

**LIST OF UN PAPERS AND OUTCOMES OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO THE 20TH SESSION OF THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS SUB-COMMITTEE**

Note: The full UN report may be obtained at <http://www.unece.org/trans/main/dgdb/dgsubc/c3rep.html>

AGENDA ITEM	UN PAPER	US POSITION/DISCUSSION
<b>1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA</b>		
<b>Adoption of the Agenda</b>	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/39 and -/Add.1 (Secretariat) (Secretariat) Provisional agenda, list of documents and annotations	-----
<b>2. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS FOR THE TRANSPORT OF GASES</b>		
<b>Background Documents</b>		
ST/SG/AC.10/27, paras. 13-21 and annex 1 ST/SG/AC.10/27/Add.1 and -/Add.2		Report of the Committee (21st session) Texts adopted by the Committee See Paras. 13-17 and annex 1
ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/31 (USA) Items for consideration by the Working Group		This paper addressed the ongoing work involving the incorporation of pressure receptacle requirements into the Model Regulations. The paper identified a number of issues which need to be addressed in the current biennium to complete work on incorporating gas cylinder requirements into the Model Regulations. The comments in the paper were taken into consideration by the Sub-Committee and the gases working group.
<b>New Document</b>		
ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/48 (EIGA) Provisions for refrigerated liquefied gases		<p>This paper proposed requirements for gas receptacles used for the transport of refrigerated liquefied gases (cryogenic liquids). EIGA excluded open cryogenic receptacles because they don't consider them to be pressure receptacles. The US did not agree that open receptacles should be excluded from the Model Regulations but did agree that they should be placed in parts of the Model Regulations that address packagings other than pressure receptacles. These cryogenic receptacles are used in multimodal transport and in particular for air transport. The US submitted an INF paper commenting on the particular proposals in the EIGA paper and proposed adopting the cryogenic handling label recently adopted by the ICAO Dangerous Goods Panel for the 2003-2004 ICAO TI. The INF paper also addressed requirements for retesting pressure receptacles. The working group adopted orientation marking for cryogenic cylinders but did not adopt the ICAO/IATA handling label. Other notable issues were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-a revised packing instruction for cryogenic liquids (P203) was adopted;</li> <li>-since the US and Canada do not require periodic inspection for cryogenic cylinders it was agreed that at the next meeting the inspections and tests which constitute the periodic inspection would be reviewed and a decision made whether such inspection is essential to safety;</li> <li>-the working group agreed to allow the set pressure of frangible discs to be either at 150% of MAWP or at the test pressure, whichever is the lower, in order to provide sufficient allowance for the tolerance in frangible disc construction and to prevent it from operating near the range of the primary automatic pressure-relief device;</li> <li>-the US and Canada agreed to propose text detailing the characteristics and responsibilities of the body performing the periodic inspection and test for the next meeting.</li> </ul>

<b>3. TANKS</b>		
<b>3 (a) Equivalent thickness formula</b>	No proposal was submitted under this sub-item.	
<b>3 (b) Miscellaneous tank proposals (Chapters 4.2 and 6.7)</b>	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/45 (Spain) Requirements for the design construction and testing of safety devices for portable tanks	Spain withdrew the proposal and invited the experts of the Sub-Committee to correspond with him with a view to improving the wording of paragraph 6.7.2.12.1.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/55 (USA) Transport of solids in portable tanks	This paper noted that many solid substances are not assigned portable tank codes in the Dangerous Goods List. The US believes that such solid substances should be generally authorized for transport without the need for competent authority approval. This paper proposed that T code assignments for solids be included in the Dangerous Goods List. The US submitted a draft listing of these substances as an INF paper. The Sub-Committee was in favor of the idea and it was agreed that a correspondence group should be established led by the USA who would submit a new proposal at the next session.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/56 (USA) Thermally activated closing mechanisms for internal valves on portable tanks	At the 19th session of the Sub-Committee the US presented a paper (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/INF.32) concerning the use of thermally activated closures for portable tanks intended for the transport of certain substances. This paper (2001/56) provided a revised proposal on the basis of the comments received from various members of the Sub-Committee and included an amended list of applicable substances and revised description of the duration of the activation time. The proposal intended to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• require thermally activated remote closures for portable tanks used to transport Class 3 flammable liquids or liquids with a Class 3 sub-risk;</li> <li>• revise the current internal valve emergency remote shut-off device requirements in order to adopt more specific performance criteria and to make them consistent in 6.7.2, 6.7.3 and 6.7.4; and</li> <li>• amend the requirements consistent with the capabilities of the devices that are currently commercially available and being used on portable tanks.</li> </ul> <p>These proposals were not adopted.</p>
	INF.5 (UIC/IUR) - Item No 3(b) Multimodal tank transport MAWP, design pressure and test pressure of portable tanks	This document proposed to simplify the definition for MAWP and to use the values in the applicable T Codes for the minimum test pressure for tanks. The US did not support the proposed changes. A working group met to discuss the proposals contained in this document and a compromise position was agreed. The compromise was to simplify the definitions in a more acceptable manner. UIC agreed to submit a new document at the next session.
<b>4. TRANSPORT OF SOLID SUBSTANCES IN BULK IN CONTAINERS</b>		
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/37 (UK, Germany) Transport of solid substances in bulk	In this paper Germany and the United Kingdom submitted revised proposals based on comments received during the working group discussions at the 19 <sup>th</sup> and previous sessions. These consisted of proposals for transport of solid substances in bulk containers. During a working group meeting, the US was able to express its concerns about some of the proposals in this paper and these concerns will be taken into account in a revised proposal which will be submitted at the next session.

