

Meeting date: 25 May 2007

Open Govt. Status: Fully Open

Exemptions: None

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES**  
**ANNUAL REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE**  
**WORKING GROUP ON ACTION TO CONTROL CHEMICALS**  
**(WATCH)**

**Issue**

1. Third annual report to ACTS Members on the activity of its scientific subcommittee WATCH.

**Timing**

2. Routine

**Recommendation**

3. That ACTS takes note of the recent activity of the subgroup.

**Background**

4. Reconstituted WATCH has completed its third year of activities, having met on 20 June 2006, 9 & 10 November 2006 and 22 February 2007. The November meeting included a session that was open to the public; additional attendees included industry, local authority and professional organisation representatives.

5. The rules of operation of WATCH permit additional ad hoc expertise to bolster the expertise of the committee for any particular item on the agenda. Members agreed that the use of additional ad hoc experts in meetings in the previous year made vital contributions to issues. Therefore this opportunity was continued with another six ad hoc experts contributing to meetings in 2006/7.

6. In its third year WATCH considered a wide range of technical issues. The majority of these were linked to either mandatory responsibilities within HSE's chemicals agenda or to the HSC's Disease Reduction Programme (DRP), which in turn contributes to the Fit3 (Fit for work, fit for life, fit for tomorrow) Strategic Programme. The issues are briefly summarised below and the advice provided by WATCH is presented. Minutes of each meeting provide more detail and are published on the HSE web site when agreed by members (<http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/hsc/iacs/acts/index.htm#watch>).

7. At the November meeting it was noted that on 10 October 2006 DEFRA announced that the UK CA for REACH would be housed within HSE in partnership with the Environment Agency. It is likely that WATCH will, in future, play an active part in this new HSE responsibility.

8. Annex 7 lists the papers presented to WATCH in 2006/7.

9. As a scientific advisory committee that adheres to the Office of Science and Technology's Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees (COPSAC), there

are requirements for inclusion of specific information in the Annual Report. Hence, the relevant information is attached in Annexes 1-6.

## **Argument**

### **10. The Disease Reduction Programme (DRP): the Cancer Project, Non-Asbestos Strand**

The Cancer Project has two distinct strands, one focussing specifically on asbestos and another strand considering appropriate activity in relation to all other chemical carcinogens. The 'non-asbestos' strand was considered by WATCH at each of the three meetings in this reporting year. The aims of the project are to:

- improve knowledge about the use, exposure and management of risks from occupational carcinogens; and
- identify chemical carcinogens (or occupations), processes of concern and options for improving the control of carcinogens and baselines for evaluation

11. Chemical carcinogens within the remit of the project are those substances (or processes) classified for carcinogenicity as either category 1 or 2 in the EU, or Category 1 or 2A by IARC, or listed in schedule 1 of the Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (COSHH) Regulation.

12. The project has four elements:

- i) to update the 'Doll and Peto' (1981) estimate of the proportion of cancer deaths caused by occupational factors;
- ii) to profile the current/predictable future use and exposure patterns for known carcinogens and their toxicological characteristics;
- iii) to review the results of past interventions with regards to carcinogens; and
- iv) to plan and deliver a stakeholder workshop aimed at securing agreement and support for the future intervention activity in this area.

13. Priorities for intervention activity work will be identified at the stakeholder workshop on 25 and 26<sup>th</sup> June 2007, with the help of stakeholders, and interventions will then commence from April 2008. Initial exposure estimates were made based on HSE's knowledge and in discussion with trade associations, followed by visits to representative sites and a refined assessment. Profiles have been developed on over 100 carcinogens.

14. WATCH discussed several aspects of the project at the three meetings, for example potency issues, how to deal with mixtures, interventions and their impact. However, the main area of debate surrounded the hygiene aspects of the profiling work.

