EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Explosives classified under classification code 1.4S are recognized to constitute a low risk compared to other dangerous goods of both Class 1 and other classes. Therefore, for a long time, it has been possible to carry these substances and articles in unlimited amounts in accordance with ADR 1.1.3.6 / marginal 10 011. This means, amongst other things, that there is no requirement for using an EX/II or EX/III vehicle. Nevertheless, in Chapter 3, Table A, in column (16), the provision “V2” is put against all 1.4S entries. This does not make sense in the opinion of the expert from Norway.

Action: Delete “V2” from all 1.4S entries in Table A of Chapter 3.2.

Related documents: None.

INTRODUCTION

It is commonly recognized that substances and articles of Class 1, classification code 1.4S constitute a low risk compared to other dangerous goods of Class 1. Nevertheless, in Chapter 3, Table A, in column (16) the provision “V2” is put against all 1.4S entries. This provision requires the use of EX/II or EX/III approved vehicles. In the opinion of the expert from Norway, this makes no sense since these substances and articles are deemed as belonging to Transport Category 4 in 1.1.3.6.3 and thus, due to their recognized low risk, may be carried in unlimited quantities on vehicles not approved as EX/II or EX/III according to Part 9.
Proposal

For all 1.4S entries in Chapter 3.2, Table A, in column (16), delete “V2”;

(UN 0012, 0014, 0044, 0055, 0070, 0105, 0110, 0131, 0173, 0174, 0193, 0323, 0337, 0345, 0349, 0366, 0367, 0368, 0373, 0376, 0384, 0404, 0405, 0432, 0441, 0445, 0454, 0455, 0456, 0460, 0481 and 0500).

Justification

As stated above, there is an inconsistency between the requirement in Table A for using EX/II or EX/III vehicles while 1.1.3.6 allows unlimited amounts of 1.4S explosives transported on non approved vehicles. Taking into account, by definition, the low risk associated with explosives correctly classified as 1.4S (see 2.2.1.1.5 and 2.2.1.1.6), the only logical step is to delete the “V2” from column (16) of Table A.

Safety:

The change will not constitute any increased risk since the transport of these explosives is normally carried out under 1.1.3.6 anyway, unless they are carried together with other explosives requiring EX/II or EX/III vehicles.

Feasibility

The expert from Norway sees no administrative or economic consequences arising from this proposal, apart from removing yet another inconsistency that causes debate and sometimes practical problems for the transport industry.

Enforceability

The expert from Norway sees no problems in enforcement of this proposal. On the contrary, it will remove yet another inconsistency that causes debate and sometimes practical problems for the transport industry.