	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/38 (UK, Germany) Carriage of infectious substances in bulk	This paper proposes to add provisions for the transport UN 2900 and UN 3291 in bulk. The paper indicates that current provisions are insufficient when, for example, large quantities of animal carcasses need to be transported in exceptional circumstances in a short space of time. Most of the experts were in favor of preparing specific provisions for the transport of infectious substance in bulk. The US and Canada indicated that they had recently developed requirements for the transport of medical wastes. The US indicated that it plans to incorporate these in 49 CFR. Canada has already implemented the requirements. After a discussion on the proposals, the expert from the United Kingdom requested all interested delegations to send him their comments by the end of February 2002 so that he could prepare a new official proposal for the next session.
<b>5. PACKAGINGS (INCLUDING IBCS AND LARGE PACKAGINGS)</b>		
<b>5 (a) Performance testing</b>	No proposal was submitted under this sub-item.	
<b>5 (b) Miscellaneous proposals (Chapters 4.1, 6.1, 6.5 and 6.6)</b>	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/40 (United Kingdom) UN 2813 Water-reactive solid, n.o.s.	This paper proposed a new special provision be added to address “meals ready to eat”. The US agreed with the proposal and offered some suggested minor amendments, which were agreed to by the SC.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/43 (CEPE) Chapter 4.1 - Use of packagings - PP1	This paper proposed that inner packagings on shrink- or stretch-wrapped pallets be excepted from the marking and labelling requirements. The US did not agree that there was a need for this amendment considering that based on the US limited quantity proposal adopted in the 12 <sup>th</sup> edition of the Model Regulations the inner packaging limits for UN 1133, 1210, 1263 and 1866, PG II and III are both 5L. These packagings are not required to have the PSN and UN number if they meet the limited quantity provisions and are marked with the new limited quantity marking. The proposal was withdrawn.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/49 (United Kingdom) UN 2956 Musk Xylene P409	<p>This paper addressed anomalies related to requirements for UN 2956, Musk Xylene that arose with the linking of Special Provisions 133 and 181 which address labelling requirements. The paper proposed to delete SP 133 and SP 181 against UN 2956 in the Dangerous Goods List in Chapter 3.2 and delete SP 133 from the list of Special Provisions in Chapter 3.3. The paper pointed out that SP 133 dispenses with the explosives label when packed in accordance with P409. As only P409 packagings can apply to this substance, the wording of SP 133 is superfluous for this entry. SP 181 permits the Competent Authority to dispense with the explosives label when the substance in the package does not exhibit explosive behaviour. The substance can only be assigned to P 409 if there is no explosive behaviour and hence SP181 is also superfluous. The US supported this proposal.</p> <p>The proposal to delete special provision 133 for UN No. 2956 was not adopted, since some experts considered that the explosive behaviour of musk xylene when closely confined in a packaging should be indicated in the special provision. It was agreed that the wording of special provisions 133 and 181 was no longer very appropriate as packing instruction P409 had been assigned to it, and a compromise solution was adopted on the basis of informal document INF.49 (see annex 2). As a result SP 133 was amended and SP 181 is no longer applied to UN 2956.</p> <p>The amended SP 133 reads: "If over-confined in packagings, this substance may exhibit explosive behaviour. Packagings authorized under packing instruction P409 are intended to prevent over-confinement. When a packaging other than those prescribed under packing instruction P409 is authorized by the competent authority of the country of origin in accordance with 4.1.3.7, the package shall bear an "EXPLOSIVE" subsidiary risk label unless the competent authority of the country of origin has permitted this label to be dispensed with for the specific packaging employed because test data have proved that the substance in this packaging does not exhibit explosive behaviour (see 5.4.1.5.5.1). The provisions of 7.1.3.1 shall also be then considered."</p>

