



ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs

**REPORT OF THE WORKING PARTY ON THE TRANSPORT OF PERISHABLE
FOODSTUFFS ON ITS SIXTY-FOURTH SESSION
(14-17 October 2008)**

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1	3
II. ATTENDANCE	2	3
III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 1)	3	3
IV. ACTIVITIES OF ECE BODIES OF INTEREST TO THE WORKING PARTY (Agenda item 2)	4 – 5	3
A. Inland Transport Committee	4	3
B. Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards (WP.7)	5	3
V. ACTIVITIES OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS DEALING WITH PROBLEMS OF INTEREST TO THE WORKING PARTY (Agenda item 3)	6 – 9	4
A. International Institute of Refrigeration (IIR)	6	4
B. Transfrigoroute International	7	4
C. International Organization for Standardization (ISO)	8	4

CONTENTS (continued)

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
D. Compatibility of ATP and European Union legislation ..	9	4
VI. STATUS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE OF PERISHABLE FOODSTUFFS AND ON THE SPECIAL EQUIPMENT TO BE USED FOR SUCH CARRIAGE (Agenda item 4).....	10 – 15	4
A. Status of application of the Agreement	10 – 11	4
B. Status of amendments	12 – 13	5
C. Test stations officially designated by the competent authorities of countries Parties to ATP and whose test reports might be used for the issue of ATP certificates	14	5
D. Exchange of information among Contracting Parties under Article 6 of ATP	15	5
VII. PROPOSALS OF AMENDMENTS TO THE ATP (Agenda item 5)	16 – 31	6
A. Pending issues	16 – 23	6
B. New proposals	24 – 31	8
VIII. ATP HANDBOOK (Agenda item 6)	32 – 37	10
IX. FACILITATION OF TRANSPORT OF PERISHABLE FOODSTUFFS (Agenda item 7).....	38	11
X. SCOPE OF ATP (Agenda item 8).....	39 – 40	11
XI. ENERGY LABELING, REFRIGERANTS AND BLOWING AGENTS (agenda item 9)	41	12
XII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS (Agenda item 10)	42	12
XIII. OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 11).....	43 – 45	12
XIV. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT (Agenda item 12)	46	12

For practical reasons, the revised draft text of Annex 1 to the ATP adopted at the 64th session of WP.11 is issued in a separate addendum (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/218/Add.1)

Annexes

I. Draft amendments to the ATP adopted at the 64 th session	13
II. Additions to the ATP Handbook.....	17

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Director of the UNECE Transport Division, Eva Molnar, addressed the Working Party at the opening of its 64th session. She said that WP.11 had an important responsibility to ensure that the ATP was kept up to date and incorporated the state of the art in technology but also that it provided a guarantee of transport facilitation. She spoke of the interest in the ATP by countries outside the UNECE region and invited those countries to consider adhering to the Agreement. She stated that the ATP Handbook could be a useful tool to clarify some provisions of the ATP where there may be differences of interpretation or ambiguity. Finally, she encouraged the Working Party to consider the possibility of extending the scope of the Agreement to cover fruit and vegetables.

II. ATTENDANCE

2. The following member States of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) were represented: Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and United States of America. The intergovernmental organization International Institute of Refrigeration (IIR) and the non-governmental organizations Liaison Committee of the Body and Trailer Building Industry (CLCCR) and Transfrigoroute International (TI) also took part in the meeting.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (agenda item 1)

3. The provisional agenda (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/217 and -/Add.1) was adopted.

IV. ACTIVITIES OF ECE BODIES OF INTEREST TO THE WORKING PARTY (agenda item 2)

A. Inland Transport Committee

Document: ECE/TRANS/200

4. The Working Party was informed that the Inland Transport Committee had approved the report of WP.11's sixty-third session (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/216 and Add.1). The Committee had adopted its Programme of Work (ECE/TRANS/2008/11) for the period 2008-2012 including that of WP.11 and had recalled that, as in the case of the Committee, its subsidiary bodies also needed to examine their programmes of work only every two years.

B. Working Party on Agricultural Quality Standards (WP.7)

5. The Working Party was informed about the recent work of WP.7 on the development of commercial agricultural quality standards for fresh fruit and vegetables, dry and dried produce; seed potatoes; meat and eggs; and cut flowers. In 2007, the WP.7 had adopted terms of reference and working procedures. The standards for meat are available on the UNECE website at http://www.unece.org/trade/agr/standard/meat/meat_e.htm. Standards for fruit and vegetables are available at http://www.unece.org/trade/agr/standard/fresh/fresh_e.htm.

