**Summary of papers to be discussed at the UN TDG Sub-Committee 29 June-8 July 2020**

| **Paper** | **Issue** | **Do you agree with what has been proposed?** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Adoption of the agenda** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/111/Add.1****(Secretariat)****Provisional agenda for the fifty-sixth session**[**Link**](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-111-Add.1e.docx) |  |  |  |
| **2. Explosives and related matters** |
| **2(a) Review of test series 6** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/4****Report of the informal correspondence group on the review of Test 6 (d) (Unconfined package test)**(SAAMI)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-04e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/11](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-11e.docx)55th Session - [INF.55](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-55-INF55e.docx) | At the fifty-sixth session SAAMI presented document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/11 to review the criteria of Test 6 (d) in the Manual of Tests and Criteria (MTC). This is a test having the primary function of limiting explosives which may be assigned Compatibility Group S, the safest explosives classification. The report of the Explosives Working Group (EWG), in informal document INF.55 (fifty-fifth session), indicated that the 6 (d) test is intended to identify hazardous effects outside of the package resulting from an accidental initiation, but that the current criteria may be identifying any effects rather than just hazardous effects. The working group determined that clear guidance is needed on what hazardous effects the 6 (d) test is meant to identify, and the criteria should be reviewed and updated so that they relate solely to hazardous effects as opposed to effects in general. The issue of whether an accidental initiation is possible is excluded from the scope of work. An informal correspondence group was formed to accomplish these tasks, which SAAMI was asked to lead.To accomplish its mission the informal correspondence group on the review of test 6 (d) conducted a survey of the group’s opinions on the four current criteria of the 6 (d) test. The group was asked to elaborate individually on each of the four criteria about whether they identify hazardous effects versus any effect. Many responses were received, which presented some identifiable trends helpful to the mission of the group.SAAMI proposes that the informal correspondence group continue its discussion within the next EWG meeting. It would be helpful for the EWG to confirm support for the above summary of the survey results, with edits as necessary. The discussion may also further develop the positions which receive support. At the EWG, the informal correspondence group should confirm its intention to continue the work intersessionally and into the next biennium. |  |  |
| **2(b) Improvement of test series 8** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item** |  |  |  |
| **2(c) Review of tests in part I, II and III of the Manual of Tests and Criteria** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/3−ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/4****Manual of Tests and Criteria, review of Test Series H: determination of self-accelerating decomposition temperature**(EWG)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-03e-ST-SG-AC10-C4-2020-04e.docx)56th Session – INF.3138th Session – INF.15 | This document contains the outcome of the work of the International Group of Experts on the Unstable and Energetic Substances (IGUS), working group Energetic and Oxidizing Substances (EOS), ad-hoc working group on revision of test series H. The information in this document was presented earlier in informal documents INF.31 (fifty-sixth session) and INF.15 (thirty-eighth session).This paper includes a list of proposed amendments to the seventh revised edition of the Manual of Tests and Criteria resulting from these discussions. A marked-up version of the full text of Section 28 of the Manual is circulated separately in information document INF.4 (TDG, fifty-seventh session) – INF.3 (GHS, thirty-ninth session). The TDG and GHS sub-committees are invited to consider the proposed amendments for adoption.A marked up copy of Section 28 of the Manual of Tests and Criteria showing the amendments proposed in the paper can be found in [UN/SCETDG/57/INF.4 - UN/SCEGHS/39/INF.3](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-57-INF04e-UN-SCEGHS-39-INF03e.docx) |  |  |
| **2(e) Explosives and related matters: review of packing instructions for explosives** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/51****Correction or amendment to packing instruction P137, special packing provision PP70**(United Kingdom)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-51e.docx) | This paper proposes a correction to the current text of P137, PP70, so that it accurately reflects the requirements found in earlier versions of the packing instruction special provision in relation to the use of orientation marks. The paper puts forward the following 4 proposals for consideration of the EWG:Amend the first sentence of PP70 with one of proposals 1 to 3 set out below with the subsequent deletion of UN Nos. 0440 and 0441 if proposal 4 is adopted.**Proposal 1**“For UN Nos. 0059, 0439, 0440 and 0441, when the shaped charges are packed singly, the conical cavity shall face downwards and the package shall be marked as illustrated in figures 5.2.3 or 5.2.4 ~~in accordance with 5.2.1.7.1~~ on two opposite sides.”**Proposal 2**“Notwithstanding the scope and exceptions provided in 5.2.1.7.1, for UN Nos. 0059, 0439, 0440 and 0441, when the shaped charges are packed singly, the conical cavity shall face downwards and the package shall be marked as described in ~~accordance with~~ 5.2.1.7.1.”**Proposal 3**“For UN Nos. 0059, 0439, 0440 and 0441, when the shaped charges are packed singly, the conical cavity shall face downwards and the package shall be marked ~~in accordance with 5.2.1.7.1~~ “THIS SIDE UP” and the marking sized in accordance with 6.1.3.1.”**Proposal 4**Delete special packing provision PP70 from UN Nos. 0440 and 0441 in column (9) of the dangerous goods list in Chapter 3.2 and from P137, special packing provision PP70 in 4.1.4.1. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/53****Clarification on the applicability of PP70 in packing instruction P137**(United Kingdom)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-53e.docx) | This paper invites the explosives working group to review the text of PP70 of Packing Instruction P137, to clarify the intent and the applicability of the provision.During a recent application of PP70, the UK found it to be confusing and open to interpretation. Te paper sets out the issues identified by the UK for discussion. |  |  |
| **2(g) Explosives and related matters: test N.1 for readily combustible solids** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/34****Proposals to amend Figure 33.2.4.1:(A) cross-section of the 250 mm long mould in the Manual of Tests and Criteria**(China)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-34e.docx) | After reviewing section 33.2.4.2 in the Manual of Tests and Criteria (ST/SG/AC.10/11/Rev.7) and regarding the mould for burning rate test, particularly Figure 33.2.4.1, experts from China have identified some deficiencies in the cross-section diagram of 250 mm long mould which need to be revised to ensure that the information corresponds to the description in 33.2.4.2.The Figure 33.2.4.1:(A) is the cross-section of mould which indicates the inner structure. With this cross-section diagram, the experiment researcher shall make the mould correctly.The paper sets out the reasons China believe Figure 33.2.4.2:(A) requires revision and provides three alternate diagrams to more accurately reflect the mould. |  |  |
| **2(h) Review of Chapter 2.1 of the GHS**  |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item** |  |  |  |
| **2(i) Energetic samples** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item** |  |  |  |
| **2(j) Issues related to the definition of explosives** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item** |  |  |  |
| **2(k) Miscellaneous** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item** |  |  |  |
| **2(l) Miscellaneous** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/17** **Inconsistency in the French description of the UN gap test in the Manual of Tests and Criteria**Note by the secretariat[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-17e.docx) | It has been brought to the attention of the secretariat that the description in the Manual of Tests and Criteria of the apparatus used for the Series 1 type (a) UN gap test (11.4.1.2.1) contains an inconsistency. The English version mentions an external diameter of 48 mm whereas the French version mentions 40 mm. After researching the matter, it is the view of the secretariat that the French version is mistaken and the English version is correct.This error occurred in 1995 when preparing the French publication |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/25****Terms of Reference for the work on “Exclusion from Class 1” within the Explosives Working Group**(COSTHA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-25e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/61](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-61e.docx) (COSTHA) and [INF.28](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF28e.docx) (France) | During the fifty-sixth session of the Sub-Committee it was agreed to request that the Explosives Working Group be asked to respond to a number of questions related to how to address the assignment of certain fire suppression dispersion devices to Class 9. An informal discussion was held by interested delegates to develop an approach to present to the Explosives Working Group for technical considerations that might assist the Sub-Committee in determining a specific path forward.**At the 56th session, Australia did not support the original proposal contained in 2019/61** |  |  |