	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/50 (United Kingdom) Wording of P407	This paper attempted to correct an editorial problem with P407 in the second sentence of the main block of text which states that "The maximum net mass of the outer packagings shall not exceed 45 kg". P407 applies to different types of matches. The UK stated that the sentence could be construed to apply to the weight of the packagings and not the contents. The paper proposed to revise the sentence to read: "The maximum gross mass of the package shall not exceed...". The proposal was adopted.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/52 (SEFEL) General requirements of steel quality in connection with para. 6.1.4.1.1	This paper proposed to add the following text to the Note in 6.1.4.1.1 to address steel quality for small drums:  "In the case of carbon steel drums of a capacity not greater than 40 litres, "suitable" steels below a thickness of 0.5 mm are identified in ISO 11949: Cold-reduced electrolytic tinplate, ISO 11950: Cold-reduced electrolytic chromium/chromium oxide-coated steel and ISO 11951: Cold-reduced blackplate in coil form for the production of tinplate or electrolytic chromium/chromium oxide-coated steel".  The proposal was adopted with some minor amendments.
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/54 (USA) Packaging for large lithium batteries	This paper proposed amending P903 to allow large robust batteries to be transported unpackaged. The proposal was adopted with minor amendments. The final text agreed to by the SC is as follows:  "In addition, batteries employing a strong, impact resistant outer casing of a gross mass of 12 kg or more, and assemblies of such batteries, may be packed in strong outer packagings, in protective enclosures (e.g., in fully enclosed or wooden slatted crates) unpackaged or on pallets. Batteries shall be secured to prevent inadvertent movement, and the terminals shall not support the weight of other superimposed elements."
<b>6. TRANSPORT OF INFECTIOUS SUBSTANCES</b>	INF.22: (Canada) - Infectious substances (see also ST/SG/AC.10/27, paras. 25-26 and 149).	This INF paper was submitted by Canada to facilitate discussion on the requirements for infectious substances and diagnostic specimens. It provided a complete rewrite of the infectious substances requirements and included substantial changes including a new package marking (Caduceus symbol). Canada did not request that a decision be taken on the proposal. The US shared its views with Canada prior to the meeting and plans to participate in further discussions. The US did not support using the Caduceus mark because we believe that this symbol conveys the wrong message. The symbol conveys healing properties and is the recognized international symbol of medicine. We are not adverse to adopting an international mark for diagnostic specimens.  We also did not support the grouping of risk group 2 and 3 substances with diagnostic specimens or calling these substances "Biological Materials". These materials do not present an equivalent risk in transportation and should not be labeled as if they do. We prefer to maintain the Division 6.2 label for Risk Group 2 and 3 substances. We generally could agree with using categories as opposed to risk groups such as "Transport Risk Categories or Groups" and to streamlining to 3 categories as opposed to 4.  We favor the revised risk group 4 listing proposed by Canada because it includes a number of WHO RG 2 and 3 substances that are on the CDC select agents list (e.g. anthrax, Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever virus, etc.).  After much discussion on this issue by the SC, it was agreed to host an informal working group meeting from 11 to 13 March 2002 in Paris, on the understanding that document INF.22 and any other documents submitted would be considered as a basis for discussion but not as a basis for proposal. the US plans to participate in this meeting.