V. ACTIVITIES OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS DEALING WITH PROBLEMS OF INTEREST TO THE WORKING PARTY (agenda item 3)

A. International Institute of Refrigeration (IIR)

Document: INF.2 (IIR)

6. The representative of IIR briefed the Working Party on the meeting of the IIR sub-commission held in Prague on 5 and 6 June 2008. The meeting had agreed to a number of recommendations relevant to the work of WP.11 (Informal document No.2) which would be discussed under the appropriate agenda items.

B. Transfrigoroute International

7. The representative of Transfrigoroute International informed the Working Party that his organization's annual meeting would be held in Portugal, including working groups on energy saving and energy labeling. He said that TI had submitted a position paper at the 63rd session of WP.11 (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2007/20) which remained the position of his organization.

C. International Organization for Standardization (ISO)

8. The secretariat was asked to formally invite a representative of ISO to participate in the 65th session of WP.11 and to provide information, inter alia, on the work of ISO on standards for temperature recorders and maritime containers.

D. Compatibility of ATP and European Union legislation

9. The secretariat was asked to formally invite a representative of the European Commission to participate in the 65th session of WP.11 who could present information on any issues concerning the compatibility of the ATP and European Union legislation.

VI. STATUS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE OF PERISHABLE FOODSTUFFS AND ON THE SPECIAL EQUIPMENT TO BE USED FOR SUCH CARRIAGE (agenda item 4)

A. Status of application of the Agreement

10. The Working Party was informed that to date 45 States had become Contracting Parties to the Agreement: Albania, Andorra, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uzbekistan.

11. The most recent was Andorra which had acceded on 14 July 2008. The ATP would enter into force for Andorra on 14 July 2009.

B. Status of amendments

Documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/1, Informal document No. 6

12. Proposed amendments to the Annexes to ATP adopted at the sixty-third session of WP.11 (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/216, Annex 1 and ECE/TRANS/WP.11/216/Add.1) had been circulated to Contracting Parties by the depositary on 6 March 2008 (C.N.138.2008.TREATIES-1). On 22 August 2008, the Government of Germany had, pursuant to Article 18 (2) (b) of the ATP, informed the Secretary-General that although it intended to accept the proposals, the conditions for such acceptance were not yet fulfilled. Consequently, the amendments would be deemed accepted only if, before the expiry of a period of nine months following the initial notification period of six months (before 6 June 2009), the Government of Germany did not notify an objection to the proposed amendments. However, if the Government of Germany notified the depositary of its acceptance before 6 June 2009, the amendments would be deemed accepted on the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the notification of acceptance.

13. At the 63rd session of WP.11, the secretariat had been asked to prepare an analysis of the objections made to amendment proposals in recent years. The WP.11 discussed the analysis presented in ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/1 and Informal document No.6 and agreed that it might be advisable to establish a period of time for verification of proposed amendments before they were sent to New York. It was also agreed that all proposed amendments be numbered so that any proposals objected to could be clearly distinguished from others.

C. Test stations officially designated by the competent authorities of countries Parties to ATP and whose test reports might be used for the issue of ATP certificates

14. The current updated list of test stations appears at the following web link: <http://www.unece.org/trans/main/wp11/teststations.pdf> Contracting Parties were invited to transmit corrections or new information to the secretariat.

D. Exchange of information among Contracting Parties under Article 6 of ATP

15. The WP.11 decided to resume collection of information on the implementation of the ATP using the new questionnaire included in the ATP Handbook at the 63rd session. Germany and Sweden said it was very difficult to collect the data required in their countries.

VII. PROPOSALS OF AMENDMENTS TO THE ATP (agenda item 5)

A. Pending issues

1. Sea crossing

Documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/2
ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/3

16. The WP.11 examined the report of the informal working group which had met in Helsinki to examine the length of the sea crossing referred to in the ATP (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/3) and the proposal from Finland to amend Articles 3 and 5 based on the findings of the informal group (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/2). It was agreed that before this work could be completed further clarification was needed regarding containers, including thermal maritime containers, and their relationship to the ATP. The WP.11 voted on the proposal and the results were as follows: 7 in favour (Finland, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Russian Federation, Sweden, United Kingdom), 4 against (Denmark, France, Latvia, Spain) and 8 abstentions (Czech Republic, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Ukraine, United States). The proposal was therefore not accepted.

