

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

14 March 2013

Joint Meeting of the RID Committee of Experts and the Working Party on the Transport of Dangerous Goods

Bern, 18-22 March 2013

Item 6 of the provisional agenda

Report of informal working groups

Comments on informal document INF.9 (Conditions of carriage for UN 3509 Packaging discarded, empty, uncleaned)

Transmitted by the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC)

Introduction

1. CEFIC had already introduced informal document UN/SCETDG/42/INF.18 at the United Nations Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods meeting in December 2012, providing comments to ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2012/85 of France, submitted on behalf of the RID/ADR/ADN Joint Meeting working group. As the UNSCETDG meeting concentrated on the decision to introduce a new specific UN number, CEFIC would like to submit its comments on the transport provisions, which have been slightly amended in order to take account of comments and the decisions already made.

Comments and proposals

On the new entry in the Dangerous Goods List: UN 3509 PACKAGING DISCARDED, EMPTY, UNCLEANED

2. According to 1.1.3.6.3 empty, uncleaned packagings having contained dangerous goods (except those classified in transport category 0) are assigned to transport category 4. They are still compliant to the requirements of the transport regulations and due to the small quantities of residues they represent only a minor risk in transportation. Packages containing UN 3509 (Packaging discarded, empty, uncleaned) carried under the new Special Provision 374 are also characterized by very small quantities of residues of the previous filling goods and represent a comparable risk for transportation. Therefore they should be assigned to the same category of transport, i.e. category 4.

On the new special provision XYZ

3. The requirement to affix all the placards corresponding to the risks or subsidiary risks related to each residue on the outside of the cargo transport unit is not justified by the very small quantity of residues present and may even lead to inadequate measures in an emergency. CEFIC therefore supports the deletion of the respective sentence to which reference is already made in the footnote "EXPLANATORY NOTE".

Alternatively, a similar marking as for Limited Quantities could be considered e.g. by defining a mark bearing the information “EMPTY UNCLEANED PACKAGING FOR DISCARD” to placard the cargo transport unit.

This concept could also be considered for the labeling of the packages containing Packaging discarded, empty, uncleaned to avoid a flood of warning notices which might misguide in case of an emergency.

4. A provision for the implementation of sorting procedures, including keeping documentation for monitoring purposes, is far beyond any requirements already implemented in dangerous goods regulations for dispatch operations such as “Shipper’s declarations” and “CTU packing certificates”. It is also not comparable to “quality systems” required for the manufacturing processes of receptacles. Enforcement into compliant and responsible logistics operations has to be regulated on national level, and has never been the scope of RID/ADR/ADN. Therefore CEFIC proposes deleting this paragraph.

On the new special packing provisions

5. Given the low risk of such transports due to the very small quantity of residues in the packaging the proposal refers to packing instructions P003 and LP02 with the addition of new special provisions exempting from testing and type approval. Although P003 already covers this, it might be useful to re-iterate this in the new special packing provision PPxy, in order to avoid confusion as this provision may be looked at in isolation from P003. In order to reach a pragmatic solution for the large packagings the proposed new requirements for UN 3509 including the exemption from the provisions in 4.1.1.3 and 6.6 should be stated together in one special packing provision Lxz.

6. P003 already allows for both rigid as well as flexible packaging to contain any kind of articles. The provision “the packaging shall be designed and constructed to prevent inadvertent discharge of articles during normal conditions of carriage” was sufficient in the past to choose either rigid or flexible packaging as appropriate and required by the nature of the articles to be contained. Therefore there is no need to define the properties of the articles and put restriction to certain packagings. The use of flexible packaging should not be excluded from the new special packing provisions as they can comply with the proposed requirements and are permitted for solid dangerous goods in general. Therefore CEFIC proposes removing the word “rigid” from the proposed new special packing provisions.

7. The need for a means of retaining should only be required when there is indeed a risk that any free liquid might escape, which definitely has not to be considered in case of solid residues.

8. In view of the 3 comments above, CEFIC proposes to amend the first sentence of the two proposed Special Packing Provisions as follows

“PPxy For UN 3509 packaging meeting the construction requirements of 6.1.4, made leak tight or fitted with a leak tight and puncture resistant sealed liner or bag, shall be used. The packaging is not required to meet the requirements of 4.1.1.3 and 6.1.5. When there is a risk that free liquid residues might escape during the transport, the packaging has to provide a means of retaining, e.g. absorbent material.”

“Lxz For UN 3509 large packaging meeting the construction requirements of 6.6.4, made leak tight or fitted with a leak tight and puncture resistant sealed liner or bag, shall be used. The large packaging is not required to meet the requirements of 4.1.1.3 and 6.6.5. When there is a risk that free liquid residues might escape during

the transport, the packaging has to provide a means of retaining, e.g. absorbent material.”

9. There is no reason why IBCs should only be referred to in a Note and why no special packing provision should be added to IBC08 instead, hereby taking into account the comments made in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 which equally apply to IBCs.

“Byz For UN 3509 IBCs meeting the construction requirements of 6.5.5, made leak tight or fitted with a leak tight and puncture resistant sealed liner or bag, shall be used. The IBC is not required to meet the requirements of 4.1.1.3 and 6.5.6. When there is a risk that free liquid residues might escape during the transport, the packaging has to provide a means of retaining, e.g. absorbent material.

Before being filled and handed over for carriage, every IBC shall be inspected to ensure that it is free from corrosion, contamination or other damages. Any IBC showing signs of reduced strength, shall no longer be used (minor dents and scratches are not considered as reducing the strength of the IBC).

IBCs intended for the transport of Packaging discarded, empty, uncleaned with residues of division 5.1 shall be so constructed or adapted so that the goods cannot come into contact with wood or any other combustible material.”