7. LISTING AND CLASSIFICATION		
<b>(a) Substances prohibited for transport</b>	No proposal was submitted under this sub-item.	
<b>(b) Correct assignment of UN Nos., proper shipping names and packing instruction numbers with respect to physical state</b>	<p>INF.17 (The Netherlands and Germany)</p> <p>In July 2001 the Subcommittee discussed a joint paper from the Netherlands and Germany (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/14 concerning the assignment of substances and solutions to the correct UN number in relation to the physical state (liquid/solid), see paragraphs 71 to 75 of report ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/38.</p>	<p>The paper addressed the decisions taken by the Sub-Committee at the 18<sup>th</sup> session to assign separate UN numbers for substances and solutions which may be offered for transport in either the liquid or solid state as well as those substances for which due to different composition of isomers the entry can be either a liquid or a solid. A listing of amendments to the Dangerous Goods List was included as an Annex to the paper. Approximately 70 new entries were proposed to be created as a result of this paper. The paper requested that the Sub-Committee consider whether it is necessary to create new UN numbers for all of the entries in the Annex on the basis of its decision not to create new entries unless the products are transported in sufficient volumes to warrant their inclusion. The paper also proposed to create two new special provisions against both the liquid and the solid entry for substances where due to different composition of isomers the entry may be both a liquid or a solid. The US indicated that these SPs are not necessary. The Netherlands and Germany indicated that their objective is to produce a final document for the July 2002 session on the basis of comments received. We plan to work with industry in assessing whether all of the proposed entries are necessary.</p>
<b>(c) Classification of substances hazardous for the aquatic environment</b>	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/39 (United Kingdom)	<p>This paper addressed criteria for environmentally hazardous substances (aquatic pollutants). At the 19<sup>th</sup> Session of the SCOE, the UK was invited to produce a revised paper based on INF.7 to include not only pure substances but also criteria for mixtures based on that recently produced by OECD. This proposal now includes criteria for mixtures based on OECD guidance. The paper proposed text for adoption into the Model Regulations. The US supported this proposal. The proposal was adopted with minor amendments and the criteria is provided in the list of amendments in ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/40/Add.2.</p>
<b>(d) Miscellaneous amendment proposals (Parts 2 and 3)</b>	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/21 (Germany) Aniline hydrochloride	<p>In this paper Germany noted that the classification of Aniline hydrochloride, a salt of Aniline, was based on human experience on poisonings with Aniline. Animal testing does not present data that would classify this Aniline salt in Class 6.1 Packing Group III. However, the relevant Special Provision 279 has only been allocated to UN 1547 ANILINE, but has not been allocated to UN 1548 ANILINE HYDROCHLORIDE. The paper proposed to add Special Provision 279 under the entry of UN 1548 of the Dangerous Goods List in column 6. The proposal was withdrawn .</p>
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/42 (USA) Definition of elevated temperature substance	<p>This paper proposed to add the following definition for Elevated temperature substances. Transport Canada submitted an INF paper modifying this proposal to address elevated temperature substances of Class 3. After some discussion it was agreed that the US and Canada would submit a revised proposal at the next session.</p>
	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/25 (South Africa) and -/25/Corr.1 (South Africa/Germany) Calcium hypochlorite and trichloroisocyanuric acid, dry in tablet form	<p>This paper proposed to add a new special provision to UN No. 1748, 2208, 2468 and 2880 to exempt from the requirements of the UN recommendations tablets with a mass of between 70 and 350 grams each which are not friable and do not contain particles less than 500 µm in diameter of more than 10 % (mass) of the total. The US supported an amendment for hypochlorite tablets to allow the classification to be relaxed to PG III under certain conditions but did not believe that this proposal was complete or acceptable as presented. The proposal was withdrawn.</p>

ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/35 (Germany)  
New entry for the persalt sodium carbonate peroxyhydrate in division 5.1

This paper proposed new entries for Sodium Carbonate Peroxyhydrate be added to the Recommendations on the basis of its increased quantities of (~180,000 MT/y ) transport. The new entries were adopted as follows (note that the limited quantity limits were adopted slightly higher than as originally proposed):

UN No.	Name and Description	Class or division	Subsidiary Risks	UN packing group	Special provisions	Limited quantities	Packagings and IBCs		Portable tanks	
							Packing instruction	Special provisions	Portable tank instruction	Portable tank special provisions
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
3yyy	SODIUM CARBONATE PEROXYHYDRATE	5.1	-	II	-	1 kg	P002 IBC08	PPXX B2, B3, B4, Bx	T1	-
3yyy	SODIUM CARBONATE PEROXYHYDRATE	5.1	-	III	-	5 kg	P002 IBC08 LP02	PPXX B3, Bx	T1	-

The US supported this proposal but questioned the need to create new special packing and IBC provisions to indicate that the packaging needs to be vented. We also did not see a need for a PG II entry based on the data. The proposal was adopted with amendments based on the comments received.

ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/36 (Germany)  
New entry for the persalt sodium perborate monohydrate in division 5.1

The proposal was adopted and the following new entry for persalt Sodium Perborate Monohydrate was added to the Recommendations on the basis of its increasingly voluminous (~200,000 MT/y ) transport (note that the limited quantity limits were adopted slightly higher than as originally proposed):

UN No.	Name and Description	Class or division	Subsidiary Risks	UN packing group	Special provisions	Limited quantities	Packagings and IBCs		Portable tanks	
							Packing instruction	Special provisions	Portable tank instruction	Portable tank special provisions
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
3xxx	SODIUM PERBORATE MONOHYDRATE	5.1	-	III	-	5 kg	P002 IBC08 LP02	PPXX B3, Bx	T1	-

The US supported this proposal but questioned the need to create new special packing and IBC provisions to indicate that the packaging needs to be vented. The proposal was adopted with amendments based on the comments received.

<b>(e) Criteria for the corrosiveness to metals</b>	INF.27: (Germany) - Item No 7(d) Testing of liquid and solid substances as dangerous goods of class 8, PG III, according to their corrosive properties on steel or aluminium (see ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/24 (Germany) for background)	This paper provided a report of the 1st and 2nd meeting of the international informal working group on materials corrosive to metals that was hosted by Germany. The document provided a complete test for the classification of substances that are corrosive to metals as an Annex. Germany had requested that the Sub-Committee consider the testing procedure. While the US generally supported the proposed test method it requested that the Sub-Committee not take an immediate decision considering that the paper was submitted late and that more time is necessary to review it. We noted that the document referred to testing for a "minimum" of one week, yet the test protocol is quite specific to one week. Most US data is based on two-week exposures, so we would prefer that the test protocol itself say "1 week as a minimum" for the test duration. After a general discussion on the result of the two sessions of the informal working group hosted by the expert from Germany, the expert from Germany invited experts to submit comments before 15 February 2002 so that he could submit a proposal for the next session.
<b>8. EXPLOSIVES, SELF-REACTIVE SUBSTANCES AND ORGANIC PEROXIDES</b>		
<b>(a) Classification criteria for fireworks</b>	<p>An informal working group met in the Hague from 16-18 October 2001 (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/38, paras. 85-89). INF. 9 provided a report of the working group meeting. The working group confirmed that the criteria for classifying explosives using Test series 6 is adequate and appropriate for the classification of fireworks. The primary discussion topic involved the development of a default system of classification for fireworks and how this could be introduced into the UN Model Regulations. We had a number of concerns with the way that the default system was being developed and indicated these in INF.27. The concerns included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The default system for the classification of fireworks should cover Divisions 1.1G, 1.3G, and 1.4G. We did not believe that a Div. 1.2G category is necessary because of the nature of design and construction of fireworks (fireworks intended for consumers and display purposes). We further believe that certain small items (or novelties) can be assigned to Div. 1.4S with clear definitions or descriptions. We did not support the view that a Div. 1.4S is assigned based on packaging in a default system. A Div. 1.4S classification should not be assigned only based on tests in accordance with relevant classification procedures for Class 1 items.</li> <li>2. We did not support the view that criteria for differentiation between 1.1G, 1.3G and 1.4G are solely based on the dimensions of firework items. We emphasized our position that it is the weight of chemical composition, and the type of composition that primarily determines the output to be expected when test series 6 is performed on fireworks devices as packaged for transportation.</li> <li>3. We recommended that a section be added to the default system to emphasize that only pyrotechnical compositions (chemical mixtures of oxidizers and fuels) are permitted in fireworks. No explosive substances, as defined and listed in the UN table, are to be used in fireworks with the exception of black powder.</li> </ol> <p>The Sub-Committee finally agreed that a parallel working group should be held during its next session with the mandate to develop a default classification list with annex 1 of INF.9 as a starting point. The expert from the Netherlands will prepare an official proposal for the next session of the Sub-Committee on the basis of annex 1 to INF.9 and comments received.</p>	
<b>(b) Classification of ammonium nitrate emulsions, suspensions and gels</b>	UN/SCETDG/20/INF.21(Japan) Classification of ammonium nitrate emulsions, suspensions and gels, Test Results of ANE See ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/38, paras. 82-83 and annexes 1 and 2 for related information.	In this paper Japan indicated that they have performed tests to validate test series 8(a), 8(b) and 8(c) which were adopted by the Sub-Committee at the 19 <sup>th</sup> session. They proposed that their test results be included as "Examples of results" in the Manual of Tests and Criteria (see ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/38/Add.1, Annex2). The Sub-Committee decided that a working group of experts on explosives would be held during the first week of the next session to discuss firework default classification (2,5 days) and ANEs (1,5 days).
<b>(c) UN pressure-vessel test</b>	No proposal was submitted under this sub-item.	
<b>(d) Miscellaneous proposals</b>	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/33 (Germany) Self-reactive substances, type G	In this paper Germany proposed to delete Note 1, in Chapter 2.4.3.2.3.1 of the Model Regulations and in Chapters 20.2.6 and 33.3.1.3.3.5 in the Manual of Tests and Criteria. Note 1 indicates that self-reactive substances that provide a positive result with the test method for Class 4.2 (see Manual of Test and Criteria, Part III, sub-section 33.3.1.6), need not be classified in Division 4.2 since they are already classified in Division 4.1 (see 2.4.2.3.1.1). In this paper Germany provided data to illustrate that self-reactive substances, Type G should not be excluded from this note. Several experts did not agree with the German interpretation of Note 1 to paragraph 2.4.3.2.3.1 of the Model Regulations. The US felt the note should be clarified but maintained. The expert from Germany said that he would submit a revised proposal.