17. The WP.11 agreed that the informal working group on the sea crossing should continue its work on this subject. The group should also discuss the possibility of extending the scope of the ATP to cover transport by inland waterways. It was stressed that clear justification should be provided. The representative of the United States asked that the group also provide evidence that thermal maritime containers posed any risk to food safety. Interested countries, including France and Spain were invited to join this group to be lead by Finland. It was suggested that the group could work by correspondence.

2. Multi-compartment multi-temperature vehicles

18. The Working Party regretted that it had not been possible to have a document on this subject for its 64th session. It recalled that this issue had been under discussion for many years and that multi-compartment multi-temperature vehicles were already in widespread use. It was agreed that France would submit a document to the 65th session of WP.11 in cooperation with Transfrigoroute International.

3. Annex 1, Appendix 2, paragraph 49

Documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2007/17, ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2007/15 and Informal documents No. 8 and No. 9

19. The WP.11 considered a proposal made by France regarding tests for renewal of ATP certificates for equipment after six and nine years of use (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2007/17) and a table presenting the duration of tests transmitted by the Netherlands in Informal document No.8. The WP.11 agreed to the text in the document by France with a revision to (i) to read "Equipment constructed one year after the entry into force of these provisions [DD MM YYYY]" as supplemented by the table presented by the Netherlands. The voting was as follows:

13 in favour (Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden), none against, and 6 abstentions (Denmark, Poland, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States). It was agreed that the proposed amendment which appears in Annex I to the present report would be transmitted to the Treaty Section for notification to ATP Contracting Parties. A number of small corrections were made to the proposal during the period allowed for verification of proposed amendments.

20. The Working Party discussed a proposal by France regarding tests for renewal of ATP certificates for equipment after 12 years of use (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2007/15) and a supplementary comment relating to Article 29 made by Spain in Informal document No.9. The proposal by France was put to the vote and the results were as follows: 6 in favour (France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation), 1 against (Spain) and 12 abstentions (Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Latvia, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States). The proposal was therefore not accepted. It was agreed that France would contact other interested countries and make a revised proposal on 12 year tests for the 65th session of WP.11 in 2009.

4. Revised text of Annex 1

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2005/2

21. The WP.11 discussed a revised text of Annex 1 (TRANS/WP.11/2005/2) which had been adopted at the sixtieth session of WP.11 in 2004 and transmitted to the UN Treaty Section by the secretariat in July 2005. Despite being the subject of an objection at that time, the WP.11 agreed that it was an improvement on the current Annex 1 and should be revised by the secretariat, taking into account the amendment proposals adopted at the 63rd and 64th sessions. Once verified by members of WP.11, it should be resubmitted to the Treaty Section for notification to ATP Contracting Parties. The draft revised Annex 1 appears in an addendum to the present report (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/218/Add.1).

5. Annex 1, Appendix 3 to ATP - ATP certificate model

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/11

22. The WP.11 proposed the following changes to the revised ATP certificate model presented by Portugal in ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/11:

- (a) The footnotes should not appear on the form but in the ATP or the Handbook;
- (b) Under item 3, change "Matriculation" to "Registration" and "Chassis serial" to "Vehicle identification number";
- (c) Delete 7.1.4 Transitional provisions;
- (d) Delete 7.2;
- (e) In 7.2.4, the K coefficient should have only 2 decimal points, i.e. "0,nn";
- (f) Delete the values of the temperatures given in the table in 7.2.5;
- (g) Add a new item 7.4 "Others";
- (h) Delete 8.1.2;
- (i) Under item 9, delete "Phone".

23. The voting was as follows: 17 in favour (Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom), and 2 abstentions (Denmark, United States). It was agreed that the proposed new model certificate which appears in Annex I to the present report would be transmitted to the Treaty Section for notification to ATP Contracting Parties.

