



Secretariat

Distr.
GENERAL

ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/1999/42
15 April 1999

Original: ENGLISH

**COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE
TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS**

**Sub-Committee of Experts on the
Transport of Dangerous Goods**
(Sixteenth session,
Geneva, 5-16 July 1999,
agenda item 5 (d))

**MISCELLANEOUS DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE MODEL REGULATIONS
ON THE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS**

Packagings

Reconditioned packagings

Transmitted by the Expert from Italy

Background

Nowadays there is a strong concern about environment and new national and international laws are dealing with the problem of pollution and the possible ways to decrease the impact of wastes in any kind of activity. In particular there is a European directive facing the problem of reducing the wastes produced by packaging: one way, clearly not the only one, to reduce the wastes derived by packaging is to use twice or more a packaging, through a recondition process. The reconditioning can reduce the amount of wastes, but if it is performed with no control can jeopardise the safety of the transport.

This proposal is aimed to clarify the reconditioning requirements to make the reconditioning process more clear and controlled.

GE.99-21394

At the present the Orange Book states that:

“6.1.3.2 Every reusable packaging liable to undergo a reconditioning process which might obliterate the packaging markings shall bear the marks indicated in 6.1.3.1 (a) to (e) in a permanent form. Marks are permanent if they are able to withstand the reconditioning process (e.g. embossed).”

The first sentence seems to imply a manufacture responsibility in deciding if a packaging can be reusable or not; and, if the manufacture thinks that the packaging is reusable, he can then think that the reconditioning process will not obliterate the markings. These two reasons are enough sometimes to avoid an embossed mark, the only permanent form of marking.

The second sentence specifies the permanent mark in a very general way. A simple printed mark can withstand the reconditioning process if during the process the mark is covered with a tape: this interpretation is used when the mark is not embossed but the reconditioner thinks the drum is reusable.

The Orange Book has no requirements for the reconditioner while specifies requirements for the manufacture, like a quality assurance programme.(see 4.1.1.14). and the test repetition (see 6.1.5.1.3).

There is only a general requirement on reconditioned packagings at paragraph 4.1.1.9 but there are no detailed procedures to fulfil the requirement.

It is clear that the reconditioner has a vast responsibility to assure the safety of the transport , including the control of the external contamination, but all his activity is unknown to the competent authority, unless the reconditioner has asked for an authorised symbol (.6.1.3.4 (i)).

Proposal

Modify the last sentence in the paragraph 4.1.1.1. as follow:

"4.1.1.1 Dangerous goods shall be packed in packagings of good quality. These shall be constructed and closed so as to prevent the package as prepared for transport from any leakage which might be caused under normal conditions of transport, by vibration, or by changes in temperature, humidity or pressure (resulting from altitude, for example). No harmful quantity of a dangerous substance may adhere to the outside of packages. These provisions apply both to new, reconditioned and to reused packagings.

Add the word “*reconditioned*” and delete “manufactured” at paragraph 4.1.1.14 as follows:

"4.1.1.14 The packagings shall be ~~manufactured~~, *reconditioned* and tested under a quality assurance programme which satisfies the competent authority in order to ensure that each manufactured packaging meets the provisions of these Regulations."

Delete completely the paragraph 6.1.3.2.

~~6.1.3.2 Every reusable packaging liable to undergo a reconditioning process which might obliterate the packaging markings shall bear the marks indicated in 6.1.3.1 (a) to (e) in a permanent form. Marks are permanent if they are able to withstand the reconditioning process (e.g. embossed). For packagings other than metal drums of a capacity greater than 100 litres, these permanent marks may replace the corresponding durable markings prescribed in 6.1.3.1.~~

Modify the paragraph 6.1.3.4 (i) as follows:

"(i) The name of the reconditioner or other identification of the packaging specified by the competent authority;"

Change the letter (d) by (e) in the paragraph 6.1.3.5. as follows:

"6.1.3.5 When, after reconditioning, the markings required by 6.1.3.1 (a) to ~~(d)~~ (e) no longer appear on the top head or the side of a metal drum, the reconditioner also shall apply them in a durable form followed by 6.1.3.4 (h), (i) and (j). These markings shall not identify a greater performance capability than that for which the original design type had been tested and marked."
