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Introduction

1. In the Model Regulations, the precedence of classes is outlined in 2.0.3. However, when a substance meets the criteria of Class 8 with an inhalation toxicity to dusts and mists in the range of packing group (PG) I, there are some inconsistencies in determining if Division 6.1 or Class 8 takes precedence. This is further complicated when comparing the English version with the French one. This document aims at clarifying and aligning both versions for consistent application of the classification scheme.

Explanation

1. For a substance that meets the criteria for Class 8 and has an inhalation toxicity to dust and mists in the range of PG I (“Substance A”), the current text leads to contradictory allocation of primary class.
2. The following schematic represents the proper determination of the precedence of classes for a substance that meets both the criteria of Class 8 and Division 6.1 (with inhalation toxicity to dusts and mists in the range of packing group I – identified as “Substance A”).
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1. In both the English and French versions, there is a contradiction in determining which class takes precedence, as the same substance can have two primary classes depending on which section is used. The table below shows what primary class would be obtained when using the current sections of the UN Recommendations.

*Determination of primary class for Substance A with an oral toxicity in the range of PG I and dermal toxicity in the range of PG III*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Footnote 3 of**  **2.0.3.1** | **Note of**  **2.6.2.2.4.1** | **2.8.2.4** |
| *English version* | 8 | 6.1 | 8 |
| *French version* | 8 | 6.1 | 6.1 |

1. The allocation to a primary class according to the different sections used is further outlined below:

(a) English text: if “Substance A” has an oral toxicity in the range of PG I and dermal toxicity in the range of PG III, Footnote 3 of 2.0.3.1 indicates that Class 8 takes precedence since oral ingestion or dermal contact is in the range of PG III or less. However, the note of 2.6.2.2.4.1 leads to a primary class allocation of Division 6.1 since oral ingestion or dermal contact is in the range of PG I or II. Furthermore, 2.8.2.4 leads to the allocation of “Substance A” to Class 8 primary class since oral ingestion or dermal contact is in the range of PG III or less.

(b) French text: if “Substance A” has an oral toxicity in the range of PG I and dermal toxicity in the range of PG III, Footnote 3 of 2.0.3.1 indicates that Class 8 takes precedence while the note in 2.6.2.2.4.1 indicates that Division 6.1 would take precedence. According to 2.8.2.4, “Substance A” is allocated to Division 6.1 as primary class since both oral ingestion and dermal contact must be in the range of PG III or less for Class 8 to take precedence.

Proposal

1. To ensure a consistent and uniform approach to the determination of the precedence of classes, the following changes are proposed, with deleted text in ~~strikethrough~~ and new text in underline:
2. In the **English version**, correct Footnote 3 of 2.0.3.1 and 2.8.2.4:

Correct Footnote 3 of 2.0.3.1 as follows:

*Footnote 3: « Except substances or preparations meeting the criteria of Class 8 having an inhalation toxicity of dusts and mists (LC50) in the range of packing group I, but toxicity through oral ingestion and~~or~~ dermal contact ~~only~~ in the range of packing group III or less, which shall be allocated to Class 8. »*

Correct 2.8.2.4 as follows:

*« A substance or mixture meeting the criteria of Class 8 having an inhalation toxicity of dusts and mists (LC50) in the range of packing group I, but toxicity through oral ingestion ~~or~~ and dermal contact ~~only~~ in the range of packing group III or less, shall be allocated to Class 8 (see Note under 2.6.2.2.4.1). »*

1. In the **French version**, correct Footnote 3 of 2.0.3.1 and the “NOTA” of 2.6.2.2.4.1:

Correct Footnote 3 of 2.0.3.1 as follows:

*Footnote 3: « Sauf pour les matières ou les préparations répondant aux critères de la classe 8 dont la toxicité à l’inhalation de poussières et de brouillards (CL50) correspond au groupe d’emballage I, mais présentant une toxicité à l’ingestion et~~ou~~ à l’absorption cutanée ~~seulement~~ du niveau du groupe d’emballage III ou moins. »*

Correct the “NOTA” of 2.6.2.2.4.1 as follows:

*NOTA: « Les matières répondant aux critères de la classe 8 dont la toxicité à l’inhalation de poussières et brouillards (CL50) correspond au groupe d’emballage I, ~~ne~~ doivent être affectées à la division 6.1 seulement ~~que~~ si, ~~simultanément~~ la toxicité à l’ingestion ou à l’absorption cutanée correspond au moins aux groupes d’emballage I ou II. Dans le cas contraire, la matière doit être affectée à la classe 8 si nécessaire (voir 2.8.2.4) ».*

1. A/75/6 (Sect.20), para. 20.51. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)