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The working group 1 did the following items:

1) Review and discussion of each change proposal allocated to working group 1 (Annex 1 provides list of these proposals). Working group used the output from TRANSSC30, TRANSSC 30 working groups, TRANSSC 27 and TRANSSC 28 as a basis to their discussions.
2) Document the views and recommendations of the working group on each proposal reviewed (see Annex 1). Working group provided this documentation on a form provided by the Secretariat and this document will submitted to plenary at to TRANSCE 31.

3) Propose new regulatory text, where necessary, in the document ‘SSR-6 draft text’ (see Annex 2)

4) Discuss proposals that identify a regulatory issue but did not include a proposed solution and propose a regulatory or advisory solution whenever possible (see Annex 1).

5) Identify any relationships between individual proposals (see Annex 1).

6) Consider if any of the consolidated/revised recommendations may be offered as a proposal for change to any of the associated transport Safety Guides (see Annex 1).

Further consideration is needed for the following proposals:

(a) Freight Container

- J/2015/31: amendment of Para 223 definition of “Freight container”
- CH/2015/02 and CH/2015/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Harmonization to UN | - Unclear consequences of introducing CSC to the definition of Freight Container concerning the use of large and small freight containers  
- Are there containers without CSC approvals?  
- Are small freight containers used, e.g. for air transport?  
- Different definition in the different regulations |

Because of the unclear consequences to add CSC to definition of “Freight container” (para 223) as proposed in J/2015/31, WG1 recommends to include the sentence to SSG-26 (para 223.2) as proposed in J/2015/24.

Distinction of Large Freight Container and Small Freight Container is only used in Class 7 (see the definition of Freight Container in UNOB). Clarification is required whether it is necessary or not.

(b) Large Surface Contaminated Object:

WG1 reviewed all proposals for Large Surface Contaminated Object and made recommendations in Annex 1

WG1 accept the concept of Large Surface Contaminated Object in general, but there are still two questions:
- In para 413(c)(iv), why is the fixed contamination not included for external surfaces?
- The accident transport condition is not defined for SCO-III.

For para. 832 a type code is necessary

(c) Special Arrangement:

WG1 discussed the UK proposal UK/2015/05. It is an Identified Problem to find better/other wording/definition for Special Arrangement.

UK will provide with the proposed text for TRANSSC31.

For the consideration of the safety significance, WG1 recommends as follows:

(a) Freight Container No
(b) Large Surface Contaminated Object Yes
(c) Special Arrangement No

Accepted 9
Accepted as modified 9
Further work required 11
Send to Plenary 1
Open \(\rightarrow\) to WG4 3
Total 33