15. WATCH raised concerns over the apparent exclusion of some occupational groups that may be exposed to carcinogens, specifically, in the agricultural sector, the health care sector (in which there is a large female population) and the welding industry. The first of these was not considered to be a high priority area by HSE (the only area of concern had been identified as exposure to creosote), whilst the other two were included in other aspects of the DRP or Fit3. Other occupations that were raised by WATCH as potentially having excess risks of cancer were painters/decorators and chimney sweeps.

16. WATCH suggested that for each industry presented, further information should be included on the number of cancer cases and the actual risks posed to workers; and that more information was needed on a number of the chemicals. A further concern was the limited list of carcinogens being studied, which may prevent the identification of significant cancer risks in occupations where the causative agent is unknown. To improve transparency in the method used to prioritise substances, WATCH suggested prioritising them according to fixed, clearly stated criteria.

17. Overall, WATCH supported the need for a prioritisation exercise and understood the general approach taken. Also, WATCH appreciated the constraints, with respect to resource and timeframes, within which the work is to be completed. However, WATCH considered that the presentation of the work done thus far is not sufficiently transparent; and that further work is necessary to ensure that the initiative is sufficiently comprehensive to meet the stated objective.

**18. An example of an ongoing issue under REACH: derivation of DNELs and risk characterisation of non-threshold effects**

The idea of deriving and stipulating a derived no effect level (DNEL) for threshold effects is new to industrial chemicals legislation but is not new to other regulatory communities, for example those setting food contamination standards. Under REACH, a DNEL will be required for chemicals being marketed in quantities greater than 10 tonnes per annum and will be used for risk characterisation and included in the envisaged 'extended safety data sheet'. Within current REACH draft guidance, a DNEL is considered to be a 'bench-mark to define adequate control/acceptable exposure'.

19. For non-threshold effects, a Derived Minimal Effects Level (DMEL) might be derived for genotoxic carcinogens and somatic cell mutagens without cancer data; HSE considered that the identification of somatic cell mutagens without animal carcinogenicity data will be quite common under REACH as in strategic toxicity testing *in vivo* mutagenicity data are acquired relatively early, and if test data showed genotoxicity a carcinogen bioassay would not usually be done. Whereas a DNEL should not be exceeded, a DMEL was intended to be a level to aim for, and not necessarily to comply with. HSE requested input from WATCH on DMELs, as there was an opportunity to influence EU guidance being developed in this area. The following four options have been proposed by HSE to the EU Working Group under REACH Implementation Project 3-2 for establishing exposure standards for genotoxic carcinogens:

- i) robust evidence of a threshold for genotoxicity, allowing a DNEL to be calculated;
- ii) robust human exposure-response data, allowing quantitative risk assessment without extensive extrapolation outside the range of observed data points to obtain a DMEL;
- iii) limited human exposure-response data, allowing an assessment factor to be applied to a reliable point on the dose-response curve to generate a DMEL; and
- iv) animal bioassay data and the use of a large assessment factor to a toxicological reference point to determine a DMEL (HSE does not support the linear extrapolation approach from a T25 to a calculated 'acceptable' lifetime excess risk).

20. WATCH agreed with this proposed four-option approach for deriving DMELs for genotoxic carcinogens, subject to the following amendments: modification of option ii) to suggest the use of 'reference risk exposure level' to which a large assessment factor should be applied; inclusion of a statement about how 'negative' human data might be used; inclusion of a statement advocating the use of mechanistic information.

21. In addition to the general discussion on these options, further points were raised by WATCH. It was noted that within the proposed approaches, provision should be made for cases where robust animal data indicated carcinogenicity towards an experimental animal species, but there was no evidence of the emergence of cancer in exposed humans: it remains unclear how 'negative' human data should be used. HSE agreed that allowance for the appropriate use of 'negative' human data should be included in the approaches available for the determination of a DMEL. WATCH also requested that mechanistic information should be considered when calculating a DMEL. Considering that it is still uncertain how REACH will work in practice, WATCH acknowledged that it was dealing as much with how to present the approach to ensure compromise and political agreement as with the scientific issues involved.