<p>ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/34 (Germany) Implementation of general N.O.S. entries into Class 3 and Division 4.1</p>	<p>This paper proposed to add the following new N.O.S. entries to Chapter 3.2 - Dangerous Goods List - of the UN Model Regulations:</p> <p>"UN XXXX, DESENSITIZED EXPLOSIVES, SOLID, N.O.S., 4.1, I, 28, 274,278, NONE, P406, PP26</p> <p>UN XXXX, DESENSITIZED EXPLOSIVES, LIQUID, N.O.S., 3, Special provisions 274, 278, NONE, P099</p> <p>UN XXXY, ENERGETIC SUBSTANCES, SOLID, N.O.S., 4.1, III, Special Provisions XXX, 132, 274, NONE, P099</p> <p>UN XXXZ, ENERGETIC SUBSTANCES, LIQUID, N.O.S., 4.1, III, Special Provisions XXX, 132, 274, NONE, P099"</p> <p>The proposed generic entries take account of substances which exhibit properties as desensitized explosives of Classes 3 or 4.1 when a specific entry does not exist. The US supported the proposal to add two new generic desensitized explosives entries. We have issued approvals for desensitized explosives where these entries would have been helpful. We opposed adding the two energetic substance proposals. We have opposed these types of entries in the past (substances related to self-reactive substances). Germany did not provide any new justification or propose any requirements for determining when these entries would be used or that they are necessary for transport. The Sub-Committee adopted the proposal for N.O.S. entries for desensitized explosives with some modifications. Since there was not much support for the N.O.S. entries for energetic substances, the expert from Germany withdrew the part of the proposal related to such substances.</p>
<p>ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/47 (ICCA) List of organic peroxides</p>	<p>In this paper ICCA offered a proposal to consolidate the list of organic peroxides. The Sub-Committee adopted the principles of updating and rationalizing the list of organic peroxides, but as informal document INF.10/Rev.1 had been submitted late and as several experts said they had comments on the proposed revised list, the representative of ICCA was requested to prepare a new consolidated document taking account of these comments for the next session.</p>
<p><b>9. HARMONIZATION WITH THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA) REGULATIONS FOR THE SAFE TRANSPORT OF RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL</b></p>	
<p>ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/57 (IAEA) Revision of the IAEA Regulations</p>	<p>This paper identified amendments that IAEA has made to TSR-1 and consequential amendments to the UN Model Regulations. The US supported the changes identified in the paper. The paper gave a lengthy but good summary of the status of the IAEA revision process. The IAEA revision panel met recently and reviewed all the proposed changes. The revision panel concurred that these changes should take the form of an amendment to the current revision of the IAEA regulations (TS-R-1, 1996 edition (as amended 2003)) rather than a new edition.</p>

