

CHARTERED INSTITUTE OF LOGISTICS AND TRANSPORT IN IRELAND

PRINCIPAL MARKER'S REPORT FORM

DANGEROUS GOODS SAFETY ADVISER EXAMINATION

SUBJECT: PAPER 2

EXAMINATION DATE: 25th November 2020

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| No Attempting Examination: | 35 |
| No Passing Examination: | 27 |
| % Pass Rate: | 77.14% |
| Average Mark | 52.91 |

A. General Comments

- The pass rate at 77% is approximately 10% down on the last paper 2 exam which took place in March 2020, pre-COVID. This is in spite of some excellent performances on the case studies meaning that there is a much wider spread between the high achievers and the underachievers.
- One person successfully completed both case studies taken achieving a 100% pass.
- A further three candidates achieved a full pass on the first case study. Of the candidates choosing the second case study five achieved a full pass often just missing out on 100% across the two case studies.
- No one made it to a 100% pass on the third case study, the best being a score of 85%.
- It was pleasing to see so many achieving so well on all of the case studies in spite of the reduced average marks.
- Roundly 77% of candidates chose the second choice case study and 23% chose the third available case study.
- Pass marks barely varied between the three case studies, being 77% for the compulsory one and the second one, dropping to 75% pass mark by those taking the third case study.
- Average marks were 24.89, 27.64 and 26.13 respectively.

Candidates were asked to attempt a compulsory case study based on the domestic transport of LPG in bottles.

The second and third case studies, at choice, concerned either the transport of a solid Class 8 substance in Large Packaging's and the transport of a Class 5.1 solid substance in bulk.

As is normal, I will just comment on the main strengths and weaknesses shown by candidates in these three case studies.

As a general comment, candidates need to be better ware of the exemptions at 1.1.3.6.3 of the ADR for small consignments and to be able to recognise questions set about the application of these rules.

B. Comments on Individual Questions

Please make comments as appropriate for each question.

Case Study 1

In part (a) (i), candidates were asked to state the two, as it happens, Special Provisions for Carriage – Operations for three gases. This meant that column (19) of the Dangerous Goods List, Table A should be consulted. Many got off to a bad start by either listing the Special Provisions generally applicable in column (6) or the CV Special Provisions for Carriage – Loading, unloading and handling from column (18). 23% of candidates made the first of these mistakes and 17% made the second mistake.

Candidates were also asked to say what mixture of gases was represented in the question. The correct answer was A0 which you could get either from the graph at the end of Packing Instruction P200 or from e.g. the collective entries for Class 2 in 2F, 2.2.2.3 or ADR Special Provision 583. 26% of candidates could not attempt this last part if (a) whilst a further 17% chose the wrong one.

However it was in an extended part (b) of this case study that so many candidates came unstuck. In both parts candidates were required to recognise that the questions were about the small load exemptions based on the Transport Categories for the gas concerned and then to apply the exemptions for small loads at 1.3.6.3 of ADR. Those that recognised what the question was about exhibited little difficulty in working out the answer and collecting six valuable marks. However, 37% of candidates did not recognise the question for what it was and either could not attempt it at all or tried some other inappropriate method of solving the question.

Part (c) was also a six mark question concerning the preparation of the transport document for the load. In the first part, I wanted a list of all the items which should appear on a transport document and then to say why the name and addresses of the consignees could be left out and replaced by the term "Delivery Sale". Again, those who recognised what the question was all about scored heavily. 34% either could not do this subpart or gave some other inappropriate answer.

In part (g) candidates were asked what should be done when the carrying vehicle of the gases had to be substituted at short notice with a closed vehicle. I wanted candidates to discover that in such cases, the provisions of Special Provision for Carriage – Loading, unloading and handling CV36 should be applied, a warning about no ventilation. No less than 49% of candidates could not attempt this question.

There followed an extended question about fire extinguishers which was well answered on the whole though as the vehicle was a 7.5 tonner, only 8 kg of fire extinguishant was needed, not 12 kg as 23% of candidates suggested.

Case Study 2

Large Packaging's when filled have to be marked with the UN number (and any other relevant mark) as well as the class label, in this case a No. 8 corrosive label. Most got this part right but where candidates went wrong was in not explaining where the mark and the label had to be affixed i.e. on two opposite sides. 33% of candidates either did not explain this or if they did only said it about the UN number or the class label. I wanted a clear indication that both the mark and the label were to be shown on both sides.

In the following part, about the transport document for the load, one person put the main danger in brackets in the sequence of information whereas this is only required for any subsidiary danger otherwise, on the whole, both subparts were well answered including clear statements of in what languages the document should be issued.

A few candidates thought that the HIN number and UN number should be included in the orange plates – which is not a requirement when Large Packages are being carried.

Most worked out that as the Large Packages were being carried on a vehicle i.e. not in a freight container, the vehicles did not need to bear placards.

Case Study 3

This case study concerned the transport of a corrosive solid substance in bulk.

Thankfully hardly anyone made any mistakes about mixing up transport in bulk with transport in tanks as the definition of transport in bulk in Chapter 1.2 helpfully points out.

Most could work out that transport in bulk in a bulk container was allowed for the substance concerned.

The transport operation involved the transfer from road to rail for a part of the journey. This has implications for the marking and placarding of the bulk container. It meant that if the option at 5.3.2.1.6 to put the HIN and UN number on the orange plates on the front and rear of the carrying vehicle and to put no kind of orange plate, consequently, on the bulk container because it was only carrying one substance was not appropriate since when the bulk container was lifted off the carrying vehicle onto the rail wagon, there would no longer be any orange plates on

display. I wanted candidates to think this through and to recommend not to use this exemption on this occasion. None of the candidates who took this case study worked this out which is a pity.

All dimensions were required. A few did not give the dimensions for the digits which should appear on the orange plates – height and stroke thickness.

Whether load counted as a High Consequence Dangerous Good (HCDG) for security purposes foxed a few candidates who did not recognise the question, I think, as being about Chapter 1.10 or said erroneously that yes it did count as a HCDG.

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.