22. WATCH concluded that, with the inclusion of the suggested revisions, currently the four-option approach is the most appropriate position to take into future EU discussions. WATCH was unable to suggest an approach for deriving DMELs for somatic cell mutagens with no carcinogenicity data beyond those indicated as unsatisfactory by HSE. However, for both this case and for genotoxic carcinogens, WATCH recommended that because of more general uncertainties surrounding REACH it was unnecessary to fix a definitive position at this stage.

### 23. **COSHH 2002 (as Amended) - Communicating the Changes**

The Control of Substances Hazardous to Health (Amendment) regulations 2004 introduced changes to the COSHH Regulations (2002). The changes, which centred on the provision of a new framework for adequate control with the introduction of eight principles of good control practice and the newly introduced Workplace Exposure Limit (WEL), were driven by a number of problems associated with the existing occupational exposure limit (OEL) framework, including the lack of understanding of OELs amongst small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) and the perception of Occupational Exposure Standards as 'safe' limits by many employers. The difficulties experienced by small firms in applying risk assessment to chemicals, and the need for simplified guidance on controlling risks for small/micro businesses, were highlighted to WATCH by HSE. WATCH was asked for its opinion on how the key message from COSHH could be communicated in a simpler and more effective way to SMEs.

24. An attendee suggested that it was important to remember that there were different target audiences. SMEs represent a large and important target audience and require a particular approach to communication. WATCH considered that SMEs should be involved as early as possible in the process to ascertain the most effective communication approach. WATCH also considered that safety data sheets (SDS) are well-recognised sources of information on risk control for SMEs and would therefore be an appropriate place to include advice on adequate control measures, although, to be effective, the quality of SDS would need to be improved. The challenge would be to make the message clear and uncomplicated, and to make health and safety more appealing, rather than being regarded as obstructive. In terms of other audiences, these would tend to expect and would be able to accommodate communication on detailed specifics; such audiences would include large organisations with specialist resources or professional occupational hygienists.

WATCH thought that representatives of the target audience should be involved at an early stage through a 'focus group' approach.

25. WATCH suggested that visual communication should be more commonly used, with the key messages focussed on changing work practices for the better. Subtle changes to the way information is presented and communicated could often make a big impact. Raising awareness on the reasons for change verbally, then the use of a combination of visual representations and written instructions to indicate what changes were necessary, would be a good approach. It was noted by HSE that graphic representation, dramatisation and visual presentations of identified exposure situations and the benefits of proper control had worked well in the past. Stakeholders and other intermediaries (e.g. trade associations, professional societies, unions) would also be involved in the implementation of identified risk control measures. WATCH suggested that other means of effective communication could include an accessible library of appropriate DVD/video material on chemical control, and interactive rather than simply instructive communication.

26. For changes in established working practices to be implemented successfully, WATCH thought that understanding and addressing the beliefs and values of workers would be important, and tackling the issue would have to involve educating workers on why they needed to change their behaviours. Emphasis was placed on the need to understand the target audience in developing any communication strategy. WATCH suggested that HSE could also conduct a nationwide campaign publicising the control aspect of COSHH. Additionally, WATCH thought that different ways of communicating should be experimented with and representatives of the target audience should be involved at an early stage, through a 'focus group' approach.

#### **27. Progress with horizon scanning issues identified in 2005**

As a government Scientific Advisory Committee, WATCH is required to identify, on a regular basis, new and emerging issues in its particular areas of responsibility, and to determine whether or not, in its opinion, they may require scientific advice or research. WATCH continued discussion of how to progress development of each of the three emerging issues that had been identified as high priorities in October 2005. The priorities were:

- i) the future impact on hazard classification and risk management (OELs, risk assessment, COSHH Essentials) of chemicals resulting from the implementation in the EU of the envisaged new legislation on chemicals known by the acronym REACH and the Globally Harmonised System of classification and labelling of chemicals, known as GHS;
- ii) the development of a strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of Workplace Exposure Limits (WELs) and the effectiveness of risk management achieved with generic control approaches, i.e. COSHH Essentials; and
- iii) the development of improvements in and/or guidelines for exposure data assessment.

