Distr.: Restricted
12 October 2021

English only

Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics

Sixty-fourth session
Geneva, 20–22 October 2021
Agenda item 7
Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units

Outcomes from the informal pre-work on the Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (second meeting)

Submitted by the secretariat

I. Introduction

1. Informal pre-work to the Group of Experts on the Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU Code) was undertaken during 2021 in accordance with decision of the Working Party on Intermodal Transport and Logistics (WP.24) at its sixty-third sessions (ECE/TRANS/WP.24/147, para 80) and further to the absence of the consideration towards the establishment of the Group of Experts by the Sectoral Advisory Bodies of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) at their fourth seating on 13–15 January 2021.

2. During the 2021 informal pre-work, two informal meetings were expected to be organized. They took place respectively on 27 and 28 May 2021 and 29 and 30 September 2021.

3. This document contains the outcomes of discussion at the second informal meeting

4. WP.24 is invited to consider outcomes of the second meeting alongside the conclusions from the first meeting as available in ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2021/11

II. Outcomes from the informal pre-work (second meeting)

A. Updates to the CTU Code

5. At the first informal meeting, participants had agreed on seven areas of elements/issues contained in the CTU Code to be explored further whether they should be prioritized for updates. At the second meeting, participants continued discussing on those issues.

6. Participants discussed on the Loading Guidelines for Combined Transport (Loading method 9.0) presented by UIC. Participants did not identify any specific updates which could be proposed to the CTU Code in this regard.

7. Participants further reviewed Informal document No.8 which was prepared by ETS Consulting and suggests guidance on package stability and building unit loads. Such guidance could be possibly included to the CTU Code in Annex 7 as its new section 3.2. Participants agreed the assurance of package stability and adequate building of unit loads was of fundamental importance to cargo safety. They agreed that guidance on this element should be prioritized for update in the CTU Code. At the same time, they found the text provided in document No.8 to be too detailed. They agreed the text be revisited for future consideration. The background information and the summary of standards should be removed. Focus should be given on the issues crucial to safety, ie. prioritize requirements on what needs to be done to ensure package stability.

8. Participants also reviewed Informal documents No. 4 and No. 9 submitted respectively by the Russian Federation and ETS Consulting to better address the transport of bulk cargo in the CTU Code and so proposing changes to Annex 7, clause 5.3 and new appendices. Participants agreed in discussion that before prioritizing this issue for update, the proposed text should be re-examined. The proponents were requested to work together, to remove unnecessary repetitions from the text.

9. Similarly, participants reviewed Informal documents No. 5 and No. 10 submitted respectively by the Russian Federation and ETS Consulting to better address in the CTU Code the transport of liquid material by providing changes to Annex 7, clause 5.2 and by adding new appendices. Participants agreed that transport of liquids had increased since CTU Code was last updated, thus this topic requires a better guidance to safe use of flexitanks in the CTU Code. The proponents were requested to work together to integrate their proposals for future consideration. The text should be reviewed to remove any unnecessary repetition. No support was given for inclusion in CTU Code of requirements for placing warning triangle for flexitanks on rooftop, side and front walls of a container.

10. Next, participants discussed Informal document No. 11 tabled by ETS Consulting, which proposes changes to chapter 4 and additional consequential changes to clarify information in the CTU Code on chains of responsibility and documentation. It was agreed that this document needs further consideration, in particular whose roles should be elaborated on and which important tasks were missing. WSC and ETS were requested to work together to develop a revised proposal for a future meeting.

11. Participants followed then with considering Informal document No. 7 prepared by IUMI with support of Mariterm AB. The document proposes adding guidance on bedding arrangements to the CTU Code by expanding clause 3.1.2 of Annex 7. Participants agreed this issue needs to be better integrated in the CTU Code and prioritized for update. The document should be however supplemented with more narratives to provide the necessary description and explanation to the tables which provide figures for (i) required length of bedding beams and their arrangement depending on cargo weight, (ii) minimum edge length of the wooden beam depending on cargo weight and its size, and (iii) minimum size of HEB steel beams depending on cargo weight and its size.

12. Participants also discussed pest contamination and Informal document No.12 tabled by ETS Consulting. In discussion, participants acknowledged the IPPC-led process in the Sea Container Task Force (SCTF) on pest contaminations. They agreed to wait for international guidance/recommendations from IPPC-SCTF before discussing this issue further and in particular how to prioritize it for update in the CTU Code.

13. Next, Informal document No.13 was discussed on blocking and rear-end securing submitted by ETS Consulting. The document proposes to expand further on clauses in Annex

7 addressing blocking and rear-end securing and to add a new appendix on fixing and fastening. Participants found the appendix too detailed to be included in the CTU Code itself. They further requested to review the text from the point of view of the information flow. Revised text should be considered in the future and possibly prioritized for update.

