

“*Reused large packaging* means a large packaging to be refilled which has been examined and found free of defects affecting the ability to ~~withstand the performance tests~~ successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.6.5; the term includes those which are refilled with the same or similar compatible contents and are transported within distribution chains controlled by the consignor of the product;”

10. Amend 4.1.1.9 as follows (deleted text is ~~struck through~~; new text is underlined):

“4.1.1.9 New, remanufactured or reused packagings, including IBCs and large packagings, or reconditioned packagings and repaired or routinely maintained IBCs shall be capable of passing the tests prescribed in 6.1.5, 6.3.5, 6.5.6 or 6.6.5, as applicable. Before being filled and handed over for transport, every packaging, including IBCs and large packagings, shall be inspected to ensure that it is free from corrosion, contamination or other damage and every IBC shall be inspected with regard to the proper functioning of any service equipment. Any packaging, which shows signs of reduced strength as compared with the approved design type shall no longer be used or shall be so reconditioned, that it is able to ~~withstand the design type tests~~ successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.5. Any IBC which shows signs of reduced strength as compared with the tested design type shall no longer be used or shall be so repaired or routinely maintained that it is able to ~~withstand the design type tests~~ successfully fulfil the requirements described in 6.5.4.5 and 6.5.6, as appropriate.”