**10. MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS OF AMENDMENTS TO THE MODEL REGULATIONS ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS**

	<p>ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/41 (Switzerland)          Insertion of a new note on the exemption of pharmaceutical products ready for use</p>	<p>This paper proposed to add an exception for pharmaceutical products in paragraph 1.1.1.2 by adding a new subparagraph "(d):</p> <p>d) "Pharmaceutical products ready for use, e.g. cosmetics, drugs and medicines for humans and animals, which are substances manufactured and packed in packagings of a type for retail sale or distribution for personal or household consumption and which otherwise are substances of classes 2, 3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.1, 8 or 9, respectively, are not subject to the provisions of the Model Regulations."</p> <p>The US did not support this proposal. We did not agree that an exception specifically for pharmaceuticals is necessary. The current consumer commodity provisions are adequate. The observer from Switzerland withdrew his proposal and supported the proposal by the United Kingdom in INF.18 for a new entry for retail products in Class 9.</p>
	<p>ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/53 (USA)          Transport of hybrid electric vehicles</p>	<p>In this paper the US proposed that the applicability of the UN Model Regulations to hybrid electric vehicles should be clarified by adding a new special provision to the entry "ENGINES, INTERNAL COMBUSTION..." (UN 3166) as follows:</p> <p>3XY This entry includes hybrid electric vehicles powered by both an internal combustion engine and wet, sodium or lithium batteries, transported with the battery(ies) installed. Vehicles that also contain an internal combustion engine must be consigned under the entry "Vehicle (flammable gas powered)" or "Vehicle (flammable liquid powered)", as appropriate."</p> <p>It was further proposed to amend SP 240 by adding the following text: "Hybrid electric vehicles powered by both an internal combustion engine and wet, sodium or lithium batteries, transported with the battery(ies) installed shall be consigned under the entry "Vehicle (flammable gas powered)" or "Vehicle (flammable liquid powered)", UN 3166 as appropriate."</p> <p>The proposal was adopted.</p>

## 11. GLOBAL HARMONIZATION OF SYSTEMS OF CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING OF CHEMICALS

The final proposals for a Globally Harmonized System (GHS) of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals, as developed by the IOMC Coordinating Group were submitted to the Sub-Committee of Experts on the GHS at its 2nd session (12-14 December 2001), under the ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001 document symbol series. A document concerning the hazard communication aspect was submitted by the US (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/44). ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/44 is an information paper that indicates that there may be some issues concerning the use of the red diamond that may affect safety. The US DOT believes that the issue should be carefully considered and assessed. Therefore, the United States is undertaking a human factors study to assess whether the safety concerns raised in the paper are valid. These concerns are described in the paper. Other parties are invited to participate/comment on the comprehensibility study and to conduct parallel studies. The US received a number of positive comments and these will be taken into account in the development of the final methodology.

## 12. OTHER BUSINESS

	ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2001/51 (Secretariat) Application for consultative status by the International Council of Chemical Trade Associations (ICCTA )	In this paper the Sub-Committee was invited to decide whether ICCTA may participate in its work with a consultative status. The US supported this application. The application was approved.
	UN/SCETDG/20/INF.23 (Secretariat) Application for consultative status by the American Biological Safety Association (ABSA)	In this paper the Sub-Committee was invited to decide whether ABSA may participate in its work with a consultative status. ABSA is an international professional organization with a membership drawn from more than 20 countries. The US supported this application. The application was approved.

*\*UN Papers for the 19<sup>th</sup> session may be downloaded from the UN Transport Division website at: <http://www.unece.org/trans/main/dgdb/dgsubc/c3doc.html>. Visit the site of the Office of Hazardous Materials Safety's International Standards Coordinator at: <http://hazmat.dot.gov/intstandards.htm> for pertinent information relative to the office's international activities including: Schedules of International Meetings, The UN Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods (UN Model Regulation), The UN Committee and Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, International Atomic Energy Agency International Maritime Organization's Dangerous Goods, Solid Cargoes and Containers (DSC) Sub-Committee, International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Dangerous Goods Panel European Agreements Concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR) and Rail (RID) North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Hazardous Materials Land Transportation Standards Sub-Committee.*