

**PRINCIPAL MARKER REPORT
ROAD IRELAND
NOVEMBER 2018**

CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT IN IRELAND

PRINCIPAL MARKER'S REPORT FORM

DANGEROUS GOODS SAFETY ADVISER EXAMINATION

SUBJECT: ROAD

PART TWO – COMMENTS MAY BE CIRCULATED

No Attempting Examination:	40
No Passing Examination:	34
% Pass Rate:	85.00%
Average Mark	39.40

A. General Comments

A reasonable set of result. No one quite achieved a perfect score though 20% of candidates achieved 90% or more.

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

- the domestic carriage of LPG gas bottles and heating oil in road tankers
- the international transport a corrosive and toxic substance in RID/ADR tank-containers
- the international transport of a dangerous good in IBCs
- the domestic transport of a self-reactive substance of Class 4.1

Just 5% of candidates chose the first and last case studies. 22.5% of candidates chose the second. No less than 67.5% of candidates chose the third.

The average marks (out of 35) for the case studies were 28.00, 25.56, 27.30 and 21.50 respectively.

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 will not comment on the performances of the first or fourth case study as there are so few takers of it.

Candidates should make themselves aware of the method prescribed in the ADR for the use of the outgoing transport document for allowing its use for the return of the containment system concerned empty unclean i.e. what it says at 5.4.1.1.6.2.3. Trainers, please take note.

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 I will refrain from making any comments on the performances of the candidates who took this case study.

Case Study 1B

One or two candidates mixed up RID/ADR tank-containers (subject to the provisions of Chapters 4.3 and 6.8 of ADR) with UN multimodal portable tanks (subject to the provisions of Chapters 4.2 and 6.7 of ADR).

Candidates were asked to give the meaning of the term ⁽⁺⁾ in an RID/ADR tank code. A few candidates who took this case study could not do this – see 4.3.4.1.3.

78% of candidates who took this case study did not give the correct answer as to what can be done to the transport document for the outgoing load to be used for the return i.e. to strike out the quantity and insert instead the words “EMPTY UNCLEANED RETURN”. As mentioned above, I ask trainers to take note.

There was an extensive question on the required marking plates and placards for the RID/ADR tank-container itself and the marking plates for the vehicle carrying the tank-container. What I was particularly keen on was that candidates should reason out that if the option to put the Hazard Identification Number (HIN number) and UN number on the plates on the front and rear of the vehicle carrying the tank-container *which is an exemption in the ADR for tanks carrying just one dangerous good* was not suitable in this case as these details would not appear on the tank container when it is transferred to rail transport. No one worked this out and said that it would not be a good idea to use the exemption at 5.3.2.1.6. This is similar to the situation I have had in the past when similar questions have been set in the past. (There is a reminder about this, actually, in the RID though obviously I cannot ask ROAD mode candidates to know this.)

Candidates who did not state positively, i.e. drawing a conclusion that the transport document needed to be written in Dutch as well as one of the three official languages of the ADR lost a mark. I always want candidates to demonstrate that not only can they find the regulation which answers the question in these exams but can actually show they can apply that regulation in a positive manner.

The comments made about transfer from road to rail and the marking of carrying vehicles and UN portable tanks with orange plate markings are relevant here. Just one person took the transfer from road to rail into account in his/her solution and even then did not demonstrate a full grasp of the situation.

A few candidates gave the wrong HIN for the substance in the question, 268 instead of 886 or did not even give a HIN number.

78% of candidates, when asked for the dimensions of placards, did not say the class number in the lower corner should be in digits ≥ 25 mm. This dimension was wanted as well as the other two dimensions.

Case Study 1C

The largest proportion of candidates by far took this case study.

In the first part, candidates were asked among other things to say what marks and labels should be applied to the IBCs and where. Here I remind that there are requirements for “marks” and for “labels” in the ADR and that I expect candidates to know this. 22% of candidates who took this case study failed to tell me that the class label should be on two opposite sides. 29.5% of candidates did not tell me that the mark, the UN number, should also be placed on two opposite sides. I wanted a clear statement from candidates that both the UN number and the class label should be placed on opposite sides.

Candidates were asked whether the substance being transported in the IBCs counted as High Consequence Dangerous Goods (HCDG) according to the provisions of Chapter 1.10 of the ADR. As it happens, the substance did not qualify as a HCDG but 29.5% of candidates who took this case study said that it did and often gave a reason for their decision which bore no resemblance to the table of HCDG in Chapter 1.10.

Candidates were asked whether the IBCs could be transported on an open (flatbed) vehicle. This foxed most candidates. To do this, candidates were firstly required to consult Chapter 7.2 of ADR and then, as a precaution, to check in the Dangerous Goods List whether there were any Special Provisions for Carriage from the three columns covered by this heading which might have overruled the general permission in Chapter 7.2. No less than 59% of candidates who took this case study failed to mention that they had looked in Chapter 7.2.

When asked to show the information to be shown on an ADR transport document according to 5.4.1, two candidates gave a list instead of showing the details as they would actually have to appear on the document. Read the question!

There was a question about the options that a driver has where to leave his or her vehicle unattended i.e. the options given in Chapter 8.4. Candidates were specifically asked to relate their answers to the quantity in the load. What I wanted candidates to do is to establish that Special Provision for Carriage S20 applied to the substance in the question. This Special Provision triggers the application of Chapter 8.4 when more than 10000 kg was being carried which was the case. Those who did not approach the question this way lost marks.

18.5% of candidates did not give the width of the black border of orange plates and so lost marks when asked about the dimensions of these plates.

A final part of this case study asked what ADR says should be done in the case of the discovery of a spillage after unloading of a dangerous good. It required candidates to find what is said at 7.5.8.1 of ADR. Two candidates who took this case study could not attempt this question. I expected candidates to state this paragraph in full for all the allocated marks. 26% did not state in full and were penalised for this. I have to be fair to the majority who did take the trouble to quote 7.5.8.1 in full. A few gave an alternative answer from elsewhere in ADR.

Case Study 1D

In view of the small number who took this case study I will refrain from making any comments on the performances of the candidates who took this case study.

The Part B Questions

Question 1: This concerned the fixed penalty offences which can be imposed according to the CDGR. The answer was 500 euros. Most got it right but I would have liked candidates to say it was a No. 47 offence that was described in the question. 50% of candidates did not include this detail in their answers.

Question 3: This question concerned the subject matter to be covered in a tanks specialisation course for drivers. Most got it right though a few gave examples of the subject to be taught in a basic course which was not what was asked for.

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

Question 5: The final question was in two parts. The first concerned the use of fire extinguishers. It required candidates to look at the first page of the Instructions in Writing as described in 5.4.3 to find out when and where they could be used. The second part concerned the operation of the battery master switch. The answer was to be found in the same place. With respect to both these questions, 22.5% of candidates gave some other answer.

in 1.8.5.1 being any of the loader, filler, carrier, or consignee.

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