Conclusions of the Transitional Arrangements TRANSSC Correspondence WG

The attached Resolution Table (see attachment 1) contains the results of the Correspondence WG based on inputs and comments from Canada, France, Germany, Japan and USA.

The proposed resolutions for the proposals have been agreed by all participants except for J/2015/21 and J/2015/30.

Concerning J/2015/21 and J/2015/30 the majority of the WG supported Option 1, which means rejection of the proposed change because a real need for it could not be demonstrated.

France supported the intention of the Japanese proposals but could neither provide a specific practical example to demonstrate its need (the example given by France about a non-updated safety report of a Type A package is not considered to be a relevant example for new transitional arrangements because a safety report of a Type A package should be updated if needed).

Japan expressed the intention to withdraw both Japanese proposals, but was also interested to have a final discussion about it.

In summary it is proposed to have a final discussion at the consultancy meeting in February before taking the decisions on J/2015/21 and J/2015/30. (I personally support option 1 because the need for these changes could not be demonstrated so far and such a change with references to other regulations would make these transitional arrangements unnecessarily complicated.)

In conjunction with USA/2015/20 the idea was brought up to delete the symbol “-96” (see Resolution Table), taking also into account that such a specific proposal for change was not submitted within the current revision cycle. Nevertheless this idea was supported by most of the WG members as well as further discussion about it during the consultancy meeting in February. A specific proposal concerning the deletion of the symbol “-96” is attached for review and discussion at the consultancy meeting (see attachment 2). If it is within the mandate and the role of this consultancy this new proposal should be considered and, if acceptable, decisions on further actions should be taken.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>SSR-6/SSG-26 Para/Line No.</th>
<th>Identified problem/Proposed new text</th>
<th>Reason/Description</th>
<th>Abbreviated Summary of Proposal</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>More discussion or justification required</th>
<th>Accept but modified as follows</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Clarification required</th>
<th>Reason for modification / rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| J/2015/21   | 819bis.1 and 819bis.2    | Packages not requiring competent authority approval of design under the 1996 and following Editions of these Regulations up to 2012 one 819bis. Packages not requiring competent authority approval of design (excepted packages, Type IP-1, Type IP-2, Type IP-3 and Type A packages) shall meet this Edition of these Regulations in full, except that packages that meet the requirements of the 1996 and following Editions of these Regulations may continue to be used provided that:  
   i) The activity limits and classification in Section IV of this Edition of these Regulations are applied;  
   ii) The requirements and controls for transport in Section V of this Edition of these Regulations are applied;  
   iii) In the case of UN Packagings, IBC’s, portable tanks and other tanks, used as IP-2 or IP-3, they conform to the UN Model regulations or Modal Regulations in force or are allowed to continue to be used by complying to transitional measures contained in those regulations;  
   iv) In the case of large freight containers used as IP-2 or IP-3, they conform to the ISO 1496/1 standard which was applicable at the time of their construction, excluding dimensions and rating. | [Freight Container] In order to introduce transitional arrangements in section VIII covering possible evolutions in the requirements for UN packagings, IBCs, tanks and ISO freight containers used as IP-2 and IP-3. The proposal covers also the case where, UN packagings, IBCs or tanks are used to comply with requirements made for the subsidiary risk. Guidance text is provided in J/2015/16 as paras 819bis.1 and 819bis.2. | Introduce transitional arrangements into SSR-6, and associated guidance text into SSG-26, covering possible changes in requirements for UN packagings, IBCs, tanks and ISO freight containers used as IP-2 and IP-3, covering the case where, UN packagings, IBCs or tanks are to be used to comply with requirements made for the subsidiary risk. | | | | | | |

**TRANSSC 30 WG 1.**

J/2015/21, and J/2015/30.

If a decision is made by TRANSSC 31 to issue a new revision it is recommended that a consultant meeting on the transitional arrangement...
## RESOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More discussion or justification required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

should be held post TRANSSC 31. Similar to USA/2015/17, USA/2015/18, USA/2015/19 and USA/2015/20.

### TRANSSC SEPTEMBER MEETING

Not discussed – await decision of TRANSSC 31 to initiate revision process

### TRANSSC CORRESPONDENCE WG

The proposal is understood in such a way that it is intended to introduce transitional provisions for IP-2 and IP-3 packages, which are designed to satisfy requirements of the UN Model Regulations or ISO Standard related to

- a) UN Model Regulations as specified in paras 626 – 628 and 630,
- b) Subsidiary risk (para. 507) and
- c) ISO 1496 Standard (para. 629).

