Programme of work – Joint work of the sub committees on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals

Proposal by the experts from Belgium, France, and the United Kingdom

1. Noting that both subcommittees have approved work to be done on issues regarding physical hazards in inter-sessions working groups, and that the subcommittee on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals has also invited the subcommittee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to act as the focal point on physical hazards and start a substantial amount work on several others subjects related to these hazards, noting also that this latter subcommittee would use its explosive working group to do some of that work, it appears beneficial to organize the work in such a way both subcommittees may examine the outcome of this work jointly.

2. If the programme of work is maintained as it is the work in progress would be presented first in the subcommittee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and then to the subcommittee on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals, at moments that will be separated by some time dedicated to other subjects (reports reading, and other items as defined in the respective agendas of both subcommittees). Thus some discussion will be duplicated and it will be difficult to some experts of one subcommittee to participate in the discussions of the other subcommittee although they might have great interest in these discussions.

3. It is proposed to make a minor change to the meeting schedule in order to allow one day of joint meeting of both subcommittees. This would happen in December 2015 and July 2016 where the subcommittee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods stops Wednesday at noon and the subcommittee on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals starts the afternoon.

4. There are two ways that could be envisaged:

   (a) At both these sessions the subcommittee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods would end Wednesday evening and the subcommittee on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals would start in the morning of the same day. That would allow the meetings of both subcommittees to overlap and to take place in the same room that day. It would be easy for experts to justify their travel as the agenda would communicate the new dates. Practically there would be no additional conference costs as the meeting room needs to be available anyway for the whole day.
(b) Without changing the meeting dates the experts from the subcommittee on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals would be invited to participate to the Wednesday morning meeting of the subcommittee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and vice versa in the afternoon meeting. This requires mentioning in the agendas of both subcommittees that experts of both subcommittees should participate in both sessions on that day.

5. Both options allow to meet jointly during one day to look the outcome of the working groups as appropriate. In addition both subcommittees would benefit from one half day more meeting time without additional conference costs. They seem therefore to be a better way to use the time allocated for meetings.

6. There is one consequence related to report reading requiring a change in current practice. For all discussions held before that date the report reading of the subcommittee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods would take place Tuesday afternoon, in order to not interrupt the joint work. The report reading concerning this joint part of the meeting even for the subcommittee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods could take place together with the report reading of the subcommittee on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals. The report of the subcommittee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods would then be completed by the secretariat with the missing part concerning the joint work. It is believed that the benefit of the proposed organisation is much greater than the inconvenience that this change in the report reading may cause.

7. These joint meetings would be alternatively be chaired by the chair persons of each subcommittees.

8. Concerning their agenda they could be adapted during the preceding sessions of the subcommittees keeping in mind that one day is short compared to the amount of work sent to the working groups, they would not reproduce the detailed discussions held within these working groups but approve their outcome and propose some instructions for these groups on how to continue their work.

9. The committee is invited to decide what option is preferred and endorse that new allocation of meeting time.