



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
24 July 2019

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Inland Transport Committee

Working Party on the Transport of Perishable Foodstuffs

Seventy-fifth session

Geneva, 8-11 October 2019

Item 5 (b) of the provisional agenda

Proposal of amendments to the ATP: new proposals

Proposals improving test reports and ATP certificate of conformity

Transmitted by the Government of the Netherlands on behalf of the informal working group on on the improvements on the approval system of ATP equipment and thermal units

Introduction

1. The informal working group on the improvements on the approval system of ATP equipment and thermal units is working on issues that may improve the acceptance of approvals. A report of the informal group that outlines the discussions and the suggestions made to improve the system will be presented in a forthcoming informal document. In the working group detail improvements are concluded that will improve the acceptance of test reports and issue of ATP certificates at short notice.

Part 1

2. Consistent use of the terms “independent”, “non-independent” and “mains operated” in the regulation. In the French version “autonome”, “non autonome” and “raccordé à une installation centrale”

Proposal 1

In test report model No. 12 “Determination of effective refrigerating capacity of a refrigeration unit in accordance with section 4 of ATP Annex 1, Appendix 2” replace under the heading of “Category”:

“Self-contained/not self-contained” by “*Drive independent/dependent/mains operated¹*”.

Proposal 2

In line 6.1.2 of the “Model form of certificate of compliance of the equipment, as prescribed in Annex1, Appendix 1, paragraph 3” (English version only)

Replace “Not independent” by “dependent”.

Proposal 3

In the paragraph following the example of distinguishing marks in the first line replace “non-independent” by “*dependent*”.

Justification

3. In the regulation a difference is made between thermal appliances that can function independent of the movement of a vehicle of the running of the engine of the vehicle. This means that the supply, or sufficient supply, of heating or cooling during standstill of the vehicle is not guaranteed. The use of these terms is in particular in the English version not consistently applied leading to confusion.

Part 2

4. The notation of the exact date of manufacture results in problems with finding the information on the unit and if not filled in correctly refusal of the test report and delay in the issue of ATP certificates. There is no particular reason to be so precise.

Proposal 4

In test report model No. 12 “Determination of effective refrigerating capacity of a refrigeration unit in accordance with section 4 of ATP Annex 1, Appendix 2” replace under (a) Technical specification:

“Date of Manufacture” in “*Year of manufacture*”.

Justification

5. In all other test reports year of manufacture is used. It is felt that while in Report No 13 date of manufacture does not serve particular purpose and proves difficult to retrieve in all cases. Also, the manufactures plate in Annex 1, Appendix 1 paragraph 5 requires only month and year of construction but not the actual day-month-year.

Part 3

6. Detailed information concerning the condenser in Test report Model No. 13.

Proposal 5

Amend the first line of the table concerning “heat exchangers” to read as below:

	<i>Condenser</i>	<i>Evaporator</i>
<i>Make</i> ^{2/}		
<i>Type (if applicable)</i> ^{2/}		

Proposal 6

Replace the wording of foot note “2” at the end of test report Model No.12:

“2 Value indicated by the manufacturer” in “2 *information indicated by the manufacturer*”

Justification

7. Some information is just not available or possible to inspect due to the assembly when offered for a test. In many cases the condenser is fabricated by the unit manufacturer and is particular to the type and has no individual type name.