B. New proposals

1. Article 18

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/10

24. The WP.11 discussed the proposal made by Portugal regarding the unanimity rule for the acceptance of amendment proposals (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/10). Germany reiterated its position that it was not possible to accept the proposal to increase the number of objections required to three in the case of the technical annexes for constitutional reasons. The WP.11 discussed the possibility of disbanding WP.11 and establishing a new working group. The WP.11 voted on a revised proposal made by Sweden which required only one objection for amendments to Annexes 2 and 3 but three objections for amendments to Annex 1. The results were as follows: 14 in favour (Czech Republic, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom), 2 against (Denmark, Germany), and 3 abstentions (Netherlands, Slovakia, United States). The proposal was therefore not accepted.

2. Annex 1, Appendix 1, paragraph 4 (c)

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/9

25. The WP.11 considered a proposal made by Portugal clarifying that it is the manufacturer or his representative who should issue the technical specifications of serially produced equipment (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/9). Some revisions were proposed and the revised text was put to the vote. The results of the voting were as follows: 17 in favour (Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom), and 2 abstentions (Ukraine, United States). It was agreed that the proposed amendment which appears in Annex I to the present report would be transmitted to the Treaty Section for notification to ATP Contracting Parties.

3. Annex 1

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/5

26. The Working Party considered the amendment proposals made by Germany in ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/5 aimed at clarifying the ATP concerning the acceptance of the K coefficient. The results of the voting regarding the proposed new provisions to Annex 1 were as follows: 6 in favour (Finland, Germany, Norway, Poland, Spain, Sweden), 2 against (Italy,

Portugal) and 11 abstentions (Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Ireland, Latvia, Netherlands, Slovakia, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States). The proposals were therefore not accepted.

4. Annex 1, Appendix 2, paragraph 29

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/5

27. As regards the new provisions proposed by Germany for paragraph 29 (c), (i), the voting was as follows: 1 in favour (Germany), 6 against (Denmark, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom) and 12 abstentions (Czech Republic, Finland, France, Ireland, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Russian Federation, Ukraine, United States). The proposals were therefore not accepted.

28. It was proposed that an informal working group could be established to work further on this subject and make a new proposal for the 65th session.

5. Annex 1, Appendix 2, paragraph 49

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/8

29. The WP.11 considered a proposal by Sweden in document ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/8 that reference be made in paragraph 49 to the particulars described in paragraph 29 (a) and (b) to be applied by appointed experts. A small revision was made and the revised text was put to the vote. The results of the voting were as follows: 15 in favour (Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom), none against and 4 abstentions (France, Germany, Poland, United States). It was agreed that the proposed amendment which appears in Annex I to the present report would be transmitted to the Treaty Section for notification to ATP Contracting Parties.

6. Annex 1, Appendix 2, paragraph 56

Document: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/6

30. The WP.11 considered the amendment proposal made by the Netherlands in ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/6 to delete as superfluous paragraph 56 (a) which prescribed the pre-cooling temperatures for the calorimeter box or transport equipment before the start of the actual capacity tests. Several delegates considered that the requirement should be retained as it constituted a function test which could also be found in other international standards. The WP.11 decided not to accept the amendment proposal.

7. Annex 2, Appendix 1, paragraph 3

Document: Informal document No. 3

31. The WP.11 discussed the proposal of the Russian Federation contained in Informal document No. 3 to amend Annex 2, Appendix 1, paragraph 3 by specifying the periodicity of the temperature controls and deadlines for keeping information. Since the proposal involved a modification to the ATP itself, the Russian Federation was asked to submit its proposal in an official working document for the 65th session.

VIII. ATP HANDBOOK (agenda item 6)

Documents: ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/4, ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/7, ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/12 and Informal document No. 4

32. The Chairman explained that the ATP Handbook had been the subject of discussion for many years but that it had never been officially adopted and approved by the Working Party. The comments and explanations in it should be considered as advice or guidelines on applying the ATP but were in no sense legally binding like the ATP itself. As such there was no obligation to transmit changes to the Handbook to the Treaty Section in New York for notification to ATP Contracting Parties. The WP.11 voted on whether to officially adopt the ATP Handbook and the results were 19 in favour (Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States), none against and no abstentions. The ATP Handbook was therefore considered officially adopted.

33. Several delegations were of the opinion that the TIR Handbook offered a good model for the ATP Handbook and that it would be useful to have information from the secretariat of the Working Party on Customs Questions affecting Transport (WP.30) on how the TIR Handbook was used. The secretariat was requested to prepare a document for the 65th session proposing how the ATP Handbook should be used and procedures for updating it, drawing on the experience of the WP.30.

