

**PRINCIPAL MARKER REPORT
CORE IRELAND
NOVEMBER 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:	40
No Passing Examination:	36
% Pass Rate:	90.00%
Average Mark	40.97

A. General Comments

- A reasonable set of results. Congratulations to the single candidate who gained a 100% mark. The average mark is slightly higher compared to when a similar paper was set.
- I remind candidates that they should be clear in their minds as to what is meant by a “mark” to be affixed to packages and what is meant by a “label” to be affixed to packages and not get the two terms mixed up in their answers.
- Candidates should always remember the importance of the Special Provisions (SP) in Chapter 3.3 of the ADR including SP 163!
- I remind candidates that packing groups should always be written in Roman numerals (I, II, III) and never in Arabic style numbers.
- Candidates should always remember there are two quantity limits for Limited Quantities packagings – the maximum size of the inner packagings and the maximum permitted gross mass for the outer box or tray (30 kg, 20 kg respectively).

B. Comments on Individual Questions

Please make comments as appropriate for each question.

- Q1. This was a two part question on a substance with two dangers. In the first part candidates were asked to determine the main and subsidiary hazard and was well answered on the whole though I continue to remind candidates that they must show clearly in their solutions that they have handled data such as for acute toxicity or for corrosive effects on the skin competently. 22.5% of candidates did not do this adequately. I continue to reserve the right to deduct marks if this is not the case. I must have clear evidence that there is logic in the solutions being offered otherwise for how am I to know otherwise whether the solutions are just based on lucky guesses. A few did not mention that they had used the Table of Precedence to find their answers and risked losing marks accordingly.

A few candidates mistook the packing group for the toxic danger as PG II when it should have been PG III.

The second part stumped quite a few candidates (30%) who could not attempt it. What candidates had was to reason out that the subsidiary danger dropped out of classification because the substance had been diluted in water. A further 17.5% said that it remained classified as toxic for transport even though the LD₅₀ Oral Rat value dropped out of the range for Packing Group III.

- Q2. This question, also in two parts required candidates to state the class, UN number, classification code and Packing Group of a substance from the data provided. The substance was TURPENTINE SUBSTITUTE. Most candidates correctly determined the Packing Group. However, as for the UN number, this varied from UN 1263, and UN 1299 to UN 1993 when, in fact, the correct UN number was UN 1300. 25% of candidates got the wrong UN number.

The second part was a familiar by now (I hope!) question about Special Provision SP163. Those who spotted this saw the point of the question easily, it seems. However no less than 82.5% of candidates did not make this connection and either could not do it or gave some other erroneous solution.

- Q3. This question concerned the UN certification code for a UN certified large aluminium packaging. A key word in the answer was “rigid”. 15% of candidates left this word out from their answers.

Two candidates made the mistake of trying to answer the question from Chapter 6.1 which does not work instead of Chapter 6.6. One person thought that the country code was for the country of manufacture. Not true – it is the symbol in the code for the state authorising the mark. It may seem strange but a packaging could be tested in one country, the results given to the competent authority of another country for ratification and the issuing of the code and then that packaging to be manufactured in a third country!

- Q4. Candidates were asked to say to which class two substances and one article containing dangerous goods with certain properties should be allocated. The performances from candidates were generally good though some thought that the first substance was in Class

7 when the answer was Class 1. Similarly some thought the third substance was in Class 4.3 when the correct answer was Class 9.

- Q5. This was an extensive question on Limited Quantities. In the first part, candidates were asked to state the class and classification code of some aerosols. This was well answered though a 17.5% stated the classification code to be just “F” instead of “5F”.

In the second part, candidates were asked to say whether the aerosols could be packed as Limited Quantities in *trays* and, if so, to state the quantity limits. As far as the quantity limits are concerned, no less than 30% said that the limit for the gross mass of the trays was 30 kg and, of course, lost a mark as the answer should have been 20 kg. Another group, 15 % failed to mention any limit for the gross mass of the package at all. 27.5% of candidates omitted the maximum size permitted for Limited Quantities aerosols (other than toxic) of 1 litre.

The third part concerned the marks and labels (if any) to be affixed. Candidates, as usual, were asked to state positively that no labels are required for Limited Quantities packages. Those who did not make this statement (32.5%) lost a mark

A few thought that the trays counted as an overpack which is not the case.

40% of candidates omitted the dimension for the line linking the top and bottom halves of the Limited Quantities mark (>2 mm)

- Q6. Question 6 was a three part question on UN portable tank codes, ADR tank codes and special tank provisions. It was well answered on the whole.
- Q7. Question 7 concerned the meaning of one of the more complex Hazard Identification Numbers used on tanks. On previous occasions when questions of this kind have been set they have been well answered on the whole. Not so this time. I found that 20% of candidates could not attempt the question which was strange.
- Q8. This was a four-part question. The first part consisted of four sub-parts on the safety obligations of the participants in the distribution chain given in Chapter 1.4 and was well answered on the whole. A few put second, third or fourth part of this question down to the consignor instead of packer, carrier or unloader despite the wording of these subpart questions being taken straight out of ADR.
- Q9. Candidates were asked to explain the meaning of a term and an acronym used in the ADR. The meanings were in Chapter 1.2. It was well answered on the whole. A few could not establish who is the UIC.
- Q10. This question concerned the meaning of one of the compatibility letters used in Class 1. It presented hardly any difficulty to the majority of candidates.

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.