UNITED NATIONS **E**

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

TRANS/WP.11/2002/10
16 August 2002

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

INLAND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Working Party on the Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs
(Fifty-eighth session,
Geneva, 11-14 November 2002)

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE ATP-HANDBOOK

1. The Working Group was kindly invited by CRT to convene in Cambridge (United-Kingdom, 22-24 April 2002).

2. Experts from Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal, the United Kingdom, Sweden and the representative from the UN secretariat were present.

3. Mr. Frans van der Rijst (Sweden) was elected chairman and Mr Hans Fokker (Netherlands) secretary.

4. The basic document for the discussion was the draft of the ATP Handbook, revised by the UN-secretariat. In accordance with the given mandate, the revised Annexes were taken into account.

A. General discussion

5. The chairman explained that, in his opinion, the lay out of the draft Handbook could be improved based on the layout key of documents from WP.29. For that purpose he introduced a restructured draft.

6. The UN secretary was, however, of the opinion that the layout of the handbook should be identical to the ATP itself and the revised Annexes. He suggested to introduce this revised draft in the WP.11. The draft by the UN secretariat should remain the basic document to be discussed in the meeting.

7. The expert from Germany made a statement that the legal status of the explanatory notes in the handbook cannot be taken over in the German legislation. The UN secretary asked Germany to submit an official document from the official legal service of their country to WP.11 to confirm this.

8. The chairman suggested to introduce a new article in the Agreement concerning the status of the explanatory notes. Furthermore, he suggested to rearrange the explanatory notes and the comments in such a way that the ATP Agreement incorporates the explanatory notes, whereas the ATP handbook would consist of the ATP Agreement and the comments. This could probably be discussed at a later stage during the meeting.

9. After introduction of the draft, revised by the chairman, the working group decided that it would complicate the present task of the group. He was advised to present his draft at a subsequent meeting to the WP.11.

10. The working group concluded that the draft, presented by the UN secretariat would be the basic document to be considered.

11. Mr Bowyer, being the author of the revised Annexes, was asked to clarify some points that might contain errors. Indeed, some references in articles such as the reference in Article 2 to Annex 1, appendix 1, paragraph 4 were no longer correct, due to rearrangement of the paragraphs in that appendix. Mr Bowyer offered therefore to correct this and he promised to look for all possibly affected references.

12. The German delegate expressed his concern about this course of action and wished to have the old numbering as reference inserted in the revised Annexes. He was not prepared to accept any further changes, proposed in this meeting. Mr Bowyer agreed to insert the old numbering. In relation to the renumbering he stressed also that the hierarchy of the original ATP should be respected. Furthermore he wished to have all mentioning of paragraphs be deleted and address only by the number.

13. On the day before closing of the WG, the UN secretary made an attempt to avoid the anticipated problems concerning the legal status of the explanatory notes. He suggested removing the distinction between explanatory notes and comments and transfer everything into comments.

14. In reply to a question to that matter, the German expert expressed his view that the handbook should contain only (not legally binding) comments. Many procedures should nationally be established, based on interpretation of ATP. He referred to the differing methods of periodic testing where attempts to harmonise have failed over the years.

15. The expert from the Netherlands found this hard to accept. He considered this WG as a breakthrough as regards to harmonisation of procedures and interpretations, but that a decision as suggested by the German expert throws us back in time. In that case the WG has failed to achieve the objective to develop a binding set of harmonised interpretations of ATP. The Netherlands would probably not have participated if this were the original objective.

16. The UN secretary then said that it could be possible to try to make the adoption procedure of the explanatory notes identical to the provisions of ATP. This would require an amendment to Article 18. He drew attention to the initiative of Italy to lift the unanimity rule for the Annexes of ATP, which would ease the adoption.

17. In his closing speech also the Chairman of the WG expressed his disappointment about the results of the meeting and announced his retreat from the WG. He requested the Chairman of the WP.11 to reserve enough time to discuss the matter in the November meeting of the WP.11.

18. Finally the German expert reminded that the test reports as presented by France during last WP.11 show some errors or shortcomings. Germany will submit a formal proposal for the next WP.11 meeting to correct this.

B. Agreed proposals for changes to the Handbook

Chapter I

The explanatory notes to Article 2 are now regarded to be comments. The first part (i) was not considered relevant and should be deleted. The remaining parts, together with the existing comments should be replaced by the following, combined comment:

"The issuing of a certificate of compliance by the competent authorities on the basis of test reports, is referred to in Annex 1, Appendix 1, paragraph 4, but there is no indication that such reports had to be issued by a testing station in the country of registration of the equipment.

The test reports in accordance with Annex 1, Appendix 2 are not certificates. To avoid duplication of test, each contracting party should recognise test stations from any contracting party, approved by the competent authority of the country concerned.

Contracting parties may recognise the test reports, issued by testing stations in countries of non-contracting parties and approved by the competent authority of those countries."

Annex 1, Appendix 1

Comment to paragraph 3 c)

The working group recommends replacing the last sentence with the following:

"The test report could be drawn up in the national language of the country, issuing the document, which should also be drawn up in at least one of the three official languages of ATP."