34. The WP.11 considered a proposal made by the Czech Republic in ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/4 to include a comment to paragraph 54 (b) in the ATP Handbook regarding the determination of fuel consumption of vehicle-powered refrigeration units. The WP.11 voted on the proposal and the results were as follows: 14 countries in favour (Czech Republic, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States), none against and five abstentions (Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Spain). It was therefore agreed that the proposed comment be added to the ATP Handbook (see Annex II).

35. The representative of Spain informed the meeting that, in light of the previous discussion, it withdrew its proposal regarding the ATP Handbook made in ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/7.

36. The WP.11 examined a proposal made by Slovakia to add an ATP checklist to the ATP Handbook (ECE/TRANS/WP.11/2008/12). It agreed to modify the first sentence on page 2 of the proposal to read "Transport equipment has to be equipped with a valid certificate or a

certification plate and a distinguishing mark." It also agreed that page 3 of the proposal was not necessary since the information presented was already in the ATP. The voting on the proposal was as follows: 11 countries in favour (Germany, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, United Kingdom), one against (Netherlands) and seven abstentions (Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Finland, Sweden, Ukraine, United States). The proposal was therefore considered accepted in principle since, as explained by the Chairman, in the case of the ATP Handbook, three negative votes were required to overturn a proposal. However, Slovakia was asked to submit a corrected proposal as an official document to the 65th session, adding an introductory text and proposing where in the Handbook it could be included.

37. The WP.11 considered a proposal by the Russian Federation in Informal document No. 4 for a comment to Annex 1, Appendix 2, paragraph 21 regarding the placement of temperature measuring equipment for K value testing of tanks. The proposal was adopted in principle but the Russian Federation was asked to submit an official document for the 65th session with the text accompanying the illustrations translated into English. It was also pointed out that a tank could have more than the three compartments shown in the illustration. The results of the voting on the proposal were as follows: 13 in favour (Finland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States), none against and 6 abstentions (Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands).

IX. FACILITATION OF TRANSPORT OF PERISHABLE FOODSTUFFS (agenda item 7)

38. Recognizing that the new Annex 8 to the International Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Controls of Goods, which included provisions related to the transport of perishable foodstuffs, had entered into force on 20 May 2008, the WP.11 agreed that its work on facilitation could be considered completed for the time being and that this item could be removed from the agenda and the Programme of Work. The representative of the Netherlands mentioned a Proposal for a Council Decision Approving on behalf of the Community Annex 8 to the International Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Controls of Goods (COM/2008/0352 final - ACC 2008/0114).

X. SCOPE OF ATP (agenda item 8)

Documents: Informal document No. 5

39. The WP.11 discussed a proposal made by the Russian Federation in Informal document No. 5 to extend the scope of the ATP to cover fruit and vegetables. Some delegates were in favour of adding fruit and vegetables, arguing that in practice ATP vehicles were often used already for such transport and that the ATP should take account of market needs. Some delegates felt that the ATP dealt with food safety and not quality standards and had reservations about the proposal.

40. The WP.11 suggested that the Russian Federation submit a formal proposal on extending the scope of the ATP to fruit and vegetables for the 65th session in cooperation with

Spain. The proposal should contain a justification and consideration of the economic impact, food safety, and other issues involved.

XI. ENERGY LABELING, REFRIGERANTS AND BLOWING AGENTS (agenda item 9)

41. The work of Transfrigoroute International on energy labelling was cited. The representative of IIR informed the WP.11 that his organization had established a working group on energy labeling in the cold chain with sub-groups on refrigerated storage and refrigerated transport. Transfrigoroute France was in the process of developing software to calculate the global consumption of energy during transport.

XII. ELECTION OF OFFICERS (agenda item 10)

42. The Working Party elected Mr. T. Nobre (Portugal) as Chairman and Mr. G. Panozzo (Italy) as Vice-Chairman of WP.11 for 2009.

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS (agenda item 11)

43. The secretariat was requested to propose draft rules of procedure for WP.11 in a working document for the 65th session drawing inspiration from those developed for other Working Parties serviced by the Transport Division.