For the resolution of this proposal 3 options are proposed:

**Option 1**

The first question is, if there is really a need for such additional transitional provisions in SSR-6? Is it not acceptable and easy to comply with if just the applicable requirements of the UN or ISO are met as they are? If such a need ca not be demonstrated SSR-6 need not to be changed.

Your thoughts on these questions are welcome and if possible specific examples to demonstrate the need would be very helpful.

### Option 2

If there is a need the following is proposed based on the Japanese proposal:

- **IP-2 and IP-3 packages designed to satisfy provision of the UN Model Regulations**
  
  819bis. IP-2 and IP-3 packages which are designed to satisfy provisions of the UN Model Regulations [10], as specified in paras 626, 627, 628 and 630, are also subject to transitional provisions of the UN Model Regulations [10].

- **Regarding the use of ISO standards**
  
  The reference in para. 629 points to the revision of the ISO standard of 1990 and all subsequent revisions. There is no identified need nor a technical basis for allowing earlier (before 1990) revisions of the ISO standard to be used. Therefore, no change to SSR-6 or SSG-26 is required regarding the ISO 1496 standard.

### Option 3

Instead of introducing new regulatory text in SSR-6 a similar text as shown above could be added to SSG-26 under a new para. 819.5 bis.
### RESOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/2015/30</td>
<td>SSG-26 Para. 819bis.1 Para. 819bis.2 (New)</td>
<td>819bis.1 While no significant changes affect non-approved package designs for radioactive material since the 1996 edition, changes may have occurred in the regulations or standards applicable for UN packages, IBC’s, tanks and freight containers in the period. Transitional arrangement was then needed to allow continuing the use of those receptacles when manufactured after 1996. 819bis.2 See also 819.4.</td>
<td>[Freight Container] In order to introduce transitional arrangements in section VIII covering possible evolutions in the requirements for UN packagings, IBCs, tanks and ISO freight containers used as IP-2 and IP-3. The proposal covers also the case where, UN packagings, IBCs or tanks are used to comply with requirements made for the subsidiary risk. See J/2015/06 for regulatory text change of para. 819bis proposed.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TRANSSC 30 WG
3/2015/21, and 3/2015/30. If a decision is made by TRANSSC 31 to issue a new revision it is recommended that a consultant meeting on the transitional arrangement should be held post TRANSSC 31.

X

TRANSSC SEPTEMBER MEETING
Not discussed – await decision of TRANSSC 31 to initiate revision process

X

TRANSSC CORRESPONDENCE WG
See above 3/2015/21
## RESOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA/2015/17</td>
<td>SSR-6 Para 820</td>
<td>Packages approved under the <a href="http://example.com">1973</a> <a href="http://example.com">1973</a> (As Amended) <a href="http://example.com">1973</a> (As Amended) Editions of these Regulations 820. Packages requiring competent authority approval of the design shall meet this Edition of these Regulations in full unless the following conditions are met: (a) The packages were manufactured to a package design approved by the competent authority under the provisions of the 1973 or 1973 (As Amended) or the 1985 or 1985 (As Amended) Editions of these Regulations. (b) The package design is subject to multilateral approval. (c) The applicable requirements of para. 306 of this Edition of these Regulations are applied. (d) The activity limits and classification in Section IV of this Edition of these Regulations are applied. (e) The requirements and controls for transport in Section V of this Edition of these Regulations are applied. (f) For a package containing fissile material and transported by air, the requirement of para. 683 is met. (g) Packages that meet the requirements of the 1973 and 1973 (As Amended) Editions of these Regulations. 820. The next revision of the regulations will be in 2018 at the earliest. By then it will be time to update the -96 designation on currently approved package designs to a more contemporary designation such as -18. It will also be time to phase-out all pre-85 (1973) packages and to restrict the use of -85 packages. Delete reference to package designs approved to the 1973 and 1973 (As Amended) editions of the Regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSSC 30 WG 3**

If a decision is made by TRANSSC 31 to issue a new revision it is recommended that a consultant meeting on the transitional arrangement should be held post TRANSSC 31. Similar to USA/2015/18, USA/2015/19, USA/2015/20, J/2015/21, and J/2015/30.