| **3. Listing, classification and packing** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/6****Clarification of control and emergency temperatures for formulations listed in packing instruction IBC520 and portable tank instruction T23**Transmitted by the expert from the Republic of Korea and the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC)\*[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-06e.docx) | In UN 20, the following new provision was added in packing instruction IBC520 of 4.1.4.2 and portable tank instruction T23 of 4.2.5.2.6:*“…The formulations listed below may also be transported packed in accordance with packing method OP8 of packing instruction P520 of 4.1.4.1, with the same control and emergency temperatures, if applicable*.”According to this new provision, the formulations that are not listed in 2.4.2.3.2.3 (*List of currently assigned self-reactive substances in packagings)* and 2.5.3.2.4 *(List of currently assigned organic peroxides in packagings)*, but listed in IBC520 or T23, can be transported in packagings with the same control and emergency temperatures. This may cause confusion as some formulations are listed in both IBC520 and T23 albeit with different control and emergency temperatures. Some formulations are listed only in IBC520 OR T23.The paper proposed the following amendment to remove any confusion:Amend 2.4.2.3.2.3, 2.5.3.2.4, IBC520 of 4.1.4.2 and T23 of 4.2.5.2.6 to read as follows (new text is shown in **bold**):(a) Last sentence of 2.4.2.3.2.3 and 2.5.3.2.4: “The formulations **not listed in this provision but** listed in packing instruction IBC520 of 4.1.4.2 and in portable tank instruction T23 of 4.2.5.2.6 may also be transported packed in accordance with packing method OP8 of packing instruction P520 of 4.1.4.1, with the same control and emergency temperatures, if applicable.”(b) Second sentence in the third row of IBC520 of 4.1.4.2: “… The formulations **not listed in 2.4.2.3.2.3 and 2.5.3.2.4 but** listed below may also be transported packed in accordance with packaging method OP8 of packing instruction P520 of 4.1.4.1, with the same control and emergency temperatures, if applicable.”(c) Fourth sentence in the paragraph under the heading of T23 of 4.2.5.2.6:“… The formulations **not listed in 2.4.2.3.2.3 and 2.5.3.2.4 but** listed below may also be transported packed in accordance with packaging method OP8 of packing instruction P520 of 4.1.4.1, with the same control and emergency temperatures, if applicable.”Refer to the paper for the table of control and emergency temperatures for the different formulations of UN 3119 organic peroxides |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/7****Toxicity of UN 2248, 2264 and 2357**(Republic of Korea)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-07e.docx) | This paper follows on from previous work by Korea in identifying toxicity and corrosivity based on the hazardous information from the revised hazard profiles established by the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) (PPR.1/Circ.1, Annex 5).Following initial discussion at the 47th session, Korea collected test data and proposed amendments to the toxicity classification of UN nos 2248, 2264 and 2357). These proposals were discussed at the 49th and 50th sessions. The report from the 50th session notes the following from the discussions:*The Sub-Committee noted that the data provided by the Republic of Korea needed further consideration. It also noted that substances belonging to Class 8, packing group Ⅱ and, because of their inhalation toxicity, to Division 6.1, packing group Ⅱ, should be classified in Division 6.1 rather than Class 8. Some experts also thought that it would be important to check thoroughly whether the proposed changes in classification would not imply changes in conditions of transport.*The current paper submitted by Korea contains proposals for the reclassification of the three UN numbers and the rationale behind the proposed classifications.  |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/9****Clarification of the scope of UN 1002 AIR, COMPRESSED**Transmitted by European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-09e.docx) | EIGA members propose to clarify the situation regarding the UN number used to transport “synthetic air”. “Synthetic air” is a mixture containing up to 23.5% oxygen with the balance being nitrogen. This mixture is used in a variety of applications, including medical and non-medical, and is intended to be used as “air” in these applications. There are a number of reasons why “synthetic air” is used in place of compressed air. These include that sometimes the ambient air is not suitable to be compressed due to atmospheric contaminants.EIGA’s recommendation is to use UN 1002, AIR, COMPRESSED based on 3.1.3.3 of the Model Regulations:*“A mixture or solution meeting the classification criteria of these Regulations that is not identified by name in the Dangerous Goods List and that is composed of two or more dangerous goods shall be assigned to an entry that has the proper shipping name, description, hazard class or division, subsidiary hazard(s) and packing group that most precisely describes the mixture or solution*.” The paper also addresses issues arising from the removal of SP 292 in 2007.**Proposal**EIGA proposes that the allowance to transport synthetic air mixtures under UN 1002 AIR, COMPRESSED is clarified by reassigning a new version of former SP292 to this UN number. This version includes a reference to nitrogen.Add the following new special provision in Chapter 3.3:*“SP2xx “Mixtures of nitrogen and oxygen containing not less than 19.5% and not more than 23.5% oxygen by volume may be transported under this entry when no other oxidizing gases are present. A Division 5.1 subsidiary hazard label is not required for any concentrations within this limit.”.*UN 1002, add “2XX” under column (6) in the Dangerous Goods List.**Justification**As this reinstate a practice that had existed successfully for many years EIGA does not foresee any difficulties in reintroducing this special provision.  |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/10****Transport of portable fire extinguishers in accordance with special provision 225**Germany[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-10e.docx) | This paper seeks to clarify that special provision 225(a) as it pertains to fire extinguishers (UN 1044) be amended to clarify that it also applies to the transport of portable fire extinguishers without the components necessary for the proper functioning, such as hoses and nozzles. The paper provides the following two options for consideration.**Proposal (option 1)**Insert an additional note between (a) and (b) of special provisions 225 as follows (new text is underlined):“***NOTE***: *Portable fire extinguishers shall be subject to this entry even if the components necessary for their proper functioning (e.g. hoses and nozzles) are temporarily not attached, as long as the fire extinguishers continue to be marked (labelled) as a portable fire extinguisher.”***Proposal (option 2)**Extend the existing second note of special provision 225 as follows (new text is underlined):*“****NOTE****: The entry under (a) also comprises portable fire extinguishers to which the components necessary for their proper functioning (e.g. hoses and nozzles) are temporarily not attached, as long as the fire extinguishers continue to be marked (labelled) as a portable fire extinguisher. Pressure receptacles which contain gases for use in the above-mentioned fire extinguishers (e.g. propellant gas cylinders of a portable fire extinguisher) or for use in stationary fire-fighting installations shall meet the requirements of Chapter 6.2 and all requirements applicable to the relevant dangerous goods when these pressure receptacles are transported separately.”* |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/12****Introduction of a new entry for (7-Methoxy-5-methyl-benzothiophen-2-yl) boronic acid as a self-reactive substance in section 2.4.2.3.2.3 of the Model Regulations**Transmitted by the European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-12e.docx) | This paper seeks a new entry in the dangerous goods list for (7-Methoxy-5-methyl-benzothiophen-2-yl) boronic acid. This compound is a precursor of a new active pharmaceutical ingredient in the approval process. As sourcing involves international transport from different countries, CEFIC proposes the creation of an entry in the list of self-reactive substances under 2.4.2.3.2.3 of the Model Regulations.Annexes I and II of the paper contain a detailed test report and the data sheet to be submitted to the United Nations for new classification of substances.**Proposal**In 2.4.2.3.2.3, create an entry in the list of self-reactive substances as follows

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SELF-REACTIVE SUBSTANCE | Concen-tration (%) | Packingmethod | Controltemperature(°C) | Emergency temperature(°C) | UN generic entry | Remarks |
| (7-Methoxy-5-methyl-benzothiophen-2-yl) boronic acid | 88-100 | OP 7 |  |  | 3230 | (11) |

Add the following new remark (11) under the table in 2.4.2.3.2.3:“(11) The technical compound with the specified concentration limits may contain up to 12 % water and up to 1 % organic impurities.”. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/14****Organic peroxides: new formulations to be listed in 2.5.3.2.4**(Japan)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-14e.docx) | Japan has proposed the inclusion of two new entries to the list of organic peroxides under 2.5.3.2.4. Approval for maritime transport of the products has already been granted by the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism of Japan. The products have been transported from Japan to Asian countries for more than 15 years without any incident or accident.Test results for the proposed entries are contained in the Annex to the paper.**Proposals**The expert from Japan proposes to include two new entries in the list of currently assigned organic peroxides under 2.5.3.2.4, as indicated below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ORGANIC PEROXIDE** | **Concentration (%)** | **Diluent type A (%)** | **Diluent type B (%)** | **Inert solid** **(%)** | **Water** | **Packing Method** | **Control temperature (°C)** | **Emergency temperature (°C)** | **Number (Generic entry)** | **Subsidiary risks and remarks** |
| tert-BUTYLPEROXY ISOPROPYLCARBONATE | ≤ 62 |  | ≥ 38 |  |  | OP7 |  |  | 3105 |  |
| tert-HEXYL PEROXYPIVALATE | ≤ 52 as a stable dispersion in water |  |  |  |  | OP8 | +15 | +20 | 3117 |  |

 |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/15****Consequential amendments related to the introduction of “TEMPERATURE CONTROLLED” in 3.1.2.6 and reference to “MOLTEN” as part of the proper shipping name in the transport document**(Spain)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-15e.docx)56th Session – [INF.5](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF05e.docx) and [INF.6](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF06e.docx) | In the twentieth revised edition of the Model Regulations (2017) a new text was introduced in 3.1.2.6 (b) indicating that, when the words “TEMPERATURE CONTROLLED” are not already included in capital letters in the name of a substance in the case temperature control is used for stabilization, this text has to be added as part of the proper shipping name. Nevertheless, 5.4.1.5.4 has not been updated. Spain considers that the text in 5.4.1.5.4 should directly reference the case when the words “TEMPERATURE CONTROLLED” are included into the proper shipping name because this would ease the application of the regulations for end users. For that reason, in the December 2019 Sub-Committee meeting, Spain presented informal document INF.5 (56th session) proposing the following amendments related to this subject:* to amend the text of 5.4.1.5.4 (paragraph 7 of informal document INF 5),
* to include in 5.4.1.4.3 a cross reference to 3.1.2.6 for modifying the proper shipping name (by including an additional sub-paragraph (e) under 5.4.1.4.3 in informal document INF.5), and
* to amend the text of 7.1.5.3.2 (paragraph 9 of the informal document INF 5).

