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Introduction

S1(6) of Chapter 8.5 states that the requirements of Chapter 8.4 shall be applicable only when substances and articles of Class 1 with a total net mass of more than 50 kg are carried in a vehicle. This is in Norway’s opinion not in line with the rationale behind the introduction of Chapter 1.10 on security provisions.

Norway is therefore of the opinion that WP.15 should take action to align Chapter 8.5 with the new requirements of Chapter 1.10.

Proposals

Change the text of the first paragraph of S1(6) of Chapter 8.5 as follows:

“(6) Supervision of vehicles
The requirements of Chapter 8.4 shall be applicable only when substances and articles of Class 1 having a total net mass of explosive substance of more than [5] kg are carried in a vehicle.”

The rest of the text remains unchanged.

Justification

As mentioned above, S1(6) of Chapter 8.5 states that the requirements of Chapter 8.4 shall be applicable only when substances and articles of Class 1 with a total net mass of more than 50 kg are carried in a vehicle.

Most explosives are regarded as high consequence dangerous goods under the new Chapter 1.10 on security in transport of dangerous goods, and the limit for these substances to be covered by the regulations for such goods under this regime in the ADR is 0 l/kg.

An amount of 50 kg of net explosives, as set in S1(6), is a very attractive cargo indeed for anyone with malicious intent. Even such an amount of small arms ammunition (approximately 3500 rounds .45 Magnum revolver cartridges or 15,000 rifle cartridges) would be a very attractive target.

Reducing it to “0” for all explosives will not be very practicable taking into account the need for small enterprises and hunters etc., and Norway is open for a discussion on a practicable lower limit much closer to the limits given in 1.10.5. The alternative to such a lower limit would be to list different limits for the various categories of explosives, which in our opinion would be too cumbersome.

Safety implications

The proposal will increase the safety level in transport of smaller amounts of explosives by lowering the risk of theft and other malicious acts, as well as increasing the security in transport of of explosives.
Feasibility

Most companies transporting explosives will already be covered by the regulations regarding security for high consequence dangerous goods in Chapter 1.10, and this change should only be a justification of their security plans.

Enforceability

Since most explosives are already covered by the provisions of Chapter 1.10, this proposal should not lead to any problems in enforceability beyond what are already present under the existing regulations.