**TRANSSC SEPTEMBER MEETING**

Not discussed – await decision of TRANSSC 31 to initiate revision process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment No.</th>
<th>Identified problem/Proposed new text</th>
<th>Reason/Description</th>
<th>Abbreviated Summary of Proposal</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>More discussion or justification required</th>
<th>Accept but modified as follows</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Clarification required</th>
<th>Reason for modification/rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA/2015/18</td>
<td>To continue to use -85 packages with multilateral approval, the certificate should clearly state what requirements of the current regulations are not satisfied. Revise 813 as follows: The competent authority shall establish a certificate of approval stating that the approved design meets the applicable requirements for Type B(M) packages and shall attribute to that design an identification mark. For packages which meet the 1985 or 1985 (As Amended 1990) Editions of these Regulations, the certificate shall clearly state which requirements of the current regulations are not satisfied.</td>
<td>The next revision of the regulations will be in 2018 at the earliest. It will be time to phase-out all pre-85 (1973) packages and to restrict the use of -85 packages. Modify text to address concerns over the continued use of -85 packages with multilateral approvals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSSC 30 WG 3.**

If a decision is made by TRANSSC 31 to issue a new revision it is recommended that a consultant meeting on the transitional arrangement should be held post TRANSSC 31. Similar to USA/2015/17, USA/2015/19, USA/2015/20, J/2015/21, and J/2015/30.

**TRANSSC SEPTEMBER MEETING**

Not discussed – await decision of TRANSSC 31 to initiate revision process

**TRANSSC CORRESPONDENCE WG**

The intention of the new sentence is seen to improve the regulations, but it should better go into para. 838 "Certificates of approval for package design", with a wording modified according to this new position: 838 (c)bis For package designs subject to para. 820, a statement specifying those requirements of the current regulations with which the package does not conform.
## Transport Regulations (SSR-6 and SSG-26) 2015 Review Cycle

**TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS**

**TRANSSC CORRESPONDENCE WG**

(CDN, D, F, J, UK, USA, WNTI)

---

### RESOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA/2015/19</td>
<td>SSR-6/ Para 821</td>
<td>821. No new manufacture of <strong>packagings</strong> to a <em>package design</em> meeting the provisions of the 1973, 1973 (As Amended), 1985 and 1985 (As Amended) 1990 Editions of these Regulations shall be permitted to commence.</td>
<td>The next revision of the regulations will be in 2018 at the earliest. By then it will be time to update the -96 designation on currently approved package designs to a more contemporary designation such as -18. It will also be time to retire all pre-85 (1973) packages and to restrict the use of -85 packages.</td>
<td>Eliminate the possibility of any new manufacturing of package designs certified to 1973 or 1973 (As Amended) Regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSSC 30 WG 3.**

If a decision is made by TRANSSC 31 to issue a new revision it is recommended that a consultant meeting on the transitional arrangement should be held post TRANSSC 31.

Similar to USA/2015/17, USA/2015/18, USA/2015/20, J/2015/21, and J/2015/30.

**TRANSSC SEPTEMBER MEETING**

Not discussed – await decision of TRANSSC 31 to initiate revision process

**TRANSSC CORRESPONDENCE WG**

Accepted

X

---
## Transport Regulations (SSR-6 and SSG-26) 2015 Review Cycle
**TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS**
**TRANSSC CORRESPONDENCE WG**
(CDN, D, F, J, UK, USA, WNTI)

### RESOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA/2015/20</td>
<td>SSR-6 Para 832 and Para 833</td>
<td>Revise all references in 832(d) and Para 833 from “-96” to “-18” 832: (d) For certificates of approval of package design and special form radioactive material, other than those issued under the provisions of paras 820–823, and for certificates of approval of low dispersible radioactive material, the symbol “-18” shall be added to the type code. 833: Multiple references in 833 (a)–(d) to “-96”, revise to “-18”.</td>
<td>The next revision of the regulations will be in 2018 at the earliest. By then it will be time to update the -96 designation on currently approved package designs to a more contemporary designation such as -18.</td>
<td>Change designation of which regulations apply to a design, from “-96” to “-18”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSSC 30 WG 3.**
If a decision is made by TRANSSC 31 to issue a new revision it is recommended that a consultant meeting on the transitional arrangement should be held post TRANSSC 31. Similar to USA/2015/17, USA/2015/18, USA/2015/19, J/2015/21, and J/2015/30.

**TRANSSC SEPTEMBER MEETING**
Not discussed – await decision of TRANSSC 31 to initiate revision process

**TRANSSC CORRESPONDENCE WG**
The “-96” had to be introduced in 1996 due to essential changes in package design requirements at that time. This is not the case this time and therefore, based on the concept which has been applied so far, the introduction of a new “-18” is not justified. The only new design requirements introduced in the draft of the new regulations are
- The introduction of the ageing management in para. 614bis for all packages and
- The requirement of having no contact between the plug and any other part of the packaging if the water exclusion condition of para. 680(b) is applied for packages to transport fissile UF6.

The new explicit requirement of an ageing management should not call for the introduction of transitional arrangements and therefore should not lead to introduction of a symbol “-18”, since a simple or complex (depending on the package design) ageing management should always be present.