In the same session, Spain also presented informal document INF.6 (56th session) to include a reference to “MOLTEN” as part of the proper shipping name in the transport document by inserting a new paragraph (d) to 5.4.1.4.3, as an additional consequential amendment to INF.5 (56th session).While there was support for the amendments in INF.5 and INF.6, several delegations provided comments on the proposed text during the session and Spain was invited to revise the text and consolidate all the proposed amendments in a formal document for the next session. This new document reflects the Spanish proposal and the comments received.The full details of the proposed amendments is contained in the paper. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/18****Modifications concerning Salvage Pressure Receptacles**(Germany)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-18e.docx) | Proposal at previous sessions (37th, 36th, 45th, 46th) relating to the use and approval of salvage pressure receptacles resulted in modifications enabling the storage of pressure receptacles of up to 1 000 litres in salvage pressure receptacles with a water capacity of up to 3 000 litres.In the meantime, other factors and developments have led the argument that the two different aspects of the pressure volume product – a) limitation of consequences and b) key criteria for the selection of appropriate salvage pressure receptacles – provides an appropriate approach for the selection of appropriate salvage pressure receptacles. The paper proposes to impose a limit on the pressure volume product that shall not be exceeded and remove the limit on the volume of salvage pressure receptacles designed for tubes of up to 3 000 litres. **Proposal 1**Introduce a maximum pressure volume product relevant for all pressure receptacles as follows (new text is underlined): *“1.2.1 "Pressure receptacle"* means a transportable receptacle intended for holding substances under pressure including its closure(s) and other service equipment and is a collective term that includes cylinders, tubes, pressure drums, closed cryogenic receptacles, metal hydride storage systems, bundles of cylinders and salvage pressure receptacles with a test pressure volume product not exceeding 1.5 million bar litres;”**Proposal 2**10. Since the pV-limit is valid for all pressure receptacles, delete the volume limit in the definition of salvage pressure receptacles if proposal 1 has been accepted (deleted text is ~~struck through~~): *“1.2.1 "Salvage pressure receptacle"* means a pressure receptacle ~~with a water capacity not exceeding 3000 litres~~ into which are placed damaged, defective, leaking or non-conforming pressure receptacle(s) for the purpose of carriage e.g. for recovery or disposal;” **Proposal 3**Since tubes may have a volume of up to 3 000 litres, delete the 1 000 litres limit for pressure receptacles accepted for storage in a salvage pressure (deleted text is ~~struck through~~, new text is underlined): “4.1.1.19.2 Pressure receptacles shall be placed in salvage pressure receptacles of suitable size. ~~The maximum size of the placed pressure receptacle is limited to a water capacity of 1 000 litres~~. More than one pressure receptacle may be placed in the same salvage pressure receptacle only if the contents are known and do not react dangerously with each other (see 4.1.1.6). In this case the total sum of water capacities of the placed pressure receptacles shall not exceed ~~1 000~~ 3 000 litres. Measures shall be taken to prevent movement of the pressure receptacles within the salvage pressure receptacle e.g. by partitioning, securing or cushioning.” |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/21****Request for a new UN number for cobalt dihydroxide powder**Transmitted by the Responsible Packaging Management Association of Southern Africa (RPMASA) and International Confederation of Plastic Packaging Manufacturers (ICPP)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-21e.docx)55th Session [INF.24](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-55-INF24e.docx)56th Session [INF.19](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF19e.docx) | At the fifty-fifth session RPMASA introduced in informal document INF.24 a new challenge experienced for packaging and transport of cobalt dihydroxide, through the requirement for comprehensive GHS testing in the regulation concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH)[[1]](#footnote-1), which had resulted in the drastic change of the transport classification from Class 9, UN 3077 ENVIRONMENTALLY HAZARDOUS SOLID, N.O.S. packing group (PG) III, to Class 6.1 TOXIC SOLID, BY INHALATION, Category 1, and PG I for which there was currently no UN number.This presented a serious challenge as thousands of tonnes of cobalt dihydroxide in various forms have been transported safely over the past forty years as UN 3077 ENVIRONMENTALLY HAZARDOUS SOLID, N.O.S. (contains cobalt dihydroxide) Class 9, in flexible IBCs of PG III. The cobalt dihydroxide ranged from crude material from the mines in Africa to refined material in Europe and other parts of the developed world, by multi-modal means in flexible IBCs, with no recorded accidents, incidents or health issues. A new UN number assigning flexible IBCs, with an appropriate packing instruction and special conditions was requested, as flexible IBCs had not previously been assigned to PG I.The issue was further discussed at the 55th session by a lunchtime working group resulting in INF.19 being presented at the 56th session and discussed at a further lunchtime working group. While some aspects of the proposals were agreed by the group, some aspects remained to be resolved. An intersessional correspondence group was formed to progress discussion and present a formal proposal to the fifty-seventh session of the Sub-Committee for approval.The proposal in the current paper takes into consideration the work of the intersessional correspondence groupsNotes from a teleconference of the intersessional correspondence group held on 4 March 2020 (including comments provided by Australia) are contained in [UN/SCETDG/57/INF.5](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-57-INF03e.docx) |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/24****Amendments to P621**(Belgium)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-24e.docx) | Packing instruction P621 applies to UN 3291 CLINICAL WASTE, UNSPECIFIED, N.O.S or (BIO)MEDICAL WASTE, N.O.S or REGULATED MEDICAL WASTE, N.O.S. This packing instruction authorizes the use of packagings conforming to the packing group II performance level for solids provided there is sufficient absorbent material to absorb the entire amount of liquid present and the packaging is capable of retaining liquids. Most of the medical waste packagings have openings with a diameter exceeding 7 cm and are therefore, by definition, of the removable head type e.g. 3H2. Some smaller medical waste packagings, such as little needle containers, may however have openings with a diameter not exceeding 7 cm. They are, by definition, of the non-removable head type e.g. 3H1. Bearing in mind that the construction and testing requirements of non-removable head type packagings are at least equivalent to the construction and testing requirements of the removable head type packagings, it is assumed that the non-removable head type packagings offer at least an equivalent safety level for the transport of UN 3291.Currently, packing instruction P621 does not allow the use of packagings with a non-removable head. It is therefore proposed to add in P621 the non-removable head type packagings.Details of the proposed packaging types to be added to P621 are contained in the paper |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/31****Amendment to classification of toxins extracted from living sources**(China)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-31e.docx) | Toxins extracted from living sources should be classified as **UN 3172**, **Toxins, extracted from living sources, liquid, n.o.s.** or **UN 3462**, **Toxins, extracted from living sources, solid, n.o.s.** in UN Model Regulations (21st edition).The name and description of **UN 3172** was “Toxins, extracted from living sources, liquid, n.o.s. **and** Toxins, extracted from living sources, solid, n.o.s.” in UN Model Regulations (12th edition).In December 2001, during the discussion of the informal document INF.17 (20th session), it was agreed that separate entries should be created for the solid and the solution. In 2002, **UN 3462 TOXINS, EXTRACTED FROM LIVING SOURCES, SOLID, N.O.S.** was added to twelfth revised edition of the UN Model Regulations.Although the introductory notes of Chapter 2.6 had been amended many times, the provisions of toxins assignment to **UN 3172** were not changed. **UN 3462** has not been mentioned.Picrotoxin, a poisonous bitter crystalline stimulant and convulsive substance obtained from the berry of a south-east Asian vine, has been assigned to UN 3172 or UN 3462 in the Dangerous Goods List in ICAO *Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air*. **Proposal**Add **UN 3462** at the end of introductory Note 2 under the heading of Chapter 2.6 as follows:*“****NOTE 2:*** *Toxins from plant, animal or bacterial sources which do not contain any infectious substances or toxins that are contained in substances which are not infectious substances, shall be considered for classification in Division 6.1 and assignment to UN 3172 or UN 3462.”* |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/32****Amendments to excepted quantities of UN 3208**(China)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-32e.docx) | **UN 3208, Metallic substance, water-reactive, n.o.s.** was assigned to code E0 for packing group II in column 7b of the Dangerous Goods List in UN *Model Regulations* (21st edition). **UN 1409**, **UN 2813**, **UN 3148**, **UN 3395**, and **UN 3398,** similar to **UN 3208**, were assigned to code E2 for packing group II**UN 3208** was assigned to code E2 for packing group II in the Dangerous Goods List in ICAO *Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air*.**Proposal**China proposes to replace “E0” with “E2” in column 7b of the packing group II of **UN 3208** in the Dangerous Goods List in Chapter 3.2 of the UN Model Regulations. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/49****Proposal to amend Special Provision XXX as adopted at the 56th session based on informal document INF.53**(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-49e.docx)56th Session – [ST/SG/AC.10/2019/42](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-42e.docx) and [INF.53](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF53e.docx) | At the fifty-sixth meeting of the Sub-Committee, the expert from Germany introduced paper ST/SG/AC.10/2019/42 on the transport of transformers with gas cylinders. Since this involved articles containing dangerous goods of class 2, an entry that had been developed by the experts from the United Kingdom, in a way that was not fully in line with our intentions presented in informal document INF.42. One of the arguments made by the expert from Germany during the debate was for flexibility in the interpretation of ‘articles containing’ as the articles in this instance did not contain the gas. Despite intervention by the United Kingdom INF.53 was adopted. However, the Chair of the Sub-Committee, possibly recognising that delegates had not had time to consult their industries, reminded the session that any delegation may bring further proposals or amendments to future sessions.On return home the United Kingdom undertook some research into the transport of transformers with attached gas bottles. The paper presents a summary of the findings from this research and analysis of the new special provision as it was adopted. As a result, the UK makes the following proposal.**Proposals**It is the view of the United Kingdom that new special provision XXX introduced unnecessary interference into an area that has successfully operated without incident for many years. However, the United Kingdom recognises that the expert from Germany had identified a potential issue.**Proposal 1**In new special provision XXX delete the adopted text and replace with:“Large and robust articles with attached gas cylinders supplying the gas during transport for conditioning purposes are not subject to these provisions unless they are transported in closed containers.Closed transport units without ventilation shall be marked in accordance with 5.5.3.6.”If the Sub-Committee are not prepared to accept this proposal, an alternative text is proposed as follows:**Proposal 2**In new special provision XXX replace the adopted text by:“Large and robust articles up to 3 tonnes with attached gas cylinders supplying the gas during transport for conditioning purposes may be transported subject to the following conditions:(a) Only gases of division 2.2 are used;(b) The contained pressure in the article does not exceed 0.2 bar (200 kPa);(c) Where carriage is in unventilated closed containers and asphyxiant gas is used the container shall be marked in accordance with 5.5.3.6.” |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/50****Updating standard reference**(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-50e.docx) | The expert from the United Kingdom has been advised by the secretary of the ISO Working Group on Transport Packages for Dangerous Goods (ISO/TC 122/SC3/WG8) that standard ISO 16106 has been revised and reissued.There are four references to standard ISO 16106 in the Model Regulations and the expert from the United Kingdom invites the Sub-Committee to consider the following amendment to the note after each of these paragraphs:6.1.1.4;6.3.2.2;6.5.4.1; and6.6.1.2.In each case, after the reference to ISO 16106, replace “2006” by “2020”. