



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
24 July 2012

Original: English

---

## Economic Commission for Europe

### Inland Transport Committee

#### Working Party on the Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs

##### Sixty-eighth session

Geneva, 22-25 October 2012

Item 5 (b) of the provisional agenda

##### Proposals of amendments to the ATP: New proposals

### Various ATP issues

#### Transmitted by the Government of the Netherlands

##### *Summary*

**Executive summary:** This document covers a number of different issues originating from Annex 1 and its appendices. The issues deal with provisions which may be seen as incomplete or obsolete. The intention is that a decision is taken on the principle of the proposals in this document. Detailed proposals based on those decisions may be submitted to future sessions of WP.11 or be integrated in a revision document for Annex 1.

**Action to be taken:** Decision in principle.

**Related documents:** -

1. During drafting for the revision of annex 1, appendix 1, the following issues emerged. WP.11 is asked to take a position on these issues.

#### **I. ATP certification plate – authentication of the plate**

2. No provisions are included in ATP to ensure that the information given on an ATP certification plate is correct and applicable for the equipment to which it is fitted. Based on the provisions in ATP anyone can manufacture and fit an ATP certification plate to equipment as long as it complies with annex 1, appendix 3, Part B. However, if the plate is fitted the ATP certification plate “shall be recognized as equivalent to an ATP certificate” (annex 1, appendix 1 paragraph 3). In other words, the ATP certificate of approval need not

be presented during carriage. While for the ATP certificate of approval measures have been agreed to prove its authenticity, no measures are foreseen to prove the authenticity of the ATP certification plate.

3. It is proposed to include measures to prove the authenticity of the ATP certification plate, i.e. stamp marking by an authority, or to include the possibility for the control authority to ask for a photocopy, fax or digital image of the ATP certificate of approval.

## **II. ATP certification plate – removal of plate after validity has expired**

4. On the ATP certification plate the expiry date of approval is marked in an unambiguous way. Removal of the plate after expiry of validity leads to loss of information for future extension of the approval and possible damage to the insulated body.

5. It is proposed to delete the provision (annex 1, appendix 1, paragraph 3, last sentence) so that the plate need not be removed after the validity has expired.

## **III. Distinguishing marks – location on the body**

6. According to annex 1, appendix 4 the location of the distinguishing marks is described as "on both sides in the upper corners near the front". For road vehicles, the front can be related to the normal direction of travel. However, for rail wagons, swap bodies and containers this is not obvious.

7. It is proposed to modify the text so that the front upper corners should be used on insulated bodies on vehicles and in other cases just the upper corners of the sides of the bodies.

## **IV. Distinguishing marks – clarification of expiry marks**

8. Expiry marks consist of cyphers indicating the month and year of expiry. In cases when the validity date has passed, users less familiar with ATP may have the impression that this date is the actual approval date and that the approval is still valid.

9. It is proposed to introduce an additional marking "Valid until" before the marking of the month and year. A transitional measure will be necessary to allow existing equipment to be used unchanged until the next periodic check.

## **V. Distinguishing marks – removal in case "equipment ceases to comply with the standards"**

10. Annex 1, appendix 1, paragraph 4 prescribes that markings shall be removed when "equipment ceases to comply with the standards". The standards are given in annex 1 but do not contain provisions regarding periodic checks. As long as it is not proven that the standards are not met, the markings may be allowed to be displayed even if expired.

11. It is proposed to amend the wording in such a way that the markings shall be removed if, during the period of validity, the equipment is no longer fit for use, for instance after an accident. In combination with the adoption of the proposal in IV, markings need not be removed after validity expires. If the proposal in IV is not supported, a note is suggested to remind users that all markings shall be removed at the same time, not leaving the classification mark standing alone.

## **VI. Definition of type – condition of being from the same manufacturer**

12. In Annex 1, appendix 1, paragraph 6 (c) conditions are given to determine if a produced unit can be regarded as of the same type as the (type) tested unit. However, the condition that the equipment should be constructed by the same manufacturer is missing. The quality of construction of insulated bodies can vary even between assembly plants of the same manufacturer.

13. It is proposed to include a new condition in annex 1, appendix 1, paragraph 6 (c) (i) to read "the insulated body shall be constructed by the same manufacturer."

## **VII. Definition of type – conditions for determining a type of mechanically refrigerated thermal appliance**

14. Mechanically refrigerated thermal appliances are allowed to be approved separately from the insulated body. However, no conditions are included in annex 1, appendix 1, paragraph 6 (c) to determine if a produced appliance can be regarded as belonging to a tested type. For example, if the unit works on another type of refrigerant the proven capacities of the type tested unit may not be delivered.

15. It is proposed to include conditions in annex 1, appendix 1, paragraph 6 (c) to determine whether a produced appliance can be regarded as belonging to a type tested unit.

## **VIII. Testing of insulated bodies – 1% rule for bodies in use with one owner**

16. Annex 1, appendix 2, 5.3 (iii) provides the option of testing at least 1% of units of the same type of equipment belonging to the same owner. If the test results are acceptable "all the equipment in question may be kept in service as insulating equipment of its original class for a further period of six years".

17. The assumption may be made that units belonging to the same owner will be used and treated in the same way, resulting in comparable ageing. However, if the owner is a rental organization for example, the ageing may be very different between the units. The owner may select a sample for the test which is well preserved or with the most favourable dimensions and accessories within the type or the latest delivered unit of the series.

18. It is proposed to delete this option.

## **IX. Testing of mechanically refrigerated thermal appliances - 1% rule for equipment in use with one owner**

19. An identical procedure as mentioned above in VIII is provided by annex 1, appendix 2, paragraph 6.5 (ii) for the periodic evaluation of the efficiency of the mechanical refrigeration appliance of the equipment. Equipment in this case is the combination of the insulated body and thermal appliance. The definition of type of equipment allows the use of thermal appliances of different manufacture and type on the body, as long as the capacity is equal or higher. Testing 1% of the mechanical refrigeration appliances belonging to the same type of "equipment" may not prove compliance if the brand or type of thermal appliance of the other units of equipment in the series is different.

20. It is proposed to delete this option.