28. With regard to i), GHS and REACH are due to be implemented, in parallel, in 2007. As it is now known that HSE is to be the competent authority for REACH and GHS, this issue will be relevant to future WATCH business. WATCH agreed that the issue of REACH and GHS as it impacts on classification and risk management remains a high priority matter. HSE will continue to update WATCH on relevant developments and the role of WATCH will be identified accordingly.

29. With regard to ii), two WATCH members, in consultation with all members, had prepared a research specification to evaluate the effectiveness of WELs and an accompanying tender brief and funding proposal. The intention was to submit these to ACTS for endorsement before being submitted to HSE as the envisaged funding body. However, members agreed that the project should be delayed until the impact of REACH implementation (in particular the requirement for suppliers to establish exposure scenarios and communicate appropriate control measures to users, therefore bringing about less reliance on OELs) on the user-orientated COSHH/WELs framework is fully understood.

30. With regard to iii), HSE had produced a concise paper proposing how the topic of exposure intelligence might best be further advanced. However, WATCH noted the difficulties of defining specific actions to improve exposure data collection and assessment of available epidemiological data. WATCH agreed that the best way to progress this issue was to combine it with another issue, intelligence gathering, identified as a priority in 2006 (see below).

### **31. New and emerging issues identified in 2006**

Fifteen topics were identified for consideration and grouped by WATCH into themes, which were then prioritised. 'Nanotechnology' was identified as a high priority, but WATCH in conjunction with its COPI ad hoc members did not feel there was a need to propose specific HSE/WATCH actions, since another group is co-ordinating the Government's activities in this field. The other five highest priority issues were considered to be:

- i) appropriate exposure controls for 'nuisance dusts';
- ii) occupational exposure intelligence gathering and data quality, to include topics 11 and 12 as described in WATCH/2006/9 Annex 1;
- iii) recycling-industry practices that may give rise to increases in exposure to hazardous substances;
- iv) risks from low-level exposure to asbestos, to includes topics 17 and 19 as described in WATCH/2006/9 Annex 1; and
- v) occupational exposure standards, limits or guidance for respiratory exposure to metalworking fluids

32. Discussion of these five themes prompted actions to instigate their further consideration at future WATCH meetings, namely for HSE to draft a position paper for each issue. All but v) were progressed in this reporting year; v) is due to be considered in June 2007.

### **33. How to progress the emerging issue of 'nuisance dusts'**

This topic was the 'new/emerging' issue that was ranked as the highest priority by WATCH at the November 2006 meeting. During a discussion on how this topic could be progressed, WATCH considered the data presented in a report commissioned by HSE and prepared by the Institute of Occupational Medicine (IOM), in which the reductions in forced expiratory volume over one second (FEV<sub>1</sub>) and consequent clinical symptoms resulting from exposure to coal mine dust, talc dust and polyvinyl chloride (PVC) dust were reported.

34. Overall, with some qualifiers (presentationally, a little more could be done to clarify the health effects of exposure to the dusts studied; and only a limited number of dusts had been included in the IOM research), WATCH considered that the IOM research, particularly that related to the effects of coal mine dust, represented a thorough, robust analysis and agreed with the IOM/HSE assessment of the findings<sup>(a)</sup>.

35. WATCH recommended characterising the best dose-response position that can be extracted from the data on the effects on the respiratory tract of exposure to coal mine dust; and then to make the most defensible statements justified by the data for the other dusts included in the IOM analysis<sup>(a)</sup>.

36. WATCH also concluded that the dose-response data indicated that the effect on the respiratory tract of exposure to coal mine dust, within the exposure range studied, occurred as a continuum, with no clear threshold appearing<sup>(a)</sup>.