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/52****Proposed amendment to packing instruction LP903**(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-52e.docx) | The United Kingdom proposes a modification to Large Packing Instruction LP903 to allow multiple batteries or pieces of equipment subject to certain packing conditions.The expert from the United Kingdom believes that this restriction of a single battery in the large packaging came from a fear that large packaging would be used as jumble packs for large numbers of small batteries and cells. However, from a package testing and performance viewpoint the restriction runs counter to the philosophy and principles of UN testing and approval.In addition the expert from the United Kingdom also notes that no such numeric restriction applies in the reciprocal packaging instruction P903 (up to 400 kg net mass) and that for batteries over 12 kg with an impact resistant outer casing under P903 (2) there is no limit on either the number of batteries or the size of the packaging when used.A copy of the amended wording for LP903 can be found in the paper. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/54****Special Provision for UN 1013, Carbon Dioxide**Transmitted by the Council On Safe Transportation of Hazardous Articles (COSTHA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-54e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/62](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-62e.docx) | During the fifty-sixth session COSTHA submitted ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/62 proposing to incorporate a new special provision based on SP 653 from the ADR into the UN Model Regulations. The proposal received comments from the experts from Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States of America. In the paper COSTHA pointed out that Canada and the United States of America have issued approvals to authorize the alternative marking in ADR SP 653 for Carbon Dioxide (CO2), UN 1013 and that the Israeli competent authority has authorized the alternative marking on packages containing CO2 cylinders which were offered for transport by sea when in cargo transport units that are placarded and marked according to the International Maritime Dangerous Goods (IMDG) Code. Since submission of the previous proposal the United States of America has granted another approval to a separate company.This paper provides responses to the comments received at the 56th session and proposes that SP 653 be added for UN 1013.Full details of the proposal along with the background to the history of Special Provision 653 in the ADR/RID/ADN can be found in the paper. |  |  |
| [**UN/SCETDG/57/INF.6**](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-57-INF06e.docx)**New entry for aerosol generating, fire suppression devices**Transmitted by the Council on Safe Transportation of Hazardous Articles (COSTHA)55th Session – [INF. 48](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-55-INF48e.docx) | This paper follows on from previous discussions relating to the classification of aerosol generating fire suppression devices. The issue was first raised during the 55th session, with further discussion held during the 56th session. Based on feedback received during those discussion, COSTHA are proposing that a new entry be added in the Dangerous Goods List as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UN No.** | **Name and description** | **Class or division** | **Subsidiary hazard** | **UN packing group** | **Special** **provisions** | **Limited and excepted quantities** | **Packagings** **and IBCs** |
| **Packing instruction** | **Special packing provisions** |
| 35XX | Fire Suppression Dispersing Devices | 9 |  |  | XYZ | 0 | EO | P003 |  |

Refer to the paper for the full details of the proposal, including wording for proposed new special provision XYZ and consequential amendments to special provision 280 |  |  |
| **4. Electric Storage Systems** |
| **(a) Testing of lithium batteries**  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/29****Applicability of packing instruction LP906, and clarification of packing instruction P911**Transmitted by the European Association for Advanced Rechargeable Batteries (RECHARGE), International Organisation of Motor Vehicle Manufacturers (OICA), PRBA – The Rechargeable Battery Association and the Council on Safe Transportation of Hazardous Articles (COSTHA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-29e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/49](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-49e.docx) and [INF.47](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF47e.docx) 55th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/23](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-23e.docx) and [INF.51](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-55-INF51e.docx)  | This paper follows on from discussions as the 55th and 56th sessions. During discussion of at previous sessions, proposals were made to clarify that the hazards in case of transport of multiple batteries in the LP906 could be controlled and verified during the packaging verification test, as specified by the competent authority.Some remaining concerns were expressed, mainly focusing on the issue of potential misuse of the packaging, in the case it would be allowed for multiple batteries. The potential misuse of the packaging would therefore increase the potential risk during transport, and the transport of multiple batteries may increase the hazard in transport. The opinion that packaging instructions would be useful was also expressed.This paper provides responses to the questions raised during previous sessions and proposed additional text to clarify the correct usage of the packaging.**Proposal 1 (LP906)**Amend the third sentence of LP906 to read: “For ~~a single~~ batter~~y~~ies and items of equipment containing batteries ~~contained in a single item of equipment~~:”Modify the second paragraph of the point 2 of LP906:“A verification report shall be made available on request. As minimum requirement, the batteries name, the batteries number, the mass, type, energy content of the batteries, the large packaging identification and the test data according to the verification method as specified by the competent authority shall be listed in the verification report.”Add a point 4 in LP906“The instructions for the usage conditions of the package shall be made available to the shipment stakeholders. It shall include at least the identification of the batteries and items of equipment that may be contained inside the packaging, their maximum number and energy, as well as the configuration inside the package, including the separations and protections used during the performance verification test.”Add a paragraph (i) into the note **a** of LP906 as follows:“*(i)* *In the case of multiple batteries and multiple items of equipment containing batteries, additional requirements such as the maximum number of batteries and items of equipment, the total maximum energy content, and the configuration inside the package, including separations and protections of the parts, shall be considered.*”**Proposal 2**15. Add a paragraph (i) into the note **a** of P911, as follows:**“***(i) In the case of multiple batteries and multiple items of equipment containing batteries, additional requirements such as the maximum number of batteries and items of equipment, the total maximum energy content, and the configuration inside the package, including separations and protections of the parts, shall be considered*.” |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/47****Lithium Battery Test Summary**Transmitted by the Medical Device Battery Transport Council (MDBTC), Dangerous Goods Advisory Council (DGAC), PRBA – The Rechargeable Battery Association, Council on the Safe Transport of Hazardous Articles (COSTHA), European Association for Advanced Rechargeable Batteries (RECHARGE), Sporting Arms & Ammunition Manufacturers’ Institute (SAAMI), and Dangerous Goods Trainer Association (DGTA)\*[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-47e.docx) | Since the adoption of the requirement in 2.9.4 (g) of the Model Regulations to require cell and battery manufacturers and downstream distributors to make available the Test Summary (TS) as specified in the Manual of Tests and Criteria, Part III, sub-section 38.3, paragraph 38.3.5, the industry has been working to implement appropriate systems for complying with the new requirement. This paper details the challenges members of the various organizations submitting this paper have experienced in complying with the TS requirements. The paper proposes amendments to the TS requirements that will help facilitate compliance with the original intent of the TS.**Proposal**Amend 2.9.4 (g) as follows:(a) Add an exception for button cell batteries installed in equipment and change the date for the applicable test summary date from 30 June 2003 to 1 January 2019 so that it reads:  “Except for button cell batteries installed in equipment (including circuit boards), manufacturers and subsequent distributors of cells or batteries manufactured after 1 January 2019 shall make available the test summary as specified in the Manual of Tests and Criteria Part III, sub-section 38.3, paragraph 38.3.5.”(b) Add the following note to explain the meaning of “make available”:“**Note**: These regulations do not require consignors to provide a test summary with each consignment. The term “make available” means providing the test summary to dangerous goods enforcement authorities or a person in the manufacturer’s or subsequent distributor’s supply chain to ensure compliance with the UN38.3 test requirements. The options for making the test summary available include, but are not limited to, publishing it to a public website, providing it upon request in a reasonable amount of time, or attaching it to a transport document. The test summary only needs to be made available to authorities and persons that have a legitimate need for it to facilitate compliance with the applicable transport regulations. Manufacturers are not required to make available a test summary if they have reason to believe their battery or product has been refurbished or repaired and no longer reflects the battery design covered by their original test summary.”In 38.3.5 of the UN Manual of Tests and Criteria:(a) Amend paragraph (i) in the test summary to read: “An indication that the cells or batteries were tested to the Manual of Tests and Criteria, Revision 3, Amendment 1 or a subsequent revision.”(b) Remove paragraph (j) in the test summary, which mandates a signature and title. |  |  |
| **(b) Hazard-based system for classification of lithium batteries** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item** |  |  |  |
| **(c) Transport provisions** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/40****Revision to Chapter 2.9.4 to Separate the Quality Management System from Classification Requirements**Transmitted by the International Air Transport Association (IATA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-40e.docx)56th Session – [INF.20](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF20e.docx) | At the fifty-sixth session IATA submitted an informal document (INF.20) that sought discussion on the need for consignors of lithium cells or batteries (UN Nos. 3090, 3091, 3480 or 3481) that are not the manufacturer of the cells or batteries to have evidence of the manufacturer’s quality management programme.In an informal discussion during a coffee-break at the fifty-sixth session there was consensus among the experts that there is no requirement for the manufacturer to provide evidence of a quality management programme to any other party than the competent authority.Based on that informal discussion, this document proposes a slight restructure of 2.9.4 to separate the requirement that lithium cells and batteries shall be manufactured under a quality management programme from the provisions applicable to classification of lithium cells and batteries to which the consignors are subject when offering the cells or batteries for transport.Full details of the proposed wording for a restructured **2.9.4 Lithium batteries** is contained in the paper. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/46****Use of packagings not required to meet 4.1.1.3 and exceeding 400 kg net mass for the transport of lithium batteries**Transmitted by the PRBA – The Rechargeable Battery Association and The Advanced Rechargeable & Lithium Batteries Association (RECHARGE)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-46e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/34](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-34e.docx) and informal document [INF.17](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF17e.docx) | This paper follows on from discussions at the 55th and 56th sessions and seeks to address comments received. PRBA expressed that some competent authorities, freight forwarders, vessel operators, and other entities in the logistics chain do not appear to fully understand that if the net mass of a packaging as authorized under P903 (2) or (4) exceeds the mass limit generally prescribed in Chapter 6.1, the batteries or equipment do not need to be packaged in large packagings in accordance with LP903.In this document, PRBA proposes amendments to the Model Regulations to better clarify this point by the addition of a note that the packagings under P903 (2) and (4) may exceed 400 kg net mass and provides for changes in other packing instructions that have similar language as specified in P903.PRBA have previously explained that the Guiding Principles for the nineteenth revised edition of the Model Regulations specifically address this issue. **Proposals**In 4.1.3.3, add a new last sentence to read (new text is underlined):“4.1.3.3 Each packing instruction shows, where applicable, the acceptable single and combination packagings. For combination packagings, the acceptable outer packagings, inner packagings and when applicable the maximum quantity permitted in each inner or outer packaging, are shown. Maximum net mass and maximum capacity are as defined in 1.2.1. Where packagings which need not meet the requirements of 4.1.1.3 (e.g., crates, pallets, etc.) are authorized in a “P” packing instruction, these packages are not subject to the mass or volume limits generally applicable to packagings conforming to the requirements of Chapter 6.1, unless otherwise indicated in the relevant packing instruction.”