

**PRINCIPAL MARKERS REPORT  
ROAD IRELAND  
MARCH 2018**

**CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT IN IRELAND**

**PRINCIPAL MARKER'S REPORT FORM**

**DANGEROUS GOODS SAFETY ADVISER EXAMINATION**

**SUBJECT:** ROAD

**EXAMINATION DATE:** 9<sup>th</sup> March 2018

**No Attempting Examination:** 45

**No Passing Examination:** 44

**% Pass Rate:** 97.78%

**Average Mark** 43.87

**A. General Comments**

A fine set of results especially considering the reduced performances overall on the other two papers. Congratulations to the seven candidates who scored 100%.

Candidates had a choice of four case studies. These concerned:

- the international transport of a dangerous goods waste stream from Ireland to mainland Europe
- the international transport of a solid substance in fixed tanks (road tankers)
- the domestic transport of a blasting explosives in portable tanks and packages
- the international transport of a dangerous good in large packagings.

24% of candidates chose the second. An equal 35.5% chose the third and fourth case studies with the balance choosing the first.

The average marks (out of 35) for the case studies were 31.00, 30.55, 29.13 and 32.94 respectively. Six of the candidates who scored 100% chose the fourth whilst the seventh chose the second. All of the average marks were higher than when similar case studies have been set.

As is my normal practice, I will just highlight below the major issues insofar as there are any concerning the second, third and fourth case studies.

I continue to remind candidates that if technical names are required after Proper Shipping Names, they must state that Special Provision (SP) 274 applies and give the complete suite of references to the Dangerous Goods List, Table A to discover that this SP applies to the UN

number concerned, chapter 3.3 to find out what it means and 3.1.2.8.1 in chapter 3.1 for further explanation as to how SP 274 is to be applied.

Candidates should note that the “forwarding” country is where a consignment originates and the country to where the goods are forwarded is the destination. Some thought that the forwarding country is the country of destination.

## **B. Comments on Individual Questions**

*Please make comments as appropriate for each question.*

### **Case Study 1A**

I view of the small number who took this case study (2) I will refrain from making any comments on the performances of the t Both are usually required but some candidate failed to give one or the other.

### **Case Study 1B**

One of the questions concerned how the transport document for the outbound laden road tanker could be used for the return journey. I wanted candidates to say that the quantity should be struck out and replaced by the words “EMPTY, UNCLEANED, RETURN”. Not everyone worked their way through all the options to reach this one.

Road tankers are subject to periodic inspections every six years, not every five years.

### **Case Study 1C**

Question 1C (d) proved difficult for some candidates. The answer lay in the table at 7.5.5.2.1, Chapter 7.5.

Candidates should remember that the compatibility group letter for explosives must appear on placards. 36% of candidates who took this case study missed this point when answering a question about placarding.

### **Case Study 1D**

A few candidates, strangely, thought that the double-arrow orientation mark is needed on large packagings.

Some others forgot to tell me that the dangerous goods marks and labels should be on two opposite sides of large packagings.

One or two candidate thought that orange-coloured marking plates are placards and gave me the dimensions for placards instead of orange plates.

## **The Part B Questions**

Question 2: This was a question concerning whether a substance carried in tanks counted as a High Consequence Dangerous Good for which a security plan had to be prepared and

implemented according to the provisions of Chapter 1.10 of the ADR. One or two candidates attempted this incorrectly from the small load exemptions of 1.1.3.6.3. Some candidates thought that the 3000 litre limit was the maximum which needed to be carried to require such plans and that any quantity carried above this was out of scope of the need for such plans!

Question 3: This was a question about DGSA annual reports, validity period for DGSA certificates and under whom the DGSA is required to act. Most got the first two parts of this question correct but some were foxed by the last part. The answer is “under the responsibility of the head of the undertaking” as it says in the first line of 1.8.3.2. The implication for me of these words is that the DGSA should report directly to the CEO who, in turn, should be involved in directing the DGSA’s activities. I often wonder how many CEOs could do this and whether they have had suitable training about it all?

Question 4: In this three part question candidates were asked about the carriage of passengers, use of e-cigarettes and running vehicle engines. It was well answered on the whole.

Question 5: The final question concerned the exemption in ADR for the transport of machinery which happens to contain dangerous goods. Most candidates provided a correct answer from 1.1.3.1 (b). A few candidates attempted an answer from 1.1.3.3 which was incorrect as this concerns the fuel of the vehicle which would have been carrying the machinery. A few others thought it concerned an exemption in the domestic regulations for so-called “wet lines” which was also incorrect on this occasion.

**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: 10.04.2018

Roadreport/dgsa