

Results of Workshop II

Scientific basis of Control Banding and new developments

Starting point

Scientific basis CB tools could be based on:

1. Validity: sufficient discriminatory power and sufficiently – but not overly – conservative
 2. Reliability: do users come to the intended results?
 3. Transparency
- Benefits of a uniform scientific basis of CB Tools:
 - Trust amongst the user group (“risk governance”)
 - Clear focus future developments

Focus on reliability and validity of

1. Hazard banding with R-phrases and H-phrases
2. Exposure modelling
3. Fire and explosion risks

Hazard banding

- COSHH hazard banding scheme developed 20 years ago
 - Based on statistical evaluation of UK OELs
 - Same scheme used for CLP hazard phrases
 - DNELs are becoming available
- Validation can be done by comparing hazard bands with threshold values (eg OELs or DNELs)
 - BAUA study (semi-) available
- OELs are not DNELs
 - Swedish study: OELs tend to be higher, because socio economic impact taken into account

Hazard banding continued

- Problem: Currently lack of data on which the C&L of substances is based
 - How reliable are H-phrases? Preparations?
 - Garbage in = garbage out
 - More tox data from REACH dossiers
 - Information on ECHA website
- What does this mean for CB tool users?
 - Availability of information will be better
 - CB tool use might have difficulties interpreting
 - REACH info → practical information (session 1)
 - How to go from e-SDS exposure scenario to RA in the workplace?

Hazard banding - recommendations

- Develop an idea how information from REACH can be used to upgrade the scientific basis of CB Tools
- More research needed on hazard banding in CB Tools
 - Take into account differences OELs/DNELs

Exposure assessment

- The validity of the exposure predictions can be evaluated with measured data
- Substantial variance remains unexplained
- Use of upper limit in the exposure distribution important
- BAUA is putting tremendous effort in validation of Tier I models and Control Guidance Sheets
 - In general CB works surprisingly good
 - More validation activity needed
- Is the assessor the weakest link?
 - Especially when they have an interest

Exposure assessment cont.

- Weak point = dustiness
 - Limited measurement methods available for quantification of dustiness
 - Often no information in e-SDS
 - Perhaps develop a list with examples for chemical powders and solid objects

Exposure assessment cont. II

- Renewed focus needed on dermal exposure
 - Very little measured data
 - EMKG dermal not quantified
 - No validated measurement method available
- Possible solution is to focus on high exposure/high risk situations:
- Eg for liquids to focus on low volatiles with and without high air concentration

Exposure – recommendations

- Focus needed on scientific basis dermal exposure
- Focus on quantification of dustiness of powders
- Strive for harmonisation
 - E-team could be a good starting point
 - Join forces to agree on scientific basis
 - Compare outcome of exposure models

Fire and explosion risks

- New and interesting topic!
- Scientific basis: no clear view
- Compared to ind. Hygiene big safety factors
 - More control measures recommended than necessary?
 - Many parameters in the Risk Assessment
 - In practice: very limited information, especially on dusts

Fire and explosion – Recommendations

- Review of scientific basis
 - Especially of guidance on the market
 - Explosive atmosphere will never have R- nor H-phrases
 - Look into maintenance operations (=highest risk)

Thank you!

- Iris Schweitzer-Karababa (BAuA)
- Martin Tischer (BAuA)
- Christian Schumacher (Arbo Unie)
- Jörg Fritzsche (BAuA)
- Paul Beumer (Arbo Unie)
- John Cherrie (IOM)
- Dorothea Koppisch (IFA)
- Urs Schlüter (BAuA)
- Maikel van Niftrik (TNO)
- Boris Gödicke (C.S.B. GmbH)
- Petra Schulte (BAM)
- Marie Cardfelt (Swedish Work Environment Authority)
- Norbert Neuwirth (AUVA)
- Norbert Fröhlich (BAuA)