.In packing instruction P903, add a new note following paragraph (4) to read:*“****NOTE:*** *The packagings authorized in paragraphs (2) and (4) may exceed a net mass of 400 kg (see 4.1.3.3).”*Amend the following packing instructions by adding a note similar to the one provided in paragraph 7 above (applicable to the packing instruction as a whole, or to the indicated paragraph(s) or special packing provision which authorize packagings not subject to the requirements of 4.1.1.3):P003 (PP32);P004 (2) and (3);P005;P006 (2);P130 (PP67);P144 (PP47);P408 (2);P801 (1) and (2);P903 (2) and (4);P905; P906 (2)(b) and last paragraph;P907;P909 (3) and (4); andP910 (3). |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/48****Phone Number on Lithium Battery Mark**Transmitted by PRBA – The Rechargeable Battery Association and RECHARGE the Advanced Rechargeable & Lithium Batteries Association[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-48e.docx)56th Session – [INF.30](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF30e.docx) | Questions have been raised by members of this Sub-Committee and, in particular, ICAO on the intended use of the phone number, whether it needs to be a 24/7 emergency response phone number, and how it is being implemented by shippers and carriers. During the 56th session, there was a general consensus that, based on years of transport experience, the phone number adds little practical value and that removing the phone number would not reduce the effectiveness of the mark. This paper therefore proposes to remove the phone number requirement from the lithium battery mark in 5.2.1.9.2 and Figure 5.2.5 but to still authorize the use of the phone number until 31 December 2026 to allow shippers the opportunity to exhaust their current inventory of marks and packages containing the marks.**Proposal**In 5.2.1.9 amend Figure 5.2.5 as follows:- Remove the two asterisks (\*\*) on the lithium battery mark;- Remove note *\*\* Place for telephone number for additional information* that is referenced immediately below the lithium battery mark.Amend 5.2.1.9.2 by adding sentence at end of the paragraph (new text is underlined):“The mark shall indicate the UN number, preceded by the letter “UN”, i.e. “UN 3090” for lithium metal cells or batteries or “UN 3480” for lithium ion cells or batteries. Where the lithium cells or batteries are contained in, or packed with, equipment the UN number, preceded by the letters “UN”, i.e. “UN 3091” or “UN 3481” as appropriate shall be indicated. Where a package contains lithium cells or batteries assigned to different UN numbers, all applicable UN numbers shall be indicated on one or more marks. A telephone number is authorized for use on the mark, where indicated in Figure 5.2.5 in the twenty-first revised edition of the Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, Model Regulations, until 31 December 2026.” |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/56****Inner packagings for lithium cells and batteries – Clarification of requirements in Packing Instruction P903**(United States of America)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-56e.docx) | Recent stakeholder outreach initiatives have indicated varying interpretations in the application of P903 as it relates to inner packaging and protection of lithium cells and batteries. Packing instruction P903 indicates the need for cells and batteries to be protected from short circuits and damage caused by the movement or placement of the cells or batteries within the packaging. However, there are no requirements in packing instruction P903 for the use of inner packagings, or other indication of how the cells or batteries are intended to be protected from short circuits. A clear indication of appropriate inner packaging or other protection is critical to ensure safety related to handling in transport.This paper proposes an amendment to P903 to clarify the existing provisions in packing instruction P903, it does not introduce new packaging requirements. **Proposal**In packing instruction P903, amend paragraph (1) as follows (new text is underlined):“(1) For cells and batteries:Drums (1A2, 1B2, 1N2, 1H2, 1D, 1G);Boxes (4A, 4B, 4N, 4C1, 4C2, 4D, 4F, 4G, 4H1, 4H2);Jerricans (3A2, 3B2, 3H2).Cells or batteries shall be packed in packagings so that the cells or batteries are protected against damage that may be caused by the movement or placement of the cells or batteries within the packaging. Cells or batteries shall be placed in inner packagings that completely enclose the cells or batteries (e.g. poly bags, shrink wrap, trays, fibreboard dividers, etc.) and be separated from contact with equipment, other devices, and conductive material.Packagings shall conform to the packing group II performance level.” |  |  |
| **(d) Damaged or defective lithium batteries** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item** |  |  |  |
| **(e) Sodium-ion batteries** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/45****Sodium-ion batteries – Creation of a dedicated UN number and related special provisions**(France and United Kingdom)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-45e.docx)55th Session – [INF.38](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-55-INF38e.docx) | At the fifty-fifth session, France, with the support of the United Kingdom, presented an informal document (INF.38) to suggest a new approach concerning sodium-ion batteries. The Sub-Committee agreed to follow the approach presented in the paper.It was agreed that France and the United Kingdom would work together and with other concerned parties make a detailed proposal for the transport of Na-ion batteries.Sodium-ion batteries exhibit a wide range of energy densities corresponding to different applications. Batteries designed with low energy densities are for stationary use purposes whereas sodium-ion batteries with higher densities can be used in mobile products such as electric vehicles and portable electronics. Different energy densities may result in different risks in transport.For reference purposes, certain lithium-ion battery chemistries may have an energy density in the range 190 Wh/kg to 250 Wh/kg. At present sodium-ion batteries currently available are reported to have energy densities from 22 Wh/kg to 150 Wh/kg. Understandably the batteries on either end of the range may have widely different intrinsic hazards and due to the different degree of hazard posed, some presenting a lower degree of risk may be subject to a simplified requirement.To take this factor into account, proposal 5 contains a special provision to exempt sodium-ion batteries that have a low energy density even from testing. However, it is felt that more supporting data would be needed to decide on this principle, as well as on the threshold, in terms of energy density, that would be relevant. Therefore, this proposal is still considered as optional in the context of this document.In general, the proposals contained in this document shall be considered as a frame to start discussion for this item. They are a first draft and may be completed with informal documents, with supporting data and possible improvements as suitable.Refer to the paper for full details of the proposals. |  |  |
| **(f) Miscellaneous** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item.** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **5. Transport of gases** |
| **(a) Global recognition of UN and non-UN pressure receptacles** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item.** |  |  |  |
| **(b) Miscellaneous** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/8****Update of LC50 values in P200**Transmitted by the European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-08e.docx) | Following its last plenary meeting on 3 October 2019, ISO/TC58/SC2 asked its working group 7 (WG7) to prepare a paper by 1 February 2020 at the latest with the rationale to agree, as an industry, the correct values for LC50 for some gases to be proposed for the Model Regulations.In doing so, WG7 identified that the LC50 values given in the twenty first revision of the Model Regulations and in ISO 10298:2018 Gas cylinders – Gases and gas mixtures – Determination of toxicity for the selection of valve outlets (which was developed by ISO/TC58/SC2/WG7) were not aligned for the following gases: Ammonia, anhydrous; Boron Trifluoride; Tungsten Hexafluoride; Phosphorous Pentafluoride; Hydrogen Fluoride, anhydrous.The paper proposes the following amendments:**Proposal** In Table 2 of P200 in 4.1.1.4, for the UN numbers below, replace the values under the heading “LC50 in ml/m3”, with those in 10298:2018, as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UN No.** | **Proper Shipping Name** | **Current LC50 in ml/m3 in P200 (Rev. 21)** | **Replace with** |
| 1005 | AMMONIA, ANHYDROUS | 4000 | 7338 |
| 1008 | BORON TRIFLUORIDE | 387 | 864 |
| 2196 | TUNGSTEN HEXAFLUORIDE | 160 | 218 |
| 2198 | PHOSPHORUS PENTAFLUORIDE | 190 | 261 |
| 1052 | HYDROGEN FLUORIDE, ANHYDROUS | 966 | 1307 |

The rationale and justification for the proposed LC50 values are contained in the paper |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/13****Updated ISO standards in Class 2**Transmitted by the International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-13e.docx) | The paper proposes amendments concerning one new standard, eight revised standards and three amended standards, being:ISO 9809-1:2019, Gas cylinders – Design, construction and testing of refillable seamless steel gas cylinders and tubes – Part 1: Quenched and tempered steel cylinders and tubes with tensile strength less than 1 100 MPaISO 9809-2:2019, Gas cylinders – Design, construction and testing of refillable seamless steel gas cylinders and tubes – Part 2: Quenched and tempered steel cylinders and tubes with tensile strength greater than or equal to 1 100 MPaISO 9809-3:2019, Gas cylinders – Design, construction and testing of refillable seamless steel gas cylinders and tubes – Part 3: Normalized steel cylinders and tubesISO 21029-1:2018 + A1:2019, Cryogenic vessels – Transportable vacuum insulated vessels of not more than 1 000 litres volume – Part 1: design, fabrication, inspection and testsISO 16111:2018, Transportable gas storage devices – Hydrogen absorbed in reversible metal hydrideISO 10961:2019, Gas cylinders – Cylinder bundles – Design, manufacture, testing and inspectionISO 11513:2019, Gas cylinders – Refillable welded steel cylinders containing materials for sub-atmospheric gas packaging (excluding acetylene) – Design, construction, testing, use and periodic inspectionISO 11118:2015 +A1:2019, Gas cylinders - Non-refillable metallic gas cylinders - Specification and test methodsISO 11117:2019, Gas cylinders – Valve protection caps and guards – Design, construction and testsISO 17871:2015 +A1:2018, Gas cylinders – Quick-release cylinder valves – Specification and type testingISO 10462:2013 + A1:2019, Gas cylinders – Acetylene cylinders – Periodic inspection and maintenanceISO 23088:2020, Gas cylinders – Periodic inspection and testing of welded steel pressure drums — Capacities up to 1 000 l.A full list of the proposed amendments is contained in the paper. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/19****Gas mixtures containing fluorine (UN 1045)**(Germany)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-19e.docx) | Germany has identified that the UN Model Regulations do not contain any guidance on the maximum allowable working pressure and minimum test pressure for mixtures containing fluorine and gases that are inert towards fluorine, such as nitrogen.Fluorine is a strongly oxidizing gas requiring specific safety measures. It reacts spontaneously with almost all organic materials and many metals. Thus, steel pressure receptacles, for example, have to be passivated before they are filled. Due to the strong chemical reactivity of fluorine, the UN Model Regulations (P200) limit the maximum allowable working pressure for gas cylinders to 30 bar. In addition, a minimum test pressure of 200 bar is required. Mixtures of fluorine and inert gases are less reactive towards materials than pure fluorine. For this reason, the maximum allowable working pressure may exceed 30 bar.The paper makes a number of proposals for how various fluorine mixtures should be treated in line with the procedure set out in EIGA Code of Practice 140/18.Full details of the proposal are contained in the paper. |  |  |
| **6. Miscellaneous proposals for amendments to the Model Regulations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods**  |
| **(a) Marking and labelling** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item.** |  |  |  |