44. The secretariat briefed the Working Party on the report of the Multidisciplinary Group of Experts on Inland Transport Security which had been submitted to the Bureau of the Inland Transport Committee on 18 February 2008. The report called for ITC subsidiary bodies, *inter alia*, to review international legal instruments under their responsibility and to create an inventory of existing security measures and a list of potentially desirable additional security provisions. The WP.11 decided to undertake this work at its session in 2009.

Date of the 65th session

45. The Working Party was informed that the dates of 27 to 30 October 2009 had been reserved for the sixty-fifth session of WP.11. In order to guarantee translation in time for the session, all documents should be submitted to the secretariat by 10 August 2009.

XIV. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT (agenda item 12)

46. The WP.11 adopted the report of its 64th session based on a draft prepared by the secretariat.

Annex I

DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE ATP ADOPTED AT THE 64th SESSION

1. Amend the text of Annex 1, Appendix 1, paragraph 4 (c) to read as follows. New text is underlined.

“(c) in the case of serially produced equipment, the technical specification of the equipment to be certified as issued by the manufacturer of the equipment or his duly accredited representative. This specification must cover the same items as the descriptive pages concerning the equipment which appear in the test report and must be drawn up in at least one of the three official languages.”

2. Amend the introductory text of Annex 1, Appendix 2, paragraph 49 to read as follows. New text is underlined.

"49. To verify as prescribed in appendix 1, paragraphs 1 (b) and 1 (c), to this annex the efficiency of the thermal appliance of each item of refrigerated, mechanically refrigerated or heated equipment in service, the competent authorities may:

Apply the methods described in paragraphs 32 to 47 of this appendix; or

Appoint experts to apply the particulars described in paragraph 29 (a) and (b) of this appendix when applicable as well as the following provisions:"

(Remaining text unchanged)

3. Replace the existing text of Annex 1, Appendix 2, paragraph 49 (b) by:

“(b) Mechanically refrigerated equipment

**(i) Equipment constructed one year after the entry into force of these provisions [DD
MM YYYY]**

It shall be verified that, when the outside temperature is not lower than +15° C, the inside temperature of the empty equipment can be brought to the class temperature within a maximum period (in minutes), as prescribed in the table below.

Outside temperature	30	29	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	16	15	°C
Class C, F	360	350	340	330	320	310	300	290	280	270	260	250	240	230	220	210	min
Class B, E	270	262	253	245	236	228	219	211	202	194	185	177	168	160	151	143	min
Class A, D	180	173	166	159	152	145	138	131	124	117	110	103	96	89	82	75	min

The inside temperature of the empty equipment must have been previously brought to the outside temperature.

If the results are favourable, the equipment may be kept in service as mechanically refrigerated equipment of its initial class for a further period of not more than three years.

(ii) Transitional provisions applicable to equipment in service

For equipment constructed prior to the entry into force of these provisions [DD MM YYYY], the following provisions shall apply:

It shall be verified that, when the outside temperature is not lower than +15° C, the inside temperature of the empty equipment, which has been previously brought to the outside temperature, can be brought within a maximum period of six hours:

In the case of equipment in classes A, B or C, to the minimum temperature, as prescribed in this annex;

In the case of equipment in classes D, E or F, to the limit temperature, as prescribed in this annex.

If the results are favourable, the equipment may be kept in service as mechanically refrigerated equipment of its initial class for a further period of not more than three years."

4. Replace Annex 1, Appendix 3, A by the following:

" A. Model form of certificate of compliance of the equipment, as prescribed in annex 1, appendix 1, paragraph 4

FORM OF CERTIFICATE FOR INSULATED, REFRIGERATED, MECHANICALLY REFRIGERATED OR HEATED EQUIPMENT USED FOR THE INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE OF PERISHABLE FOODSTUFFS BY LAND

These footnotes shall not be printed on the certificate itself.

The areas in grey shall be replaced by the translation in the language of the country issuing the ATP Certificate.

