

**PRINCIPAL MARKERS REPORT
CORE IRELAND
JULY 2018**

CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT IN IRELAND

PRINCIPAL MARKER'S REPORT FORM

DANGEROUS GOODS SAFETY ADVISER EXAMINATION

SUBJECT: CORE

PART TWO – COMMENTS MAY BE CIRCULATED

No Attempting Examination:	35
No Passing Examination:	32
% Pass Rate:	91.43%
Average Mark	41.74

A. General Comments

- A fine set of results. Congratulations to the four candidates who scored 100%.
- I remind candidates that in answering classification questions if they do not show in a positive way how they have handled the chemical data in any given question they may lose marks.
- It would be nice if candidates would put in the full stop after “S” in “N.O.S.”

B. Comments on Individual Questions

Please make comments as appropriate for each question.

Q1. This question required candidates to complete a grid of with some missing details about certain substances. Hardly anyone had any problems with it.

Q2. This was a question in two parts. In the first part candidates were asked to classify a flammable liquid with toxic properties as well. Most got it right. However 37% of candidates were to a lesser or greater degree at fault in not showing clearly how they handled the chemical data in this question. A few thought that for the corrosivity danger, class 8, packing group II applied when it should have been packing group III. This affected the use of the Table of Precedence and the subsequent part of this question.

In the second part, candidates were asked to choose a Proper Shipping Name and corresponding UN number. I expected candidates to choose an N.O.S. name requiring completion with a technical name in brackets because Special Provision 274 applied. Though I go on and on about this, no less than 54% of candidates did not apply this correctly. Remember, candidates must firstly determine that this Special Provision applies from consulting the UN number concerned in The Dangerous Goods List then mention 3.3.1 in Chapter 3.3 where Special Provision 274 is

explained and then proceeding to 3.2.8.1 in Chapter 3.1 for further information on how to add the technical name when required by this Special Provision. I urge trainers to explain fully to their trainees how to justify the addition of technical names after Proper Shipping Names where this is required.

Q3. In this question, candidates were asked to decode a UN certification code for an aluminium drum. 14% of candidates gave the wrong answer for the “250” detail in the code, stating that this was the maximum gross mass for which it had been tested. The packaging was clearly approved to transport liquids so that this datum represented the hydraulic test pressure.

Q4. This question was in two parts and was based on one of the regulations in the domestic regulations. In part one, candidates were asked to say whether by a derogation from the ADR, transfer of dangerous goods between two sites of private premises was allowed without applying ADR and if so under what conditions. Those that realised this was a CDGRR question got it right. However 48.5% of candidates tried to find an answer from ADR which in this case did not work. In addition a further 23% of candidates could. Overall the question was not well answered.

Q5. In this question candidates were asked to state any three documents which would have to be present on a vehicle during a journey from Germany to Ireland *all the way through* i.e. after completing the sea leg of the journey. One person stated the annual vehicle approval certificate which, of course, is not required for packaged goods vehicles (except for Class 1). The bigger error made by 28.5% of candidates was made by those who suggested that the Vehicle Packing Certificate was one of the documents. Not so. This is only required by ADR to be present as far the *port of departure* as the IMDG Code would require this to be given to the shipping line to retain (and show to the ship’s master).

Q6. This question was in four parts. The first part concerned intervals between periodic inspections and tests for fixed tanks i.e. one of the kinds of tanks subject to the provisions of Chapter 6.8 of the ADR. The term “fixed tank” means a road tanker in common parlance. Most got it right, i.e. six years though a few said five years which is the answer for either RID/ADR tank-containers of UN portable tanks.

In the second part, candidates were asked about the intervals between periodic inspections and tests for UN portable tanks. Most got this right, too, i.e. five years though some went for 2.5 years, the interval for intermediate periodic inspections and tests.

Candidates were then asked about whether a substance was permitted to be transported in RID/ADR tank-containers. Most also got this right, identifying the code LGBF as allowing this. A similar question was asked in the last part of this question about whether a specified substance could be carried in UN portable tanks. Most also got this right, mentioning that, depending on the packing group, either T4 or T7 allowed transport in UN portable tanks.

NB: RID/ADR tank-containers are not the same as UN portable tanks though many seen in Europe have dual approvals as both UN portable tanks and RID/ADR tank-containers. There are several important differences in the rules for their design and construction.

Q7. This was about the Limited Quantities allowances for a particular dangerous good. It was well answered on the whole though one or two candidates tried to answer the question from the Excepted Quantities rules which was not possible in the way the question was put to candidates.

Q8. This question concerned the training requirements for staff mentioned in Chapter 1.3. 17% of candidates attempted the question from the DGSA duties section of Chapter 1.8 or even could not attempt it (a further 14%). That important chapter in the ADR, chapter 1.3 should not be overlooked by candidates.

Q9. Candidates were asked for the number of ADR subdivisions and hazard groups in Class 2 in this two-part question though one or two drifted off into the 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 divisions (not subdivisions) of this class. It was well answered on the whole.

Q10. Finally candidates were asked to state the placards required on a freight container on an ADR journey for a particular substance. It was also well answered on the whole.

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.