| **(b) Packagings** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/28****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**Belgium and Germany[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-28e.docx)56th Session - ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/5 and INF.13 | At the 56th Session, the Sub-Committee adopted an amendment to 6.5.1.1.2. The amended text, regarding alternative service equipment, arrangements and methods of inspection and testing of IBCs 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.”Belgium and Germany have proposed that 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, and should also be considered for the definitions in Chapter 1.2 (“Repaired IBC”, “Reused packaging” and “Reused large packaging”) and to paragraph 4.1.1.9Refer to the paper for a full list of the proposed amendments. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/35****Scope of 4G packaging and the translation of the Chinese version**(China)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-35e.docx) | This paper identifies potential inconsistencies in the definition of ‘G’ type packagings due to language and invites the sub-committee to clarify whether “fibreboard” in the English version and “carton” in the French version mean the same material. The paper also ask the sub-committee to clarify whether the term "Fibreboard" in 4G in the Model Regulations contains the "corrugated fibreboard" described in BS 1133 and whether the fibreboard (without corrugations) in 6.1.4.7.1 is a solid fibreboard.In the recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods Model Regulations, codes which consisted of Arabic number and a capital letter are used for designating types of UN packaging. In 6.1.2.6 that letter “G” indicates the packaging material “Fibreboard”. In 6.1.4.12 on the packaging 4G “Fibreboard boxes”, it is stated that “strong and good quality solid or double –faced corrugated fibreboard (single or multiwall) shall be used, appropriate to the capacity of the box and to its intended use” (see 6.1.4.12). However, in 6.1.4.7 which explains that “1G” means “Fibre drums”, the statement can be found that “The body of the drum shall consist of multiple plies of heavy paper or fibreboard (without corrugations) firmly glued or laminated together”. It seems that, in these two paragraphs, the letter “G” does not indicate the same packaging material. However, in the French version, the letter “G” indicates the packaging material “carton” and this word is used in 1G and 4G. According to the Chinese standard system on packaging materials, the two terms, “fibreboard” and “corrugated fibreboard” refer to two different packaging materials.  |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/36****Supplement for drop orientations in the drop test of box packaging**(China)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-36e.docx) | This paper discusses China’s experience during drop tests that the manufacturing junction is one of the weakest parts of the package, which was prone to breakage, and should be paid attention to during testing. For example, most of the box-type packaging containers have six surfaces and eight corners. When the drop test project was actually carried out, it was found that if the corner or the side connected to the junction of the box-type container was selected for the drop position, the junction would tend to crack more commonly during the drop.In the “Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods Model Regulations - 6.1.5.3.1", there is no mention that the manufacturing junction should be chosen during the drops. To address this, China proposes to clarify in 6.1.5.3.1 that, during the drop test, attention should be paid to the manufacturing junction. Two options are given below (new text is underlined):**Option 1:***“6.1.5.3.1 Number of test samples (per design type and manufacturer) and drop orientation*For other than flat drops the centre of gravity shall be vertically over the point of impact.Where more than one orientation is possible for a given drop test, the orientation most likely to result in failure of the packaging shall be used (e.g. the manufacturing junction is one of the weakest parts of the packaging and needs attention during testing).……”**Option 2:***“6.1.5.3.1 Number of test samples (per design type and manufacturer) and drop orientation*For other than flat drops the centre of gravity shall be vertically over the point of impact. Where more than one orientation is possible for a given drop test, the orientation most likely to result in failure of the packaging shall be used.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Packaging | No. of test samples | Drop orientation |
| …… |  |  |
| Boxes of natural wood Plywood boxes Reconstituted wood boxes Fibreboard boxes Plastics boxes Steel or aluminum boxes Composite packagings which are in the shape of a box  | Five(one for each drop) | First drop: flat on the bottomSecond drop: flat on the topThird drop: flat on the long sideFourth drop: flat on the short sideFifth drop: on a corner*Note: The manufacturing junction is one of the weakest parts of the box, which needs attention when choosing the drop orientation.* |

 |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/37****Increase a water temperature adjustment factor for the hydraulic test**(China)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-37e.docx) | This paper maintains that as the ambient water temperature has significant influence on the internal pressure (hydraulic) test of plastic containers (such as 1H1, 3H1, 31HA1), under the rated constant pressure conditions (such as 250 kPa), test results will differ for containers of equivalent specifications due to different ambient water temperature test conditions (such as in summer).In the "Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods Model Regulations - 6.1.5", no general requirements for hydraulic test water temperature and the adjustment factor of test pressure and water temperature are specified. Containers of the equivalent specifications might have different test results under different water temperature test conditions.ISO 16495 Packaging — Transport packaging for dangerous goods — Test methods specifically define the water temperature adjustment factors. It is also defined in ISO 16467 Packaging -Transport packages for dangerous goods -Test methods for IBCs. Tables containing the water temperature adjustment factors in ISO 16495 and ISO 16467 are contained in the paper.**Proposal**It is proposed to add the water temperature adjustment factor for hydraulic tests of plastic packaging and plastics IBCs in the Model Regulations as below:Insert new 6.1.5.5.5 to read:“6.1.5.5.5 When the water temperature for environmental test of plastic containers is greater than or equal to 10 °C, the test pressure used shall be adjusted according to the water temperature adjustment factors specified in ISO 16495 Packaging - Transport packaging for dangerous goods - Test methods.”Renumber 6.1.5.5.5, 6.1.5.5.6, 6.1.5.5.7 as 6.1.5.5.6, 6.1.5.5.7, 6.1.5.5.8 respectively.Add new 6.5.6.8.4.3 to read:“6.5.6.8.4.3 When the ambient water temperature for testing of plastic IBCs are greater than or equal to 10 °C, the test pressure used shall be adjusted according to the water temperature adjustment factors specified in ISO 16467 Packaging - Transport packages for dangerous goods - Test methods for IBCs.” |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/42****Definition of recycled plastics material**Transmitted by the experts from International Confederation of Plastics Packaging Manufacturers (ICPP) and the International Confederation of Container Reconditioners (ICCR)\*[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-42e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/51](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-51e.docx) and [INF.16](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF16e.docx) | This paper follows on from discussion at the 56th session on how the definition of recycled plastics material in Chapter 1.2 of the Model Regulations could be modified to address current practise.During that meeting most experts agreed that a minimum set of provisions is necessary to ensure a harmonized approach to quality assurance. This has been considered in the proposal contained in the current paper.The paper notes that the definition of recycled plastic material, as set out in 1.2.1, is from the 1990s when the requirements were understandably conservative. In 2007, the definition was supplemented by the note, which provides more detailed information on the handling of recycled material. The text has not been modified in any other aspects and should therefore be brought into line with the current procedures.**Proposal**Modify the current wording of UN Model Regulation to read as follows (stricken out text is deleted):**“1.2.1 Definitions***Recycled plastics* material means material recovered from used industrial packagings that has been cleaned and prepared for processing into new packagings. The specific properties of the recycled material used for production of new packagings shall be assured and documented regularly as part of a quality assurance programme recognized by the competent authority. The quality assurance programme shall include a record of proper pre-sorting and verification that each batch of recycled plastics material has the proper melt flow rate, density, and tensile yield strength, consistent with that of the design type manufactured from such recycled material. This necessarily includes knowledge about the packaging material from which the recycled plastics have been derived, as well as awareness of the prior contents of those packagings if those prior contents might reduce the capability of new packagings produced using that material. ~~In addition, the packaging manufacturer's quality assurance programme under 6.1.1.4 shall include performance of the mechanical design type test in 6.1.5 on packagings manufactured from each batch of recycled plastics material. In this testing, stacking performance may be verified by appropriate dynamic compression testing rather than static load testing~~.***NOTE:*** *ISO 16103:2005 “Packaging – Transport packages for dangerous goods – Recycled plastics material”, provides additional guidance on procedures to be followed in approving the use of recycled plastics material.”* |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/44****Extending the use of plastic recycled materials to all plastic packagings, plastic IBCs and plastic Large Packagings**(Belgium)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-44e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/51](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-51e.docx) | This paper follows on from amendments that were adopted at the 56th Session to clarify that the use of recycled plastics material for rigid plastic IBCs and for composite IBCs with plastic inner receptacle is not prohibited.The paper contends that considering that packagings produced from recycled plastics material shall, in accordance with 6.1.3.6, be marked with the word “REC”, the same should apply for IBCs produced from recycled plastics material. The paper contains 6 proposals to amend 6.5.2.1.2.Refer to the paper for full details of the proposals. |  |  |
| [**UN/SCETDG/57/INF.7**](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-57-INF07e.docx)**Diameter of cylindrical steel rod during puncture test according to 6.3.5.4**(Germany) | Paragraphs 6.3.5.4.1 and 6.3.5.4.2 of the UN MR specify the diameter of the cylindrical rod used during puncture tests according to 6.3.5.4. In both 6.3.5.4.1 and 6.3.5.4.2, the diameter is a fixed value without any tolerances defined. This leads to the situation that a cylindrical steel rod with a slightly different diameter should not be accepted for puncture testing.Contrary to the definition of the diameter, the mass of the steel rod is defined as a minimum value in 6.3.5.4.1 and the radius of the edges of the upper end is defined as a maximum value in 6.3.5.4.1 and 6.3.5.4.2.This paper proposes amendments to paragraphs 6.3.5.4.1 and 6.3.5.4.2 of the Regulations and to define the diameter as a maximum value, bearing in mind that the pressure during impact is greater if the diameter is smaller.Refer to the paper for full details of the proposed amendments. |  |  |
| **6(c) Fibre-reinforced plastics (FRP) portable tanks**  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/57****Working group on fibre-reinforced plastics (FRP) portable tanks**Transmitted by the Chair of the working group[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-57e.docx) | This paper notes the work of the FRP working group and invites the Sub-Committee to review the proposed regulatory text in the annexes to the paper and provide comments or questions during the plenary session.Refer to the annexes to the paper for full details of the proposed amendments. |  |  |
| **6(d) Portable tanks (other than FRP)**  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/5****Impact testing of portable tanks and MEGCs: proposal to revise Section 41 of the Manual of Tests and Criteria**(Canada)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-05.docx) | Paragraph 41.3.4.5 of the Manual of Tests and Criteria states that “To satisfy the [longitudinal impact] test, the portable tank or MEGC shall show no leakage, permanent deformation or damage that would render it unsuitable for use, and shall be in conformity with the dimensional requirements regarding handling, securing and transfer from one means of transport to another.” Canada notes that these tests are primarily done outdoors to accommodate the length of track and the railway vehicles required for the test protocol. As such, the portable tank or MEGC being tested is exposed to the elements of weather and in adverse weather conditions such as rain or snow, it may be difficult to identify sources of leakage resulting from impact testing, as a container may be wet due to weather.Canada proposes to add a new requirement that the container must be completely dry immediately prior to beginning the impact test, and that during the test, the container must not be subjected to any adverse weather conditions that could hinder the assessment of container leakage by the facility and witnessing agency**Proposal**Add a new paragraph 41.1.3 to read as follows:“The portable tank or MEGC being subjected to the dynamic longitudinal impact test shall be completely dry prior to beginning the impact testing. If the facility or witnessing agency’s ability to identify potential sources of leakage is negatively impacted by adverse weather conditions that develop during testing, the impact testing shall be terminated. Impact testing shall only resume once the portable tank or MEGC is dry, and the adverse weather conditions have stopped.” |  |  |