37. WATCH considered that the term 'nuisance dust' is not appropriate, since it carries the implication that the nuisance is the major concern, rather than any possible adverse health effects. An alternative term, 'low toxicity dust', has a different connotation, the inference being that such a dust has a limited health impact. WATCH recommended that any nomenclature should attempt to express what people are being exposed to. For example, a term such as 'dust not otherwise characterised' might be appropriate for some situations, but its use should not apply to specific dusts such as 'coal mine dust' or 'talc dust', the properties and control of which should be assessed on their own merits. It may also be necessary to include in any generic term a reference to the solubility of the dust.

38. WATCH recommended consideration of some work to better guide duty holders as to what category of dust they might be dealing with and hence, if specific guidance or control standards for that dust were not available, which benchmark or reference would need to be adhered to<sup>(a)</sup>.

39. WATCH also recommended reconsideration of the wording of some of the statements in the COSHH ACOP and in EH40 in the context of the discussion that had taken place<sup>(a)</sup>.

40. Finally, WATCH charged HSE with presenting to ACTS a distillation of the dose-response curve for coal mine dust and for any associated observations and recommendations from WATCH, in relation to the issue of exposure to, and control of, dusts in general<sup>(a)</sup>.

**41. New/emerging issue: modern exposure intelligence strategy**

There has been a decline in exposure measurement, illustrated by the National Exposure Database (NEDB) established by HSE. The decline has been less dramatic for a few substances, e.g. isocyanates, where, exceptionally, many recent occupational exposure measurements have been collected in a very targeted approach, illustrating that such data can still be gathered, but it is very expensive to do and such investigative work is rare nowadays.

42. WATCH considered a modern risk management intelligence initiative, which would capture qualitative as well as quantitative information on the conditions of chemical use and control. Such an initiative would seek to capture a wider spectrum of information than that traditionally employed in gathering data suitable for NEDB. It was proposed by HSE that a pilot be undertaken to test the viability of the initiative.

43. WATCH thought that the strategy had a strong link with, and would provide new opportunities for working under, COSHH Essentials. WATCH also saw that there would be the potential to inform exposure assessments made under REACH, particularly if the approach could be adopted across the EU.

44. To aid resource issues and also to maintain anonymity, HSE would involve as many people outside of HSE as possible, for example the Institute of Occupational Safety and Hygiene (agreed to participate in the pilot project and is seen as a crucial intermediary body). Notwithstanding, WATCH still had some concerns over the availability of resources within industry to comply with the strategy. Also, a potential problem would be in the quality of the data input into the database, in the absence of a quality assurance review. However, HSE thought that the more data that was obtained, the more would it be possible to identify the outlying cases that indicated that something was wrong with the data quality. HSE also noted that some of the data in NEDB was sparse, one issue being the absence of contextual information surrounding some of the numerical data; this would be rectified in this new approach.

45. WATCH made the following recommendations:

- i) a new HSE strategy should be developed with partners to seek practicable ways to capitalise on the factual and qualitative intelligence potentially available from the large volume of exposure assessment information held under modern risk management methods;
- ii) indicators shown to be of value through analysis of the pilot should be converted into a short, standardised set of risk exposure and control descriptors that are compatible with existing and emerging regulatory frameworks, particularly REACH; and
- iii) a rationalised set of the new descriptors arising from the pilot should be used to inform any revision of the NEDB, also incorporating with a defined set of COSHH risk control factors.

46. Overall, WATCH supported the conduct of a pilot study to test this proposed new initiative; and considered that such a pilot would provide valuable information on the potential usefulness and viability of the proposed strategy and indication of the resources that would be involved in progressing it. <sup>(a)</sup>

**47. New/emerging issue: recycling industry**

A representative of HSE's Policy Group, Manufacturing Sector – waste and recycling, presented WATCH with an insight into this growing industry. HSE reported that the waste and recycling industry has one of the worst safety records, with an accident rate of five times the national average and accounting for a twelfth of all occupational deaths in the UK. There is some evidence of ill-health amongst workers in this industry, and some of the potential hazards have been identified, but there is little information on the extent of the potential for harm or on the characteristics of

---

<sup>a</sup> Note: from draft minutes of the 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2007 meeting

exposures. This item will be progressed further when a relevant HSL report and associated comments from an ad hoc expert are distributed to WATCH.