Neither the new mentioning of the plug in para. 680(b) should require transitional arrangements or the introduction of a “-18” symbol (but there is not much information available, the consequences of this change should be analyzed in due time!). Therefore, this proposal should be rejected.

But this proposal gives rise to think about the future need of “-96”? Do we still need it? It has been introduced 20 years ago with a very good reason at that time, but although it still now means that the package design is up to date, there is still a reference to 1996! Due to the fact that we would not have any longer package designs based on 1973 Edition, we would have now only “-85” designs, which must remain, and “-96” designs. We could even delete the “-96” without losing anything and would avoid any discussion about 1996. The problem just is that there is no specific member state proposal within this review process on this subject. If we agree nevertheless that it would be very useful to provide a specific
Transport Regulations (SSR-6 and SSG-26) 2015 Review Cycle
TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS
TRANSSC CORRESPONDENCE WG
(CDN, D, F, J, UK, USA, WNTI)

|-----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------|--------|---------------------|---------------------------------|

Proposed in this regard so let me know your opinions and ideas on the way forward.
Proposal to delete the symbol “-96”

The US proposal USA/2015/20 gives rise to think about the future need of the symbol “-96”? Do we still need it? It has been introduced 20 years ago with a very good reason at that time, but although it still now means that the package design is up to date, there is still a reference to 1996!?. Due to the fact that we would not have any longer package designs based on 1973 Edition, we would have now only “-85” designs, which must remain, and “-96” designs. We could even delete the “-96” without losing anything and would avoid any discussion about 1996. The problem just is that there is no specific member state proposal within this review process on this subject. If we agree nevertheless that it would be very useful to provide a specific proposal the following could be discussed:

Regarding package design approval there are basically two things to do related to SSR-6:
1) to make sure that package designs approved under the 1985 Edition and used under the transitional arrangements are identified by the symbol “-85”, and
2) to delete the need to add the symbol “-96” for new package designs and introduce also the deletion of this symbol for existing package designs issued under previous Editions of these Regulations.

Regarding special form approval the requirements can not be changed, because para. 823 still contains designs approved under 1973 Edition. In this context the current requirements for approval of low dispersible radioactive material should also remain.

If such a new proposal for change for package designs is considered to be within the mandate of the consultant meeting, it is proposed as follows:
1) Add text to para 820 for clarification as follows:
   (g) Each certificate and each package shall bear the appropriate competent authority identification mark including the symbol “-85”.
2) Change para 832 (d) such, that it refers to special form and low dispersible form only:
   (d) For certificates of approval of special form radioactive material, other than those issued under the provisions of paras 820-823, and for certificates of approval of low dispersible radioactive material, the symbol “-96” shall be added to the type code.
3) Add a new para 832 (e) as follows:
(e) For certificates of approval of package design issued under the provisions of previous Editions of these Regulations, except under the provisions of paras 820-823, the symbol “-96” shall be deleted if new revisions of these certificates are issued under these Regulations.

4) Add to para 833 (a) reference to symbol “-85” as a consequence of the change under 1) above:

(a) Each certificate …………….., if applicable, the symbol “-96” or the symbol “-85” shall appear…….

5) Delete any reference to “-96” in all examples under para 833 (a), (b), (c) and (d).

Resulting text changes to SSR-6 to delete the symbol “-96” together with changes according to USA/2015/20 to delete package designs approved under 1973 Edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Packages approved under the 1973, 1973 (As Amended), 1985 and 1985 (As Amended 1990) Editions of these Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Packages requiring competent authority approval of the design shall meet this Edition of these Regulations in full unless the following conditions are met:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The packagings were manufactured to a package design approved by the competent authority under the provisions of the 1973 or 1973 (As Amended) or the 1985 or 1985 (As Amended 1990) Editions of these Regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The package design is subject to multilateral approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The applicable requirements of para. 306 of this Edition of these Regulations are applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) The activity limits and classification in Section IV of this Edition of these Regulations are applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) The requirements and controls for transport in Section V of this Edition of these Regulations are applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) For a package containing fissile material and transported by air, the requirement of para. 683 is met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) For packages that meet the requirements of the 1973 or 1973 (As Amended) Editions of these Regulations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) The packages retain sufficient shielding to ensure that the radiation level at 1 m from the surface of the package would not exceed 10 mSv/h in the accident conditions of transport defined in the 1973 Revised or 1973 Revised (As Amended) Editions of these Regulations with the maximum radioactive content which the package is authorized to contain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) The packages do not utilize continuous venting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) A serial number in accordance with the provision of para. 535 is assigned to and marked on the outside of each packaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q) Each certificate and each package shall bear the appropriate competent authority identification mark including the symbol “-85”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Competent authority identification marks

832. Each certificate of approval issued by a competent authority shall be assigned an identification mark. The mark shall be of the following generalized type:

**VRI/Number/Type Code**

(a) Except as provided in para. 833(b), VRI represents the international vehicle registration identification code of the country issuing the certificate.