| **6(e) Other miscellaneous proposals** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/11****Amendment to 5.4.1.5.12 – additional entries in the case of the application of special provisions**(Germany)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-11e.docx) | Germany has identified and inconsistency with the way additional information required by special provisions in the transport documentation is dealt with in the UNMR. To address this, Germany proposes to include additional provisions in Chapter 5.4 for specific UN numbers or specific special provisions, it should be included in the Model Regulations that all entries required by applied special provisions also have to be indicated in the transport document.To achieve this Germany proposes the following: Amend 5.4.1.5.12 as follows (deleted text is struck through):**“5.4.1.5.12 ~~Transport of UN Nos. 3528, 3529 and 3530~~ Additional entries in the case of the application of special provisions**For transport of UN Nos. 3528, 3529 and 3530, the transport document, when required according to special provision 363, shall contain the following additional statement “Transport in accordance with special provision 363” Where, in accordance with a special provision in Chapter 3.3, additional information is necessary, this additional information shall be included in the dangerous goods transport document.”. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/16****Transport of butylene**(Spain)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-16e.docx) | In recent years, Spain has been working on harmonizing the names of UN numbers, specifically for the Spanish language version. Additional attention has been paid to those cases where the name and description of the UN numbers is not the same in the Model Regulations as in RID/ADR, for all languages. During a Joint Meeting in 2019 where proposals resulting from Spain’s work were discussed, Spain were asked to submit a proposal to the Sub-Committee for an amendment relating to UN 1012, BUTYLENE to clearly distinguish it from UN 1055, ISOBUTYLENE.The paper provides the following two alternative options for consideration (new text added in **bold**) **Option 1**Amend the name and description in the Dangerous Goods List of Chapter 3.2 for UN 1012 to read (same name and description as currently in RID/ADR):“UN 1012 BUTYLENE**S** **MIXTURE or 1-BUTYLENE or cis-2-BUTYLENE or trans-2- BUTYLENE**”**Option 2**Include into the Dangerous Goods List of Chapter 3.2 for UN 1012 a new special provision with the following text:**SP XXX: This UN number covers transport of butylenes mixture, or 1-butylene or cis-2-butylene or trans-2- butylene**. **For transport of isobutylene, see UN 1055.****Consequential amendments**As a consequential amendment for Option 1, T50 and P200 should be amended by introducing the new name. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/26****Miscellaneous proposals for amendments to the Model Regulations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods**Submitted by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-26e.docx)56th Session - ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/58 | At its fifty-sixth session, the Sub-Committee supported in principle amendments to special provision 388 and 6.1.3.13 as contained in ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/58; these amendments were based on decisions taken by the ICAO Dangerous Goods Panel Working Group Meeting in April 2019 when reviewing amendments proposed to the *Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air* (Doc 9284) to harmonize with the 21st revised edition of the UN Model Regulations. The relevant amendments are contained in the proposals below. **Australia’s position was support****Proposal***Amend* special provision 388 (last sentence of the seventh paragraph) to read:“Lithium ion batteries or lithium metal batteries installed in a cargo transport unit and designed only to provide power external to the cargo transport unit shall be assigned to the entry UN 3536 LITHIUM BATTERIES INSTALLED IN CARGO TRANSPORT UNIT ~~lithium ion batteries or lithium metal batteries.~~”*Amend* paragraph 6.1.3.13 to read: “6.1.3.13 Where a packaging conforms to one or more than one tested packaging design type, including one or more than one tested IBC or large packaging design type, the packaging may bear more than one mark to indicate the relevant performance test requirements that have been met. ~~Where more than one mark appears on a packaging, the~~ The marks must appear in close proximity to one another and each mark must appear in its entirety.” |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/27****Information on salvage in the transport document when using packagings not approved as salvage packagings**(Germany)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-27e.docx)56th Session - ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/41 (**Australia’s position was support with additional comments from AMSA)** | During the 56th session, Germany submitted document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/41 concerning information on salvage in the transport document when using packagings not approved as salvage packagings. The proposal received comments from several experts and the expert from Germany agreed to submit a revised proposal.Taking into account the comments received from other experts and in order to clarify the provisions, Germany proposes that 5.4.1.5.3 should be split up into two sentences and amended accordingly to include references to 4.1.1.18 and 4.1.1.19.**Proposal**The expert from Germany therefore suggests amending 5.4.1.5.3 as follows (new text is underlined, deleted text is ~~struck through~~): “For dangerous goods transported in salvage packagings according to 4.1.1.18, including large salvage packagings ~~or salvage pressure receptacles~~, larger size packagings or large packagings of appropriate type and performance level to be used as a salvage packaging, the words **“SALVAGE PACKAGING”** ~~or~~ **~~“SALVAGE PRESSURE RECEPTACLE”~~** shall be included. For dangerous goods transported in salvage pressure receptacles according to 4.1.1.19, the words **“SALVAGE PRESSURE RECEPTACLE”** shall be included.” |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/38****Interpretation issue: Aromatic and flavouring, UN 1169 and UN 1197**(Spain)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-38e.docx) | This paper raises issues with the meaning of the words ‘flavouring’ and ‘aromatic when translated into other languages. The translation issue leads to confusion when trying to differentiate UN 1169 EXTRACTS, AROMATIC, LIQUID and UN 1197 EXTRACTS, FLAVOURING, LIQUIDThe paper contains the following conclusions and open questions for the sub-committee:**Conclusions and open questions**It seems that both entries are covering the same reality, as the definitions for both substances overlap. Transport conditions for both UN numbers are the same in all modal regulations, too.It would be important to learn how industry classifies these substances, if there is an overlap in between both UN numbers; chemical companies could also provide some very valuable input on these aspects.If no difference in between the use of both UN numbers exists, thought may be given to eliminate one entry; if there is a difference, the names in the French and Spanish versions should be modified. It would be appreciated if the different delegations and associations represented in the Sub-Committee could provide some further information on the use of these UN numbers. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/43****Increase of the maximum allowed internal pressure for aerosol dispensers**Transmitted by the European Aerosol Federation (FEA) and the Household and Commercial Products Association (HCPA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-43e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/55](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-55e.docx) | At the fifty-sixth session, FEA and HCPA introduced document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/55. There was support for the proposal in general with several comments.As a result of the comments received, FEA and HCPA propose the following modifications:* Placing the equivalent provisions in Chapter 6.2.4.
* Maintaining the general pressure limits as a global and multimodal safety net, but without linking design provisions for which reaching a global consensus would not be achievable.
* Including provisions addressing aerosols containing several propellants of different nature (e.g. flammable and non-flammable).

ProposalFEA and HCPA proposes to amend Chapter 6.2.4, which applies to all aerosol dispensers, by adding a new paragraph 6.2.4.1 and some inevitable renumbering (in bold) of existing paragraphs and references to read:[For readability reasons, the text which is unquoted or not in bold remains unchanged]“6.2.4.1 The internal pressure of aerosol dispensers at 50 °C shall not exceed 1.2 MPa (12 bar) when using flammable liquefied gases, 1.32 MPa (13.2 bar) when using non-flammable liquefied gases, and 1.5 MPa (15 bar) when using non-flammable compressed or dissolved gases. In case of a mixture of several gases, the stricter limit will apply.**6.2.4.2** Each filled aerosol dispenser or gas cartridge or fuel cell cartridge shall be subject to a test in a hot water bath in accordance with 6.2.4.**2.**1 or an approved waterbath alternative in accordance to 6.2.4.**2**.2.6.2.4.**2.**1 *Hot water bath test*6.2.4.**2.**1.1 The temperature…6.2.4.**2.**1.2 No leakage…6.2.4.**2.**2 *Alternative methods* With the approval of the competent authority alternative methods that provide an equivalent level of safety may be used provided that the requirements of 6.2.4.**2.**2.1 an, as appropriate, 6.2.4.**2.**2.2 or 6.2.4.**2**.2.3 are met.6.2.4.**2.**2.1 Quality system…6.2.4.**2.**2.2 Aerosol dispensers6.2.4.**2.**2.2.1 Pressure and leak testing……6.2.4.**2.**2.2.2 Testing of the aerosol dispensers after filling6.2.4.**2.**2.3 Gas cartridges and fuel cell cartridges6.2.4.**2.**2.3.1 Pressure testing… |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/58****Proposal of amendments concerning the use of the terms “risk” and “hazard/danger” in the Recommendations and Model Regulations**Transmitted by the observer from Romania[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-58e.docx) | This paper contains the ongoing work of the correspondence working group working to facilitate the alignment of the terms ‘risk’ and ‘hazard’. At that session (fifty-fifth) it was also decided that the alignment of the terminology should continue in the Recommendations and its annexed Model Regulations, and that the term “*risk*” and “*hazard*” should be used where it is really necessary.The paper invites the sub committee to analyse the proposals of amendments for the UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and the annexed Model Regulations on the use of the terms “*hazard*” and “*risk*”, as contained in the paper (for the French version, two options are proposed in some cases):Refer to the paper for the complete list of proposed amendments. |  |  |
| **7. Global harmonization of transport of dangerous goods regulations with the Model Regulations** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/55****Request for survey to better understand global dangerous goods training requirements**Submitted by the Medical Device Battery Transport Council (MDBTC) and the Dangerous Goods Trainers Association (DGTA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-55e.docx) | This paper highlights issues relating to the training requirements being imposed by various countries relative to the transport of lithium batteries. MDBTC members have been challenged when attempting to determine what the training requirements apply based on various regulations and national requirements and this is becoming even more challenging as national authorities impose specific training requirements. As the transport of dangerous goods has become increasingly globalized, multinational companies are struggling to understand the nuances of each individual country’s training requirements. While the training requirements are clearly established in Chapter 1.3 of the UN Model Regulations, additional requirements have been established in the Modal Regulations (i.e. ICAO Technical Instructions and IMDG Code). Regional regulations such as the ADR, ADN and RID also have additional requirements such as requiring that companies designate a certified Dangerous Goods Safety Advisor (DGSA) that approves training. Individual competent authorities apply even more requirements. For instance in some European countries, parties involved in the transport of dangerous goods must be certified by the national inspectorate or in another example shippers of lithium batteries must have at least two people that are trained by an instructor that is from the country where the operations are conducted. In some countries training organizations must be certified by the national government. For transportation by air, some countries require that only approved instructors or training schools can be used. It is not entirely clear when computer based, or online training is acceptable. For companies engaged in international commerce trying to comply with the multitude of additional requirements is extremely challenging.The MDBTC would like the Sub-Committee to conduct a survey and attempt to quantify dangerous goods training requirements globally. MDBTC has drafted a survey for consideration at the 57th session and is requesting comments on the relevance and content of the survey. **Proposed Survey**It is recognized that the dangerous goods regulations (e.g. ADR, IMDG Code, ICAO Technical Instructions) require that persons employed whose duties concern the carriage of dangerous goods to be trained appropriate to their responsibilities and duties. Employees are required to receive general awareness, safety, security and most importantly function specific training commensurate with their responsibilities and the functions (e.g. completing shipping papers, packaging, classification, etc.) and additionally based on the modes of transport requirements that apply.The survey can be completed by going to the following website: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/DGTA>. |  |  |
