**TRANSSC 33**

**Working Group 7 – Proposed Guidance Document based upon the structure of SSG3 to include all SSR-6 requirements (16/11/16).**

**Summary of Terms of Reference:** document (TECDOC) aimed at Regional Networks (regulators and operators) who find SSR-6 difficult to understand. Not looking for a detailed technical check. Output: considerations on scope, content and format.

**Chair/Secretary** – Joint – R. Thorington/I. Davidson (UK)

**Attendees** – A. Kirkin (Russia), G. Ferran (France), S. Hellsten (Finland), I. Petrova (Czech Republic), A. Bujnova (Slovakia), M. Tor Morshuizen (Netherlands), S. Sarkar (Australia), M. Badr (Egypt), M. Muneer (Pakistan), H. Zika (Sweden), V. Ershov (Russia), M. Hishida (Japan), Y. Ikoma (Japan), J. Endres (Germany), I. Reiche (Germany), W. Cho (Korea), T. Katona (Hungary), J. Van Aaarle (Switzerland), J. Rijpkema (Belgium), J. Duffy (Ireland), A. M Xavier (Brazil) and A. Sahyun (Brazil).

**Summary:**

1. Use of hyperlinks or similar to reduce the ‘size’ may be useful.
2. Feedback from target users would be useful so that the document may be better matched to their needs. Do they need paragraphs on e.g. fissile exceptions etc?
3. There were comments regarding a correlation table between IAEA paragraphs and other modal regulations and also adding the extra modal requirements not covered by SSR-6. Given that the target users consigned mostly by road then these extras would not be beneficial.
4. It may be helpful to further differentiate between those paragraphs that are requirements and those that are just references.
5. The new document must not conflict with the PDSR document or SSG-26.
6. Separate out fissile parts to simplify (but leave in the document in case other MSs need them)
7. This is a large document – it may be expensive to amend/update?
8. Could IAEA consult on most common package types and then these paras could be prepared in detail and consulted on?
9. Headings or similar to guide the user on which part of SSR-6 the paras come from e.g. training, RPP etc.
10. May be useful to have a table of material types (radiopharmaceuticals, yellowcake tec) v likely UN Number to help target users.
11. Use of more flow charts to simplify. Use of flow charts in classification process. Separate the document into two sections: classification and UN number schedules.

**Discussion:**

Netherlands – very large document. Aimed at 2 groups – Competent Authorities and Users – what does it do that the schedules does not do for the User? Any feedback on Users? Author – no
feedback but know that developing countries find existing docs difficult to use. In order to reduce the document size then hyperlinks could be used (e-document).

Brazil – can we see the actual schedule to compare? Thought new document would be very useful as the existing schedules are not easy to use.

Ireland – will the TECDOC supplement or replace the Schedules? Author – supplement. Regional feedback wanted something like this – would be interested to hear from those member states to see if they would find this useful?

Germany – thought about the structure to harmonize with the UN i.e. have a correlation table showing IAEA/IMDG/ICAO/UNOB.

Russia – how many pages? Author - 3137 pages.

Brazil – not concerned with overall size as the user would only use one schedule (one UN number) at a time.

Author – looked at [515] excepted packages, which was complex due to the number of paragraphs referenced out. Brazil – may be useful to separate out the general requirements from package testing requirements?

Germany – could it be simplified by splitting references from requirements e.g. [403] refers to [402] but [402] is not a requirement. Difficult to differentiate what is a requirement and what is a reference. Not sure if this is the right thing to help ‘operational’ Users for Air and Sea as they already have adequate regulations. How to capture all modal provisions?

Brazil – asked about the connection between SSR-6 and UNOB.

Ireland – this new document must not impact on the PDSR document and SSG-26. SSR-6 is the parent doc, which feeds into the UNOB, which informs IMDG, ICAO, ADR and RID.

UNECE – must include the other modal requirements in order to make this useful for operators.

Brazil – All we are doing is putting the IAEA regs in a different format i.e. by UN number – we should not be considering other regs.

Author – target audience are regional networks so simplicity important.

IAEA – Feedback from Regional Networks is that regs (SSR-6) are complicated. Regional networks mostly concerned with ROAD regulations so other modes not a significant issue. Once in a mature state would be rolled out to those states and feedback gathered. It is known that RNs (about 80 member states) want this kind of document. CSM expected to develop and check.

Russia/Germany – separate out paragraphs on fissile material but leave in document – simplify main document for target user.

Russia – how will document be updated? Cost going forward (large document) – is it worth it?
Brazil – No need to finish document before consultation – just consult on paragraphs for e.g. excepted and Type A. Author – could ask which packages are consigned most often.

Germany – what are the other IT opportunities? Other headings/ contents table e.g. Training/RPP to navigate document easier. Brazil – could follow existing schedules headings?

Pakistan – LLW/NORM/radiopharmaceuticals/fresh fuel/yellowcake etc – could document guide from type of material as well? Operators do not want to read the whole of SSR-6. Brazil – a table/matrix of material v likely UN number may help.

Germany – Classification flow chart very good – could be the starting point for an operator – could there be more of these charts? Simpler – no need to deal with whole document! Flow chart would precede classification sections.
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