14. Participants exchanged views on which of the existing "Informative Material" (IM) should be considered for prioritization for updates in the CTU Code proper. It was agreed that:

- IUMI with support of Mariterm AB would consider IM 6 on Intermodal load distributions and make specific proposal for consideration at future meetings,
- IPPC and WSC when preparing in the future a proposal on additions to CTU Code proper on pest contamination would review IM 4 on Species of concern regarding recontamination and make suggestions as appropriate,
- ETS Consulting would review IM 1, IM 2 and IM 10 respectively on Consequences of improper packing procedures, on Typical documents related to transport, and on Testing CTUs for hazardous gases and make proposals as appropriate.

15. Participants further agreed that the other IMs should be maintained – for various reasons including simple process of their revision – in the existing format. They should be however considered, as appropriate, in inclusion in mobile application should such be developed in the future.

16. Participants also continued the discussion on the values of suggested acceleration coefficients as started at the previous meeting based on ECE/TRANS/WP.24/2020/8 and taking into account the additional information provided by the Russian Federation in Informal document No.6. Participants noted that:

- increasing the value of the coefficient from 0.5 to 1.0 or 1.19 tf/t in longitudinal direction would prevent full payload in a CTU, so such decision could only be taken based on precise scientific results,
- the coefficients have been determined for normal operations, and
- these values cannot take into account shunting.

17. At the same time, participants recognized the point of view of the Russian Federation and its request for an increased value for the railway gauge of 1520mm. Participants recommended to the Russian Federation to consider coefficient of 0.8 tf/t, for the 1520mm gauge to be included in the CTU Code ie. a coefficient that would be equal to the one for road transport.

18. With regard to the issue of determination of the blocking capacity of the dunnage bags other than based on bursting pressure, the Russian Federation proposed that information on maximum working loads for the dunnage bags be included in the CTU Code. Participants requested the Russian Federation to prepare a specific text proposal on how to communicate to packers on the forces that dunnage bags can sustain. Such proposal would be then considered at future meetings to agree whether such an addition should be prioritized for update.

19. Participants agreed then that specific proposals should be made with regard to:

- Changes to clause 2.4.4 of Annex 7 in case pre-tension for lashing can be understood differently than up to 50 % of maximum securing load (MSL),
- Assessment tests other than inclination test proposed for evaluating suitability of a specific securing arrangement on their usefulness, and

- List for cargo types that require different than 150mm void space in any horizontal direction

20. Secretariat was requested to work with volunteers to prepare such proposals.

21. Participants agreed – pending the decision of WP.24 on the continuation of work on the CTU Code – that the inputs, further revisited as per suggestions made at this meeting, be considered at future meetings for better determination for updates of the CTU Code.

22. Moreover, at the WSC's suggestion regarding challenges with temporary storage and consolidation at warehouses and various supply chains problems and resulting delays in cargo transport flows, participants agreed to discuss at future meeting safe warehousing, and stabilization of dangerous goods for transport, with the view to understand if these issues should be prioritized for update in the CTU Code. ICHCA and WSC were invited to prepare a document on temporary storage and consolidation in warehouses, and WSC on the challenges faced with delays in the transport of dangerous goods that are being stabilized.

B. CTU Code mobile application

23. Discussion also continued on the possible usage of the CTU Code in the mobile application.

24. Lineas presented mobile applications developed and used in-house to manage freight train operations and train safe deployment. The presentation showed that the applications helped to increase efficiency in managing specific safety processes, improved communication among safety staff and evidence collection. To offer this added value they however need to be designed to well respond to procedures in place. This suggests that the CTU Code mobile application cannot be developed without the detailed knowledge of the content of the CTU Code proper as well as IMs and all the interlinkages within that content.

25. Participants discussed then Informal document No.3 which presents the CTU Code mobile application framework and was prepared by the ETS Consulting with support of the secretariat. The framework diagram gives an initial insight into the linkages in the CTU Code's content. The document also introduces icons which could be used in the mobile application to support text.

26. In the discussion, participants expressed different and sometimes conflicting views:

- the mobile application should be simple versus mobile application might not be helpful if not supported by an e-leaning program,

- simple application may not respond to the complex task of the safe packing of CTUs,

- content should be restricted to the CTU Code proper and IMs versus include references from other sources useful to frontline workers,

- application could be possibly developed in stages, starting small, while adding more complex functions later (data collection, e-learning).

27. Participants agreed then that a group of industry volunteers led by Brough Marine Limited would prepare for the future meeting a document which (i) describes challenges and possibilities to use the CTU Code by the frontline workers for packing CTUs and their transport, (ii) proposes the application's user functionalities to that end, and (iii) estimates costing for the development of these functionalities in the application.