- 1/ *Strike out what does not apply.*
- 2/ *Distinguishing sign of the country, as used in international road traffic.*
- 3/ *The number (figures, letters, etc.) indicating the authority issuing the certificate and the approval reference.*
- 4/ *The test procedure is not yet determined within the ATP Agreement. Multi-temperature equipment is insulated equipment with two or more compartments for different temperatures in each compartment.*
- 5/ *The blank certificate shall be printed in the language of the issuing country and in English, French or Russian; the various items shall be numbered as in the above model.*
- 6/ *State type (wagon, lorry, trailer, semi-trailer, container, etc.); in the case of tank equipment for carriage of liquid foodstuffs, add the word "tank".*
- 7/ *Enter here one or more of the descriptions listed in Appendix 4 of Annex 1, together with the corresponding distinguishing mark or marks.*
- 8/ *Write the mark, model, fuel, serial number and year of manufacture of the equipment.*
- 9/ *Measurement of the overall coefficient of heat transfer, determination of the efficiency of cooling appliances, etc.*
- 10/ *Where determined in conformity with the provisions of Appendix 2, paragraph 42, of this Annex.*
- 11/ *The effective cooling capacity of each evaporator depends on the number of evaporators fixed at the condensing unit.*
- 12/ *In case of loss, a new Certificate can be provided or, instead of it, a photocopy of the ATP Certificate bearing a special stamp with "CERTIFIED DUPLICATE" (in red ink) and the name of the certifying officer, his signature, and the name of the competent authority or authorized body.*
- 13/ *Security stamp (relief, fluorescent, ultraviolet, or other safety mark that certifies the origin of the certificate).*
- 14/ *If applicable, mention the way the power for issuing ATP Certificates is delegated."*

Annex II

ADDITIONS TO THE ATP HANDBOOK

Comment to paragraph 54 (b):

1. This procedure describes the measurement method for determining the fuel consumption of vehicle powered refrigeration units, or in other words the increase in diesel engine fuel consumption when the refrigeration unit is on.

2. Three standards have been introduced and used to determine the increase in fuel consumption as a result of the operation of the refrigeration unit:

- Standard diesel engine with standard specific fuel consumption: $c_s = 165 \text{ g/(kW. h)}$.
- Standard vehicle alternator efficiency: $\varepsilon = 50 \%$.
- Standard diesel fuel specific density: $\rho = 836 \text{ g/l}$.

3. The most frequent arrangement is assumed: the refrigeration compressor or a special electric generator supplying the refrigeration unit is driven from the vehicle engine crankshaft (usually by a belt drive). Using a suitable design of power pack in the test station, the torque τ [N.m] and operating rotational speed n [s^{-1}] are measured and the input power P_1 [W] on the shaft of the compressor or generator is calculated.

$$P_1 \text{ [W]} = 2\pi n\tau \quad \dots \text{ where } \pi = 3.141593$$

4. There are also vehicle-powered units taking in addition electric current from the standard (or auxiliary) vehicle alternator, or from vehicle batteries, usually to drive electric fans and blowers. Regarding the shaft power P_2 [W] of a standard or auxiliary alternator determined from electric measurement, the efficiency of such vehicle alternators has to be considered (usually 24 V dc, 100 A to 150 A). Alternator efficiency ε for these calculations is postulated at 50 % (see the second of the three standards mentioned above). Accordingly, if P_{fans} is the total electric input needed to drive the fans, the alternator shaft input is:

$$P_2 = 2 \times P_{fans}$$

5. In this case the total input power P [W] that the vehicle engine has to deliver to the refrigeration unit consists of the compressor input P_1 and of the alternator input P_2 for the fans:

$$P = P_1 + P_2$$

6. If P [W] is the total refrigeration unit input power at specific operating conditions, then the fuel consumption by weight C_{fw} [g/h] of the tested refrigeration unit can be calculated as:

$$C_{fw} \text{ [g/h]} = P \times c_s = 0.165 \times P.$$

7. The consumption by weight (measured in g/h) can be converted to consumption by volume (measured in l/h) if the specific density ρ of the diesel fuel is known. This density varies from 830 kg/m³ (winter) to 842 kg/m³ (summer). The standard (mean) value of the specific density $\rho = 836 \text{ kg/m}^3 = 836 \text{ g/l}$ has been used for the purposes of this procedure (see the third of the standards mentioned above).

$$\mathbf{C_{fvol} [l/h] = C_{fw} / 836}$$

8. It is beneficial to introduce specific fuel consumption; it is the quantity which can be used to compare the economy of units with different refrigeration capacities. Specific fuel consumption **cfvol** (consumption by volume reduced to 1 kW of refrigeration capacity **Q**) is defined in this way:

$$\mathbf{cfvol [l/(h. kW)] = 1000 C_{fvol} / Q}$$

* * * * *