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I. Purpose of document

This document provides an agenda for the meeting of the joint informal working group on  
corrosivity classification, to take place in Room XII on 11th December 2012 from 09:30 –  
12:30. Some background information is also provided in the annex to this document.

II. Suggested agenda for meeting

1. Welcome and introduction
2. Summary of state of play and opportunity for general remarks
3. Discussion of progress on Workstream (b) (see annex, section III, item (b)), with  
particular reference to documents: INF.8 (GHS) – INF.16 (TDG) and INF.12 (GHS) – INF.25 (TDG) (CEFIC);  
INF.17 (GHS) – INF.37 (TDG) (Netherlands); and  
Any further documents as relevant.
4. Discussion on remaining workstreams
5. Next steps
6. Any other business
Annex

I. Terms of reference for joint informal working group

The terms of reference of the joint working group were agreed at the 20th session of the GHS Subcommittee (December 2010) and are as follows:

(a) Verify the definition of “skin destruction” as mentioned in the Model Regulations on the transport of dangerous goods complemented with reference to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and development (OECD) test guidelines. If the definition is not aligned with paragraph 3.2.2.4.1 in Chapter 3.2 of the GHS, propose appropriate improvements;

(b) Identify and analyse the discrepancies between assignment to subcategories 1A, 1B and 1C, based on in vitro and in vivo testing and alternative approaches (bridging principles, mixtures calculations, pH…);

(c) Identify differences in assignment to categories in lists provided by different regulations and guidance documents for a few representative common substances. Analyse the underlying data and origin of these differences and use these results for the work under paragraphs (a), (b) and (d);

(d) Check the way OECD guidelines are referenced and their relevance.

(e) Report findings and make recommendations that meet the need of all sectors with the aim of achieving consistent classification outcomes for skin corrosivity.

II. Summary of documents submitted to date

21st GHS Session /39th TDG Session (June 2011):

- INF.6 (GHS) – INF.14 (TDG) - (United Kingdom) Update on work of the informal joint correspondence group on corrosivity criteria

22nd GHS Session/40th TDG Session (December 2011):

- INF.12 (GHS) – INF.9 (TDG) - (ICCA) Harmonization of classification criteria for transport with the classification criteria of the GHS for substances and mixtures corrosive to skin
- INF.13 (GHS) – INF.10 (TDG) (ICCA) Harmonization of classification criteria for transport with the classification criteria of the GHS for substances and mixtures corrosive to skin
- INF.17 (GHS) – INF.30 (TDG) - (ICPP) Harmonization of classification criteria for transport with the classification criteria of the GHS for substances and mixtures corrosive to skin
- INF.18 (GHS) – INF.33 (TDG) - (United Kingdom) Work of the joint correspondence group on corrosivity criteria
- INF.18/Add.1 (GHS) – INF.33/Add.1 (TDG) - (United Kingdom) Work of the joint correspondence group on corrosivity criteria: agenda for the meeting and additional information
23rd GHS Session/41st TDG Session (July 2012):

- INF.11 (GHS) – INF.27 (TDG) (CEFIC) – Harmonisation of the skin corrosion classification criteria in the UN Model Regulations with those in GHS
- INF.28 (TDG) (CEFIC) – Adoption of expert judgement and weight of evidence procedures into the Model Regulations
- INF.14 (GHS) – INF.41 (TDG) (United Kingdom) – Update on the work of the joint informal correspondence group on corrosivity classification
- INF.18 (GHS) – INF.53 (TDG) (United Kingdom) – Contribution to the work of the joint informal correspondence group on corrosivity classification – approaches to classifying corrosive mixtures under Class 8

24th GHS Session/42nd TDG Session (December 2012)

- INF.8 (GHS) – INF.16 (TDG) (CEFIC) – Harmonisation of the skin corrosion classification criteria in the Model Regulations with those in GHS
- INF.12 (GHS) – INF.25 (TDG) (CEFIC) – Corrections to INF.8 (GHS) – INF.16 (TDG) (Harmonisation of the skin corrosion classification criteria in the Model Regulations with those in GHS)
- INF.17 (GHS) – INF.37 (TDG) (Netherlands) – Implementation of GHS corrosivity criteria in the Model Regulations

III. Summary of discussion at 23rd Session

The report of the 23rd Session ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/46 - (Secretariat) gives a summary of discussions but a more detailed summary is given below.

The joint TDG–GHS working group on corrosivity held its second meeting on Wednesday 4 July, during the 23rd session of the GHS Sub-Committee. After adoption of the agenda as contained in INF.14, the group addressed the suggested items for discussion under each of the workstreams and concluded that:

(a) Workstream (a):

There are some differences in the definitions of what should be considered “skin destruction” in the Model Regulations and in the GHS. Although both definitions lead to the same interpretation because they are linked to the results obtained using the same OECD Tests Guidelines, the working group recommends that the concept of “skin destruction” in Chapter 2.8 of the Model Regulations be fully aligned with the definition of “skin corrosion” in the GHS.

As further changes to the text in Chapter 2.8 of the Model Regulations are still under discussion, it is proposed that further discussions of this point be postponed until the extent of further changes is clearer.

(b) Workstream (b):

On the basis of the comments received, CEFIC will revise the proposal in INF.11 to include further parts of Chapter 3.2 of the GHS, having regard to the ideas in document INF.18. Experts also invited CEFIC to provide further examples and data to inform their proposals on the assignment of packing groups taking into account alternative methods such as bridging principles, mixture calculations, interpretation of pH values etc. Many experts also felt that the terminology surrounding hazard
classification and the assignment of packing groups should be clarified to avoid any potential confusion.

(c) Workstream (c):

The group considered that there is no need to provide more case studies at this stage. A summary of the case studies undertaken so far will be provided.

(d) Workstream (d):

The group considered that although the way in which OECD test methods are referenced in the Model Regulations and the GHS is different (in general transport regulations are more prescriptive than GHS), these differences reflect transport and supply specific needs and therefore concluded that the texts should remain as they are and therefore no action is required.

(e) Workstream (e):

Many experts continued to agree that transport conditions should be decoupled from hazard based classification, and that assignment of packing groups should be made on the basis of both hazard and risk. The joint informal group will consider further recommendations in light of the work to be taken forward by CEFIC under workstream (b).

Subject to time availability, the Sub-Committee requested the secretariat to explore, committees in consultation with the bureaus of the TDG and the GHS sub-committees, the possibility of scheduling a new meeting of the joint working group during their December 2012 sessions.