#### **48. New/emerging issue: low-level exposures to asbestos**

A preliminary discussion of how to progress this issue was held at the February 2007 meeting. There was a clear consensus amongst WATCH members that this is an important issue to be progressed. WATCH considered its committee to be the most appropriate forum to address this issue, and that the committee should be strengthened at future meetings by the inclusion of ad hoc members with particular expertise in asbestos.

49. HSE will prepare a scoping document detailing a draft plan for how this work should be advanced through WATCH.

#### **Action**

50. ACTS members are asked to note the information in this paper.

#### **Contact**

Nicola Gregg HSE FOD (CHSD 1)  
WATCH Secretary  
Tel: 0151 951 5800  
Email: nicola.gregg@hse.gsi.gov.uk

#### **References**

COPSAC December 2001, Office of Science and Technology, Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees, Department of Trade and Industry.

#### **Attachments**

Annex 1 WATCH Membership Template 2006/7  
Annex 2 Register of Members' Interests 2006/7  
Annex 3 WATCH Terms of Reference  
Annex 4 WATCH Financial Statement 2006/7  
Annex 5 Methods of Resolving Conflict  
Annex 6 Glossary of Terms  
Annex 7 Papers Issued to WATCH in 2006/7

As a scientific advisory committee WATCH is required to adhere to the Office of Science and Technology's Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees (COPSAC). The COPSAC requires committee arrangements/procedures to be established and some of these arrangements/procedures to be presented in the Annual Report; these have been included in Annexes 1-6.

## Annex 1

### WATCH Membership Template 2006/7

#### MEMBERS

##### TUC Nominees

Dr T Fletcher  
Prof A W M Hay  
Dr M J Nieuwenhuijsen

##### Area of Expertise

Epidemiology  
Toxicology  
Occupational hygiene/epidemiology

##### CBI Nominees

Dr S P Binks  
Mr R Chapman  
Mr S D Williams

Toxicology  
Occupational hygiene  
Toxicology

##### Independent Members

Mr S R Bailey  
Mr D G Farrar  
Prof L S Levy  
Dr S R Hutchinson

Occupational hygiene  
Toxicology  
Toxicology

##### Chairperson

Dr S Fairhurst

Toxicology

##### Ad hoc Members co-opted in 2006/7

Dr R Fielder  
Mr G Kowalczyk  
Dr P Lewis  
Prof C Haslam  
Dr M van Tongeren  
Ms Helen Casstles

Toxicology  
Toxicology  
Toxicology  
Health psychology  
Occupational hygiene  
Environmental public health

## Annex 2

### Annual Register of Interests 2006

Members have declared the following interests (ie share holdings or fundings received)

Name and Employer or Nominating Body	Declaration	Personal Profile (optional)
Dr S Fairhurst HSE	None	
Dr T Fletcher TUC	None	
Prof A Hay TUC	None	
Dr M Nieuwenhuijsen TUC	None	
Dr S P Binks CBI	Employee and Share Holder of GlaxoSmithKline	
Mr R Chapman CBI	Employee of BASF plc (chemical manufacturing/trading company) Share Holder of BASF AG	
Mr S Williams CBI	Employee of BP Chemicals Ltd Share Holder of BP plc (specifically, petroleum products and petrochemicals)	
Mr S Bailey	Employee and Share Holder of GlaxoSmithKline Share holder of Shell plc	
Mr D Farrar	Employee of Ineos ChlorVinyls Limited. Consultant to Ineos Enterprises, Ineos Fluor, Ineos Silicas, Ineos Healthcare, Asahi Glass Fluoropolymers UK Ltd, Saffil Ltd, CXR Biosciences and ICI plc. Share Holder of ICI plc.	
Dr L Levy	Scientific Adviser on Occupational & Toxicological research to International Carbon Black Association (specifically, carbon black)	
Dr S R Hutchinson	Share Holder of Johnson Matthey	
<b>Ad Hoc Members</b>		
Prof C Haslam	None	
Dr M van Tongeren	In receipt of research grants from ILZRO (dermal lead exposure) and CONCAWE (dermal exposure to heavy fuel oils)	
Ms H Casstles	None	
Dr R Fielder	None	
Mr G Kowalczyk	None	
Dr P Lewis	None	