(b) The number shall be assigned by the competent authority and shall be unique and specific with regard to the particular design, shipment or alternative activity limit for exempt consignment. The identification mark of the approval of shipment shall be clearly related to the identification mark of the approval of design.

(c) The following type codes shall be used in the order listed to indicate the types of certificate of approval issued:

- **AF** Type A package design for fissile material
- **B(U)** Type B(U) package design (B(U)F if for fissile material)
- **B(M)** Type B(M) package design (B(M)F if for fissile material)
- **C** Type C package design (CF if for fissile material)
- **IF** Industrial package design for fissile material
- **S** Special form radioactive material
- **LD** Low dispersible radioactive material
- **FE** Fissile material complying with the requirements of para. 606
- **T** Shipment
- **X** Special arrangement
- **AL** Alternative activity limits for an exempt consignment of instruments or articles

In the case of package designs for non-fissile or fissile-excepted uranium hexafluoride, where none of the above codes apply, the following type codes shall be used:

- **H(U)** Unilateral approval
- **H(M)** Multilateral approval

(d) For certificates of approval of package design and special form radioactive material, other than those issued under the provisions of paras 820–823, and for certificates of approval of low dispersible radioactive material, the symbol “-96” shall be added to the type code.

(e) For certificates of approval of package design issued under the provisions of previous Editions of these Regulations, except under the provisions of paras 820–823, the symbol “-96” shall be deleted if new revisions of these certificates are issued under these Regulations.

833. These identification marks shall be applied as follows:

(a) Each certificate and each package shall bear the appropriate identification mark, comprising the symbols prescribed in para. 832(a)–(d), except that, for packages, only the applicable design type codes including, if
applicable, the symbol “-96” or the symbol “-85” shall appear following the second stroke, that is, the “T” or “X” shall not appear in the identification marking on the package. Where the approval of design and the approval of shipment are combined, the applicable type codes do not need to be repeated. For example:

A/132/B(M)F-96: A Type B(M) package design approved for fissile material, requiring multilateral approval, for which the competent authority of Austria has assigned the design number 132 (to be marked both on the package and on the certificate of approval for the package design)

A/132/B(M)F:T: The approval of shipment issued for a package bearing the identification mark elaborated above (to be marked on the certificate only)

A/137/X: An approval of special arrangement issued by the competent authority of Austria, to which the number 137 has been assigned (to be marked on the certificate only)

A/139/IF-96: An industrial package design for fissile material approved by the competent authority of Austria, to which package design number 139 has been assigned (to be marked both on the package and on the certificate of approval for the package design)

A/145/H(U)-96: A package design for fissile-excepted uranium hexafluoride approved by the competent authority of Austria, to which package design number 145 has been assigned (to be marked both on the package and on the certificate of approval for the package design)

(b) Where multilateral approval is effected by validation in accordance with para. 840, only the identification mark issued by the country of origin of the design or shipment shall be used. Where multilateral approval is effected by issue of certificates by successive countries, each certificate shall bear the appropriate identification mark and the package whose design was so approved shall bear all appropriate identification marks.

For example:

A/132/B(M)F-96

CH/28/B(M)F-96

would be the identification mark of a package that was originally approved by Austria and was subsequently approved, by separate certificate, by Switzerland. Additional identification marks would be tabulated in a similar manner on the package.

(c) The revision of a certificate shall be indicated by a parenthetical expression following the identification mark on the certificate. For example, A/132/B(M)F-96(Rev.2) would indicate revision 2 of the Austrian certificate of approval for the package design; or A/132/B(M)F-96(Rev.0) would indicate the original issuance of the Austrian certificate of approval for the package design. For original issuances, the parenthetical entry is optional and other words such as “original issuance” may also be used in place of “Rev.0”. Certificate revision numbers may only be issued by the country issuing the original certificate of approval.

(d) Additional symbols (as may be necessitated by national requirements) may be added in brackets to the end of the identification mark, for example, A/132/B(M)F-96(SP503).

(e) It is not necessary to alter the identification mark on the packaging each time that a revision to the design certificate is made. Such re-marking shall be required only in those cases where the revision to the package design certificate involves a change in the letter type codes for the package design following the second stroke.