

# CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT IN IRELAND

## PRINCIPAL MARKER'S REPORT FORM

### DANGEROUS GOODS SAFETY ADVISER EXAMINATION

**SUBJECT:** CORE

**PRINCIPAL MARKER:**

**EXAMINATION DATE:** 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2017

<b>No Attempting Examination:</b>	51
<b>No Passing Examination:</b>	48
<b>% Pass Rate:</b>	94.12%
<b>Average Mark</b>	43.47

#### A. General Comments

- A fine set of results. Congratulations to the two candidates who scored 100%.
- Candidates should clearly understand the difference between “marks” which go on packages and “labels” which go on packages. The sign for Limited Quantities, for example, is not a “label” but a “mark”.

#### B. Comments on Individual Questions

*Please make comments as appropriate for each question.*

Q1. This was a short question requiring candidates to fill in a grid of two lines with the missing details such as the UN number, class and classification code. Virtually everyone got this right.

Q2. This was a two part question. In the first part candidates were asked to determine the primary class, the subsidiary class and packing group of a liquid described in the question. Most got it right though one or two could not attempt it or chose the wrong packing group.

In the second part candidates were asked to find a suitable Proper Shipping Name (PSN) and UN number for the liquid. Most chose the most appropriate PSN and UN number. However it was a PSN which required to be completed with a technical name in brackets because Special Provision 274 applies. I repeat for the umpteenth time that (a) candidates must not overlook this Special Provision in their answers and (b) to give the complete set of references for these situations i.e. the appropriate column of the Dangerous Goods List in Chapter 3.2, Chapter 3.3 where the basic meaning of this Special Provision is given and 3.1.2.8.1 in Chapter 3.1 where a full explanation of what is required is to be found. 41% of candidates made some mistake or other in connection with Special Provision 274 ranging from those who did not even mention it to those whose references were incomplete.

Q3 In this question, candidates were asked to decode a UN certification code for a gas cylinder. It was well answered on the whole though one or two could not attempt it or if they did tried an answer from Chapter 6.1 of the ADR which does not work.

Q4. In this question candidates were asked about the safety obligations of the participants [in the transport chain] set out in Chapter 1.4 of ADR. It, too, was well answered on the whole though one or two gave the answer packer or the DGSA where the answer consignor was required.

There was a second part to this question concerning the marking and labelling of the packages in the question. Many (35%) told me that the UN number was required to be marked on them but did not actually say what the UN number was (UN 1866). A few mistakenly opted for UN 1993 which on this occasion was not correct. 15.5% of candidates did not tell me that a No. 3 flammable liquid label was required.

Q5. In this question, candidate's knowledge of the rules for using IBCs was tested. It was in three parts. In the first part candidates were given the name and packing group of a substance and then asked to say whether a particular kind of IBC could be used. It required candidates to establish that IBC Packing Instruction IBC 08 applied and then to confirm that that several types of the IBCs in the question was allowed for the transport of the substance according to the type code which would appear in the full UN approval code. 55.5% of candidates did not go far enough with their answers. They typically said that the use of the type of IBC must be OK as there was an IBC Packing Instruction given in the Dangerous Goods List, Chapter 3.2 but did not list the types allowed. I wanted e.g. 11H1, 11H2 etc. Such candidates lost marks. After all they were invited to "explain your answer as fully as you can".

In the second part candidates were asked to state an additional condition applicable to the use of the IBCs. It meant candidates had to discover that Special Packing Provision for IBCs B3 applied and to state what B3 requires. This second part was well answered.

The third part was similar to the first part except that the packing group of the substance was changed to PGIII meaning that now IBC Packing Instruction IBC06 applied. Candidates were asked, as in the first part, to say whether a certain type of IBC was still allowed. Those who gave a full answer including examples of the type codes e.g. 21H1, 21H2 etc. gained all the marks. This time 53% of candidates did not go this far with their answers.

Q6. This was a short two-part question. In the first part candidates were asked about the intervals between periodic inspection and tests for UN portable tanks intended for liquids. Most got it correct. One person gave an incorrect reference based on the intervals for UN portable tanks intended for the transport of pressure liquefied gases (6.7.3 et sq.) and two persons attempted an answer from Chapter 6.8 of the ADR when they should have used Chapter 6.7.

In the third part, candidates were asked to use the UN portable tank hierarchy table to determine if a named higher specification UN portable tank could be used as a substitute for a lower one. It was well answered.

Q7. This was a relatively easy question about the allowances for Limited Quantities. One person tried the Excepted Quantities route which, had the question been studied carefully enough with respect to the provisions of Chapter 8.5 of the ADR was clearly inappropriate. 11.75% of

candidates could not attempt it whilst a few left out the second limitation for these packages i.e. that they must not weigh more than 30kg.

Q8. This question concerned the mandatory training requirements of Chapter 1.3 of the ADR which, in turn, is linked to the list of persons having safety obligations listed in Chapter 1.4. It was definitely not a question about the driver training provisions of Chapter 8.2 though 17.5% of candidates tried to answer from this chapter. Those who did this lost all the marks for this question.

Q9. This was a question about the number of ADR subdivisions for two classes of dangerous goods. It was well answered.

Q10. Finally candidates were asked to state what kind of placard should be put on a freight containers laden with a specified product and where the placards should be affixed. It was well answered in the main though three candidates did go on to say that Kemler plates would be needed which is not the case when packaged goods are being carried.

**C. Comments on Candidates' Performance (include identification of any gaps in knowledge\areas of weakness)**

Any comments appear above.

**D. Comments on the Marking Process**

None.

SIGNATURE: ..... DATE: 19.12.17

Core report/dgsa