
Economic Commission for Europe**Inland Transport Committee**

4 October 2019

Working Party on the Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs

English

Seventy-fifth session

Geneva, 8-11 October 2019

Item 4 (e) of the provisional agenda

**Status and implementation of the Agreement on the International Carriage of Perishable Foodstuffs and on the Special Equipment to be Used for such Carriage (ATP):
exchange of good practices for better implementation of ATP**

Progress report of the informal working group on improvements to the approval system of ATP equipment and thermal units.**Introduction**

The informal working group met for a second session on 16 and 17 January in Brussels, Belgium and a third session on 23 May in Olching, Germany under a mandate from the WP.11. The second session was attended by representatives of 6 contracting parties and Transfrigoroute International, the third session was attended by representatives of 5 contracting parties and Transfrigoroute International.

General

It was recognized that in some contracting parties the issue of a type approval for equipment was seen as a right of the country in which equipment was to be registered or recorded. This would mean that the most efficient option to be achieved, that a type approval issued (based on a test report) by the competent authority of one contracting party that would be accepted by the other contracting parties, would not be feasible.

However, whether that this most efficient option would not be feasible at this moment, the system could be improved to make it more efficient. It was decided to limit work to two or three issues at a time. During the IIR D2 –CERTE- meeting on 24 to 25 April in Wageningen, Netherlands it became obvious that significant issues existed in test reports that hindered acceptance when equipment would be transferred to another country.

Guidelines versus ATP handbook

It was suggested that the annexes to the treaty should contain the outline of the requirements. The more detailed information, that may require regular updates, should be placed elsewhere. The ATP handbook would be the most suitable place for this. However the ATP handbook seems to develop from limited comments to page long additional sections, that make the handbook less easy to read. In other Working Parties of the UNECE guidelines are used to explain a specific issue (see: http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/trans/danger/publi/adr/guidelines/Consolidated_table_of_the_applicable_provisions_of_Part_9_of_ADR-ENG.pdf). It was decided by the working group to suggested this way of working to the WP.11.

Appointment of testing stations

As suggested in the report of the first session, to introduce definitions of testing stations being test laboratories and others performing periodic inspection, was not seen as necessary after a

re-reading of article 1 of Annex 1, Appendix 1. It is clear that “testing stations” as used in this article are always test laboratories, other periodic tests as described in sections 5 and 6 of Annex 1, Appendix 2 were allowed to be done by appointed experts in the country of registration or recording of the equipment.

However the suggestion of the previous session to improve the information on the particular capabilities of testing stations was supported again. The table as given in annex 2 of the report of the first session was further improved with additional columns for particular duties. It was also proposed to add an additional table with information per contracting party where transporters could apply for a periodic check of equipment. In case countries have a website containing this information just a link to this website in the table would be sufficient. Samples of the tables are attached in Annex 1 to this report.

Accreditation to ISO 17025 was felt to be appropriate for testing stations but it was also recognized that this was not always possible. Including the basic requirements that apply to accreditation in the regulation itself was not supported. Also a system of a check by WP.11 on testing stations that are intended to be notified on the list of the UNECE was also not supported, but the organization of a round robin as a peer review was mentioned as highly recommended.

Information required for type approval and issue of the ATP certificate

It was confirmed that the detail of information required by testing station to perform a type test would exceed that of the competent issuing an ATP certificate. The detail of information would also exceed the information required today in the various test reports. Part of the detailed information could be intellectual property of the manufacturer that should be treated as confidential.

To harmonize the information requirement for testing stations it was suggested that the IIR/IIF D2 CERTE Meeting would be the appropriate place to develop a more elaborate level of detail of information required for the various test in the agreement. Also the information need of a competent authority issuing an ATP certificate should be harmonized and completed to prevent delays in the issuance of the certificate.

At this moment the test report is given to the applicant for an ATP certificate which in many cases is the carrier. An option would be to have a basic information document and that if necessary information should be asked directly to the testing station performing the test.

Supervision of manufacturer.

As time allowed there was a short exchange of views on the supervision of manufacturers. The suggestion that an ISO 9001 certification should be sufficient was not supported by most of the participants. It was felt that an ISO 9001 system would be a benefit but that a specific audit should be performed by auditors that have particular knowledge, in principle this would be test engineers that normally perform the tests as they would be able to spot the particular problems in the procedures and the way construction and control was performed. A detailed list of items to be checked was not supported as this would limit the time spend on problematic areas at a manufacturer.

Harmonization of test reports.

A number of issues surfaced during the CERTE Meeting end of April and at which time it was decided to have a third session for which TUV SUD kindly hosted the meeting. To aid the discussion a table with topics was presented by the representative of Germany. The following issues were addressed:

* Thermal Units of the same type – wording is missing in Annex 1, Appendix 1 article 6 to describe when units are of the same type, and to prevent retesting of units (2019/4 by Germany).

* Self-contained versus independent – In test report no 12 “Self-contained” is used instead of “Independent” in the other places in the annexes, this may lead to confusion (see 2019/22 UK and 2019/16).* A definition of thermal appliance was recommended (see 2019/2 by Germany).

* Date of manufacture in test report should be modified in Year of construction to be in line with other test reports (see 2019/16).

* The use of the word “Mark” in the ATP certificate of Annex 1. Appendix 3 should be “Make” (see 2019/19 and 2019/16).

It was discussed if the number of cylinders and the information on the evaporator, such as surface could be checked by the testing station. These questions should be forwarded to the next CERTE meeting.

---CdP---

Annex 1

Example of an overview of testing station and the competences

For the purpose of this table testing station means a facility that has, or has by contract assess to a conditioned test climatic chamber and is able to perform tasks and interpret the results of the particular test given in the table and defined in Annex 1 Appendix 2. Accreditation is recommended where possible. Where "CAA" is stated the testing station is approved and under supervision by the competent authority.

Testing station (name and address)	K-Value test Road equipment and containers	K-Value test rail wagons	K-Value tests tanks	K-value tanks with more than 2 compartments	Calculation multi temp bodies	Mech refrigerating unit Liquid fuel/electric	Mech Multi temp unit liquid fuel/electric	Mech refrigerating unit with gaseous fuels /electric	Liquefied gas unit	Heating unit	Approval
Azerbaijan											
The example laboratory, invented street 99, Somewhere, Far-away	X		X			x			X		Accreditation No xx-yy-2019
											CAA

Example of an overview of experts and the competences

For the purpose of this table periodical inspection body means an expert (facility or organisation) appointed by the competent authority of the country in which the equipment is registered or recorded for the checks, inspection or verifications as defined in Annex 1, Appendix 2 part 5 and 6.

Inspection body (name and address)	Checking of insulation capacity of equipment in	Verification of effectiveness of thermal appliances	Mechanically Refrigerated	Multi temp units	Liquefied gas systems	Eutectic systems					Approval
Azerbaijan											
The expert/inspection body, invented street 99, Somewhere, Far-away	X		X			x					Accreditation No xx-yy-2019
											CAA