Comments to paragraph 6 (d)

The comments were considered to be superfluous and be deleted, except for the sentence:

"When determining the percentage of units (bodies) to be tested, the competent authority may take into account the manufacturers procedures and quality assurance systems."

Annex 1, Appendix 2:

2.1.4

It was observed that, due to the rearrangement of the Annex, the reference to paragraph 6 was not applicable anymore. The correct reference now would be: 1.7.

2.3.1

It was observed that this provision contradicts 2.1.4, particularly with the referenced 1.7: whereas 1.7 states that the steady state of the temperature shall be verified over a period of not less than 12 hours, 2.3.1 stipulates that the test may be stopped as soon as the measurements show that the K coefficient meets the requirements.

To avoid confusion as long as this contradiction is not removed from ATP, a comment is proposed as follows:

"2.3.1 makes a reference to 2.1.1 to 2.2.9, where 2.1.4 defines the duration and makes a reference to 1.7.

1.7 defines the steady state period of at least 12 hours. It is understood that the test, described in 2.3.1 may be interrupted when the steady state is reached."

Comment A (changes in the K-coefficient during the service life):

The comment is considered to relate to 5.1, rather than to 2.

Comment 1 (B to be deleted) examples for errors:

The detected errors in the formulae should be corrected:

- the "e" of the first formula should be “ε” (epsilon);
- the epsilon in the second formula should be "em";
- in both formulae the "A" should be "S" and “θ” (theta) should be "T";
- the definitions of the symbols should be corrected accordingly.

Comment 2

- the following heading should be inserted: "Example of calculation (not taking into

account the calibration of the instruments).";

- "A" should be "S";

- the second indent should be replaced by: "The error of W does normally not exceed ± 1%."

- the third indent should read: "Temperature is measured with an absolute accuracy of ± 0.1 K.

The measurement of a temperature difference (Te - Ti) of the order of 20 K therefore gives an error of twice ± 0.5%, i.e. ± 1%.";

- the fourth indent should read: "The total error is therefore $\varepsilon = \pm \sqrt{0.0003} = \pm 0.017$ i.e. ± 1.7%. The maximum admissible error is em = ± 3%."

Comment 3 (a) is not regarded as helpful. However, for the time being no alternative was proposed.

Comment 3 (b)

The sentence starting with "If the..." was questioned: it was therefore placed between square brackets.

Comment 4

T and S should replace the symbols theta and A in the formula respectively, but foremost: the equation does not determine an error. Within the time limits of the WG it was not possible to produce an alternative.

Comment (former explanatory note) to 3.2.6

The "i" to be deleted. Because the relevance was not clear, the whole text was placed between square brackets, awaiting the outcome of a discussion in the IIR-D2 group. The Chairman offered to prepare a proposal and promised to send the basic document GE.11/R.103 to all participants of the IIR D2 Sub-Commission "test-engineers" group.

4.3.2

An error in the cited standards was detected: ISO 917 should read: ISO 971. Furthermore some delegates preferred a more general reference to ISO, EN, DIN, BS-standards (the NEN-standard is outdated anyway) or would like to see also the title or scope of the referenced standards added. This would however require a formal proposal to WP.11.

Comments to 5.3

0.4 should read 0.40; 0.7 should read 0.70. Also the unit (W/m^2) should be added wherever appropriate.

The chairman thought that the first paragraph was not giving any guidance and could therefore be deleted.

Second paragraph: "..Sections 5 and 6." instead of "..paragraphs 29 and 49."

Third paragraph: delete the last sentence.

The UK expert proposed to replace the third paragraph (ii) by the following: “Re-approval can be carried out either by a test station ensuring the maximum K-value for classes B,C, E and F is less than 0.40 W/m^2 and 0.70 W/m^2 for classes A and D or by fulfilling Sections 5 and 6.”

6.4

The title should not be written in italics.

The explanatory note should be deleted.

Explanatory note to 7

Although the French expert considered the note essential, it was agreed to delete it. Instead it was suggested to add the properties: “nature, blowing agent and thickness” in the footnotes to the test report (1).

Comment to item 8.1.2 (originally indicated as item 8)

Delete underlining.

The first sentence should be amended as follows: "The replacement of components of the thermal appliance does not constitute a material alteration, in as much as replacement components do not reduce the quality of the appliance performance."

The second sentence should be deleted.

Annex 1, Appendix 4

The Danish expert asked the UN-secretary to bring the Appendix in line with the agreed amendments elsewhere.

Annex 2

Comments to Annex 2: to be deleted.

Comments to Annex 2, Appendix 2

Comment 2 should be deleted;

Comment 3 should be renumbered as 2. It has to be checked if it still up to date or that in the meantime an EN standard on the subject has come into force. In any case "…less than 8 hours..” in the last sentence should read “…more than 8 hours…".

Page 61, footnote (1):

The remark: “The procedure will be defined.” can now be replaced by a reference to the following European Standards:

- EN 13485: Thermometer for measuring the air and product temperature for transport, storage and distribution of chilled, frozen, quick frozen foods and ice cream – tests, performance and suitability; and

- EN 13486: Temperature recorders and thermometers for transport, storage etc. – periodic verification.

Comments to Annex 2, Appendix 2

None of the comments were considered useful and should therefore be deleted.

_____