

**PRINCIPAL MARKERS REPORT
CORE IRELAND
MARCH 2018**

CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT IN IRELAND

PRINCIPAL MARKER'S REPORT FORM

DANGEROUS GOODS SAFETY ADVISER EXAMINATION

SUBJECT: CORE

EXAMINATION DATE: 9th March 2018

No Attempting Examination:	42
No Passing Examination:	36
% Pass Rate:	85.71%
Average Mark	37.56

A. General Comments

- The overall results are lower compared to when a similar set of questions was set, about 5% down on the pass rate and about 3 marks down on the average mark. I cannot easily account for this. Nevertheless, congratulations to the one candidate who scored 100%
- I say as ever, it seems that the way candidates should justify the addition of a technical name to Proper Shipping Names when Special Provision 274 applies with full referencing. Candidates must prove that a technical name is required by showing that this Special Provision applies to the UN Number/Proper Shipping Name concerned from the Dangerous Goods List, quote 3.3.1 from Chapter 3.3 where the meaning of this Special Provision is found and then quote 3.1.2.8.1 from Chapter 3.1 where the process of providing technical names is given in detail. Those who did not give full referencing, some not even giving any, for SP 274 lost marks.

B. Comments on Individual Questions

Please make comments as appropriate for each question.

- Q1. This was a two part question concerning the classification of a *solid* with two dangers. Most candidates got this right, i.e. using the Table of Precedence to show which of the dangers took precedence. In questions of this kind, I always look for clear evidence that candidates have used the data presented to them to reach their classification conclusions. Most did provide some justification. Some could be perfectly succinct in the process. I like demonstrations of logic of this kind.

It was in the second part that many candidates came adrift. Candidates were asked to provide a suitable Proper Shipping Name and UN number. The best fit was UN 2923 for CORROSIVE SOLID, TOXIC, N.O.S. which, because Special Provision 274 (SP)

applied had to be completed with a technical name in parenthesis. Most got this right. On the other hand, a few candidates among themselves chose seven incorrect UN numbers and Proper Shipping Names including some for liquids when the substance in the question was a solid.

A few chose the trade name instead of the technical name for inclusion in brackets after the main part of the Proper Shipping Name.

43% of candidates either did not realise that SP 274 applied and did not state anything at all about it or if they did they did not give all the required references (DG List, Chapter 3.3 and Chapter 3.1 references) – see the general comments above.

- Q2. In this question, in two parts, candidates were asked to give the definition for one of the types of substance of Class 4.1, the self-reactives and Class 6.2. Both parts were well answered on the whole.
- Q3. This was a two part question concerning whether one substance could be carried in UN multimodal portable tanks and another, a solid, could be transported in bulk using the newly installed requirements in the ADR for flexible bulk packagings. Most found the first part of the question to be of little difficulty. However that was not the case with the second part. I show below an image of a flexible bulk packaging as most DGSA's are unlikely ever to have seen one:



To answer the second part of the question candidates had specifically to say that the code “BK3” applied to the substance in the question thereby authorising the use of these flexible bulk packagings. 31% of candidates thought the question was about Intermediate Bulk Containers (IBCs) which was not the case.

- Q4 This question concerned the UN certification code of a multiwall paper bag. It was well

answered, too, on the whole. The letter “S” in a code can signify two things: that the packaging is approved for the transport of certain solid dangerous goods or for the transport of inner packagings containing dangerous goods. Both answers were needed but 21.5% of candidate left out the second possible meaning.

- Q5. This was a three part question on aerosol cans and Limited Quantities. In the first part, candidates were asked to give the class and classification code for the aerosols. Most gave the classification code of “5A” correctly though 14% of candidates left out the figure “5” from their answer.

In the second part, candidates were asked to justify why the aerosol cans could be transported as a Limited Quantity in shrink-wrapped trays. 14.0% of candidates gave the maximum permitted gross mass of the trays as 30 kg which is for boxes whereas the correct limit is 20 kg for trays.

The third part concerned the marking of the Limited Quantities trays. Several candidates showed that they did not understand the difference between a “mark” to be put on the trays and a “label” – trainers please note. Most candidates described the Limited Quantity mark pretty well including all the dimensions though a few either left out one or the other or both of the dimensions out of their answers (100 mm x 100 mm outer dimension and a minimum width of the border line joining the top and bottom halves of 2mm). Candidates were asked to say positively whether danger labels were required or not. No less than 31.5% of candidates either failed to address this part of the question.

A few candidates thought that the shrink-wrapped trays counted as overpacks which was not the case.

- Q6. The first part of question six concerned the level of fees payable for having a vehicle certified in accordance with Part 9 of ADR. Candidates had to use CDGRR to find their answer. 26% of candidates failed to attempt this first part of question 6.

The second part concerned whether EX/II explosive vehicles were subject to a particular part of Chapter 9.2. It merely called upon candidates to look in the table in Chapter 9.2, the reference for which was actually given in the table. Most got it right though 12% could attempt it.

- Q7. This was another question which seemed to stump many candidates. It concerned the use of UN certified Large Packagings for a dangerous goods waste. It required candidates to discover that Large Packing Instruction LP 01 applied to the substance concerned. 24% of candidates could not attempt it. Of those that did, 91.5% left out another key detail, the maximum permitted capacity of the Large Packaging i.e. 3m³ or three cubic metres.

- Q8. This was another case where the overall performance was unsatisfactory. It required candidates to give the significance of Special Provision 266 applied to UN 0114. Candidates were asked to be “as specific as you can in your answer”. What I meant by this was that I expected candidates to apply the provisions of SP 266 in their answers and tell me that the amount of water in this explosive must not be allowed to fall below 30%. This can be derived from the Proper Shipping Name column in the Dangerous Goods List. No less than 65% of candidates did not give me this specific detail.

Q9. Candidates were required to consult the table listing all the radioactive nuclides at 2.2.7.7.2.1 in the *last* column for *exempt consignments* where the solution 1×10^7 Becquerel per gram (Bq/g) could be found. I suspect 40% of candidates did not read the question properly as they gave the answer from the previous column of 1×10^3 Becquerel per gram (Bq/g), the column for *exempt material*. A further 19% of candidates could not attempt the question.

Q10. This question concerned the rules of precedence in 2.1.3.5.3. 31% of candidates could not attempt it. It was a question where the Table of Precedence could not be used. Nevertheless a further 24% of candidates attempted a solution in this way.

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: .09.04.18