

Meeting Summary

Consumer Chemical Sector Working Group (CCSWG) Eighth Meeting (Teleconference) April 20th, 2006 (1:00 pm - 2:15 pm EST)

Members

Present:

Claude Chartrand - Consumer Product Safety Bureau (CPSB) - Health Canada (Chair)
James Hardy - Consumer Product Safety Bureau (CPSB) - Health Canada
Stephen Rathlou - Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association (CCSPA)
Jacqui Jensky - Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association (CCSPA)
Lorraine Bennett - Canadian Paint and Coatings Association
Patty Anacleto - Adhesives and Sealants Manufacturers Association of Canada
Catia Messier - Consumer Product Safety Bureau, Quebec Region - Health Canada

Regrets:

Jeff Bennie - Canadian Labour Congress
Larry Stoffman - Canadian Labour Congress
Shannon Coombs - Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association (CCSPA)
Anne McConnell - Soap and Detergent Association of Canada

Observers

Present:

Deborah Ramsingh - Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) - Health Canada
Mary Toro - U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)
Kailash Gupta - U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)
Bruce Rebel - Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association (CCSPA)
Karen Kohrman - U.S. Consumer Specialty Products Association
Suranika Dias - National WHMIS Office, Consumer Product Safety Bureau (CPSB)
- Health Canada
Richard Sedlak - U.S. Soap and Detergent Association

AGENDA

1. Attendance: members present and absent (regrets).
2. Introduction by Claude Chartrand (chair) and James Hardy.
3. Additions to the agenda.
4. Options chosen based on March 7th, 2006 Discussion Guide: TOST (Target Organ Systemic Toxicity) - SE (Single Exposure) and Physical Hazards.
5. Meeting Wrap-Up - Set date for next CCSWG.

MEETING SUMMARY

Item 2. Introductions

Claude Chartrand introduced himself as the new Chair of the CCSWG since Ms. Lisa Wardell has left the group. Mr. Chartrand joins the group with a wealth of information about the *Consumer Chemicals and Containers Regulations, 2001* (CCCR, 2001) and consumer product safety in general. James Hardy was also introduced to the group as the Health Canada CPSB NCR (National Capital Region) correspondent and aide to Mr. Chartrand on the GHS (The Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals) project.

Item 3. Additions to Agenda

No changes were made to the agenda.

Item 4. Discussion Guide: TOST-SE and Physical Hazards

TOST - SE Category 2 & 3

Industry representatives stated that the information used to classify products into these categories should be related only to human exposure data. There was agreement among the meeting participants to implement GHS category 1 for this class.

PHYSICAL HAZARDS

Mr. Chartrand gave a quick overview of the options available for implementation:

- The “Safety-Net” Approach - wherein the categories are implemented in case a product of that type were ever to be marketed and fall under the purview of the CCCR, 2001 in the future.
- The “No-Added-Value” Approach - wherein the categories are not implemented since consumer products falling under such categories are not foreseeable.
- Lastly, the “Prohibit” Approach - wherein some categories may be prohibited from use in products since they may pose a significant risk to consumers.

Oxidizing Gases, Liquids, and Solids

- Options:
- (1) Adopt GHS criteria
 - (2) Create a prohibition
 - (3) Do not adopt GHS criteria

Industry members expressed concern at adopting categories from the GHS where there are no current products on the market that would fall under their scope. They believed that it would not be a benefit for the GHS to be complicated.

There was a discussion following this round about the “over-complexity” of the GHS if too many categories are implemented. Members explained that categories such as this are unnecessary since these sorts of products would never fall under the CCCR, 2001.

There was a general agreement of the meeting participants to not adopt the GHS criteria for oxidizing gases, liquids and solids (Option (3)).

Self-Reactive Substances and Mixtures

- Options:
- (1) Adopt GHS criteria Types A through G
 - (2) Adopt GHS criteria Types A through F, but not G
 - (3) Create a prohibition;
 - (4) Create a partial prohibition (e.g. Types A & B only)
 - (5) Do not adopt GHS criteria

Industry members began the deliberations in this category by stating that the organizations they represent do not deal with products of this type and that they lacked specific knowledge about the category type. This opinion was reflected by other members and a consensus to choose Option (5) was agreed upon.

Pyrophoric Liquids and Solids

- Options:
- (1) Adopt GHS criteria for both categories
 - (2) Create a prohibition for both categories
 - (3) Do not adopt GHS criteria for either category

Mr. Chartrand began by saying that these product types may include certain hobby products such as model rockets. All attending members agreed that their organizations would not be involved in such products and that they had no opinion or position on the matter.

Self-Heating Substances and Mixtures

- Options:
- (1) Adopt GHS test method
 - (2) Do not adopt GHS criteria

Mr. Chartrand explained that this category is essentially already in the CCCR, 2001, although the classification criteria are much broader than what is offered by the GHS (a laboratory test). He stated that our own current regulations may be strengthened by adding this GHS test and would like to hear everyone’s opinion.

All present members agreed to keep the current regulations in the CCCR, 2001. Further deliberations led to the consensus of the attending group members to choose Option (1).

Substances and mixtures which, in contact with water, emit flammable gases

- Options:
- (1) Create a prohibition
 - (2) Adopt GHS criteria
 - (3) Do not adopt GHS criteria [*NB: added during meeting*]

Mr. Chartrand explained that products that fall under this category may be far too dangerous for consumers to use and went on to say that there is currently nothing in the CCCR, 2001 to prohibit their use. It was asked if these are the only two options available and Mr. Chartrand responded by saying that any suggestions are welcome.

Industry members expressed some desire in creating a restriction, but due to lack of knowledge at this time as to how the product would use such a substance, it would be too difficult. Meeting participants came to an agreement on Option (3).

Organic Peroxides

- Options:
- (1) Adopt GHS criteria Types A through G
 - (2) Adopt GHS criteria Types A through F, but not G
 - (3) Create a prohibition for Types A & B and adopt GHS criteria for Types C through F, but not G
 - (4) Do not adopt GHS criteria [*NB: added during meeting*]

Mr. Chartrand gave the example of certain wood cleaners and treatments that may fall into this category. Members stated a general unfamiliarity with these products. A stalemate was reached since attending members decided on both Option (2) and (3).

Corrosive to Metals

- Options:
- (1) Do not adopt GHS criteria
 - (2) Adopt GHS criteria

Mr. Chartrand explained the “No-Added-Value” of having another corrosivity warning in the CCCR, 2001 when one already exists. General consensus was reached by participating members on Option (1).

Item 5. Meeting Wrap-Up

Mr. Chartrand would like to schedule another CCSWG meeting on June 12th, 2006, to discuss the progress of the two Ad Hoc Expert Working Groups (Chronic and Environmental Hazards). The meeting concluded at 2:15 pm (EST).