| **8. Cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/1****References to the IAEA Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material**Note by the secretariat[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-01.docx)56th Session – INF.45 **(Australia’s position was ‘follow committee view’** | During the fifty-sixth session, INF.45 could not discussed due to lack of time and the Sub-Committee requested the secretariat to submit an official document for the fifty-seventh session. Below is an updated proposal based on INF.45The paper advises of amendments to harmonise and clarify the references to the IAEA Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Material throughout RID/ADR/AND that were adopted by the Joint Meeting Refer to the paper for a full list of the proposed amendments |  |  |
| **9. Guiding principles for the Model Regulations** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/2****Review of the guiding principles**Note by the secretariat[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-02.docx)56th Session - ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/112, para. 125 and 126 | At its fifty-sixth session in December 2019, the Sub-Committee adopted an amendment aiming at clarifying the rationale behind the exempted quantity provisions (see ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/112, para. 125 and 126). When updating the current version of the guiding principles to take account of this decision, the secretariat noticed that several additional updates were needed to make them compliant with the twenty-first revised edition of the Model Regulations.The paper proposes several amendments to the Guiding Principles |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/41****Revisions to Special Provision 301**Transmitted by the International Air Transport Association (IATA)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-41e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/63](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-63e.docx) | At the fifty-sixth session of the Sub-Committee IATA submitted a working document (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/63) that sought discussion on the application of special provision 301, which sets out the allowance for the dangerous goods that may be contained in UN 3363, DANGEROUS GOODS IN APPARATUS, ARTICLES or EQUIPMENT.The discussion of the working document at the fifty-sixth session agreed that the wording of special provision 301 could be improved to remove any confusion as to the dangerous goods that can be included in articles assigned to UN 3363. This working paper proposes an amendment to special provision 301 to specifically exclude explosives and flammable gases from being permitted in articles assigned to UN 3363.This working document also includes an alternative proposal that would permit a very small quantity of flammable gas in a gas cartridge / receptacle, small, containing gas to address the clock that was the motivation for the initial document to the fifty-fifth session of the Sub-Committee.The clock in question contains a sealed capsule in which is a very small quantity, less than 2 g, of flammable gas, UN 1037, ETHYL CHLORIDE. While the gas is not permitted to be shipped under the provisions of Chapter 3.4, limited quantity, the sealed capsule meets the provisions of UN 2037, GAS CARTRIDGE and is permitted as limited quantity.With such a small quantity of flammable gas inside a sealed capsule, the risk in transport is very, very low and as such it is believed that there could be provision to permit an article containing this small quantity of flammable gas to be assigned to UN 3363, DANGEROUS GOODS IN ARTICLES.The current paper contains two proposals for amending special provision 301.Refer to the paper for details of the proposals. |  |  |
| **10. Issues relating to the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals** |
| **10(a) Testing of oxidizing substances** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/20−ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/5****A new Chapter 2.1 for the GHS**(Sweden on behalf of the Informal Correspondence Group on the Review of Chapter 2.1)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-20e-ST-SG-AC10-C4-2020-05e.docx) | This document contains a proposal for a new Chapter 2.1 for the GHS, hazard class “Explosives”, and consequential amendments to Annex 1 and Annex 3, section 1, to the GHS. It is recognised that precautionary statements need to be allocated to the new classifications suggested herein, and a supplemental document to this end is intended to follow. While no changes to the UN Model Regulations are suggested herein (or are planned), some editorial amendments to the Manual of Tests and Criteria will be needed, and a forthcoming document is intended to address this. |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/22−ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/7****Amendments to the Manual of Tests and Criteria to accommodate the new GHS Chapter 2.1 – in principle**(Sweden on behalf of the Informal Correspondence Group on the Review of Chapter 2.1)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-22e-ST-SG-AC10-C4-2020-07e.docx) | Document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/20-ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/5, proposes a new Chapter 2.1 for the GHS. As a consequence of the proposed new classification system, Part I of the Manual of Tests and Criteria (the Manual) needs amending. The amendments are of an editorial nature, the main problem being the use of the term “unstable explosive(s)” which will be repealed as a classification and therefore needs to be replaced. There may also be some further editorial changes needed to complete the transformation.The paper provides some examples of amendments and proposes to prepare an INF document containing a complete list of amendments for discussion byt the EWG in their meeting parallel to the 57th session  |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/23−ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/8****Allocation of precautionary statements for the new Chapter 2.1**(Sweden on behalf of the Informal Correspondence Group on the Review of Chapter 2.1)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-23e-ST-SG-AC10-C4-2020-08e.docx) | Document ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/20-ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/5, proposes a new Chapter 2.1 for the GHS. As a consequence of the proposed new classification system, the precautionary statements (P statements) currently used for explosives need to be allocated to the classifications of the new system. This document contains such proposed allocations. Furthermore, a new P statement is also proposed to state the Division for transport on the GHS label.As P statements do not occur in the UN Model Regulations or in the Manual of Tests and Criteria, the proposals have no effect on these |  |  |
| **10(b) Chemicals under pressure** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/33−ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/10****Clarification of 2.9.3.4.3.4 of Model Regulations and 4.1.3.3.4 of GHS**(China)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-33e-ST-SG-AC10-C4-2020-10e.docx)56th Session – [INF.12](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/UN-SCETDG-56-INF12e-UN-SCEGHS-38-INF11e.docx) | The purpose of this document is to invite the TDG and GHS sub-committees to reconsider the text for the classification of the long-term (chronic) aquatic environmental hazard of mixtures in the Model Regulations and GHS. At the previous session, the expert from China submitted informal documents INF.12 (56th session). Following the discussion, the sub-committees invited the expert from China to submit a formal document for this session (57th TDG and 39th GHS).Paragraph 2.9.3.4 of the Model Regulations was paraphrased from section 4.1.3 of GHS. In GHS, the short-term (acute) aquatic hazard (this term is phrased as “acute (short-term) aquatic hazard” in the Model Regulations) of mixtures hazardous to the aquatic environment has three categories, i.e. Acute 1, 2 and 3, while the long-term (chronic) aquatic hazard (this term is phrased as “long-term aquatic hazard” in the Model Regulations.) can be classified as Chronic 1, 2, 3 and 4 (see Table 4.1.1 in GHS). However, in the Model Regulations, only one acute (short-term) aquatic hazard category (category Acute 1) and two long-term aquatic hazard categories (categories Chronic 1 and 2) exist (see Table 2.9.1 in the Model Regulations). In other words, there are no categories corresponding to Chronic 3 and 4 in GHS listed in the Model Regulations.The proposal in the paper provides two options for amending the text in 2.9.3.4.3.4.Refer to the paper for full details of the proposed amendments |  |  |
| **10(c) Updating of references to OECD Guidelines** |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/30−ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/9****Tests for oxidizing liquids and oxidizing solids improvement regarding consideration for particle size, friable or coated materials**(France)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-30e-ST-SG-AC10-C4-2020-09e.docx) | During its ninth session the Committee approved the programme of work of its two sub-committees for the biennium 2019-2020 (see ST/SG/AC.10/46, para 14; ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/108, paragraph 139 and ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/72, annex II). This programme of work includes the tests for oxidizing liquids and oxidizing solids.The programme of work focuses on improving the testing of materials of different particle sizes distribution and coated materials, as well as improvements to the testing methods for the Tests O.1, O.2 and O.3.During the fifty-fifth session of the Sub-Committee of Experts on the transport of Dangerous Goods the expert from France proposed a schedule for the work foreseen (see ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/20 – ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2019/4).The work progress was reported during the fifty-fifth session (see informal documents INF.44 (55th session) and INF.16 (37th session)) and the fifty-sixth session (see ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/68 – ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2019/11 and informal documents INF.39 (56th session) and INF.18 (38th session)). The present document reports the latest progress.The current paper provides the results of the work programme and makes the following proposal.**Proposal**Taking the outcome of the RRT into account and to better define the approach to properly assessing the oxidizing potential of coated materials, it is proposed to insert the following note at the end of paragraphs 34.4.1.2.6 and 34.4.3.2.3 of the Manual of Tests and Criteria:*“****NOTE:*** *In the case of a substance coated to reduce or suppress its oxidizing properties with a significant content (> 10 % by mass) of particles less than 500 μm, two sets of tests should be conducted: tests conducted with the substance as presented and tests conducted with particles less than 500 μm that were obtained from sieving the substance as presented. The substance should not be ground before sieving or testing. The final classification should be based on the test results with the most stringent classification*.” |  |  |
| **ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2020/39****Optical differentiation of labels/placards for gases**Spain and the International Association of Fire and Rescue Services (CTIF)[Link](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2020/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC10-C3-2020-39e.docx)56th Session - [ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/19](http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/doc/2019/dgac10c3/ST-SG-AC.10-C.3-2019-19e.docx) | In the July 2019 session, Spain and CTIF presented a joint proposal for the optical differentiation of labels and placards for gases (see ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2019/19) aimed at provider greater visual differentiation for emergency respondersAfter discussion of the proposal, it was decided to create an informal correspondence working group to continue the work of this topic (see ST/SG/AC.10/C.3.110, paragraphs 72-75). The correspondence working group meetings were attended by 30 members, representing competent authorities, concerned industry and firefighter associations and started as a platform for the exchange of arguments for and against the general idea of amending the labels for Class 2.The paper proposes the following options: (refer to the paper for full details of the proposals)* modify labels 2.1 and 2.3 to include the gas receptacle symbol into the lower part of the label
* modify labels 2.1 and 2.3 to include the word « gas » into the lower part of the label. The inclusion of the text « flammable gas » or « toxic gas » instead of only « gas » should be left as an additional option, for those regions where its authorities require it

**Australia participated in the informal working group and provided feedback that our preferred option was to include the words in the label, e.g. FLAMMABLE GAS** |  |  |
| **10(d) Review of Chapter 2.1** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item.** |  |  |  |
| **10(e) Simultaneous classification in physical hazards and precedence of hazards** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item.**  |  |  |  |
| **10(f)**  |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item.** |  |  |  |
| **11 Other business** |
| **At the time of writing no document has been submitted under this agenda sub-item.**  |  |  |  |
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