## Annex 3

### WATCH Terms of Reference

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE WORKING GROUP ON ACTION TO CONTROL CHEMICALS (WATCH)

1. *To be the ACTS scientific sub-committee to advise ACTS and HSC/E on issues relating to the assessment and control of health risks of chemicals.*

2. *WATCH's terms of reference are:*

*To provide scientific and technical advice to ACTS and HSE on matters within its competence. In particular, to provide scientific and technical advice to ACTS and its other sub-groups and where requested, HSE, on issues relating to chemicals, their actual or potential health impact and the means of their control in the workplace.*

3. *Should issues arise which require additional expertise, the Chair and the Secretariat, in consultation with WATCH members, may appoint other persons to attend meetings of WATCH to meet particular needs, including co-opting independent experts for particular issues/meetings.*

4. *WATCH will provide annual reports on its work to ACTS.*

## Annex 4

### WATCH Financial Statement 2006/7

Costs incurred are travel and subsistence reimbursements to members, hire of conference facilities and equipment, refreshments and meals during meetings and overnight rooms for residential meetings.

Members do not receive a fee for time spent preparing for or attending WATCH meetings.

In 2006/7 WATCH met on three occasions, two 1-day meetings, at HSE's offices in London and Bootle, and one 2-day residential meeting in Liverpool.

Total travel and subsistence costs	=	£ 1660.83
Total conference expenses including meals, room/equipment hire, overnight rooms	=	£ 4896.57
-----		
Total WATCH expenditure in 2006/7	=	£ 6557.40

NB. Several members have not claimed for travel and subsistence reimbursement in 2006/7 as expenses are met by their employers.

## Annex 5

### Methods of Resolving Conflict

Extract from Members' Terms and Conditions (WATCH/2004/8) :

#### **8. Handling conflict of interests**

WATCH members are appointed on a personal basis, even when nominated by stakeholder groups. However, to avoid any public concern that commercial interests might affect the advice of WATCH, HSE has decided that the arrangements that govern relationships between members and the chemicals industry and information on significant and relevant interests should be on public record. Members will be required to declare any interests on appointment and at relevant meetings. Such interests can be direct or indirect. Examples of a direct interest would be employment at a company that manufactures chemicals and personal involvement in the subject under discussion or being retained as an expert witness in a legal case involving the subject under discussion. An example of an indirect interest would be when a member, working at a University Department, is aware that the Department is part-funded by grants from a particular company, but where the member is not involved in the work funded by that company.

If an interest is declared the member should seek the Chair's guidance on whether they should take part in the proceedings.

To avoid any danger of WATCH members being influenced, or appearing to be influenced, by their private interests in the exercise of their public duties, all members should declare commercial interests.

## Annex 6

### Glossary of Terms

ACTS	Advisory Committee on Toxic Substances
CA	Competent Authority
COPD	Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease
COPI	Community of Practice and Interest
COPSAC	Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees
COSHH	Control of Substances Hazardous to Health
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DMEL	Derived minimal effects level
DNEL	Derived no effect level
DRP	Disease Reduction Programme
FEV	Forced expiratory volume
GHS	Globally Harmonised System of classification and labelling of chemicals
HSC	Health and Safety Commission
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
HSL	Health and Safety Laboratory
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer
IOM	Institute of Occupational Medicine
NEDB	National Exposure Database
OEL	Occupational Exposure Limit
PVC	Polyvinyl chloride
SDS	Safety data sheet(s)
REACH	Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals
SME	Small- and medium-sized enterprise
WATCH	Working Group on Action to Control Chemicals
WEL	Workplace Exposure Limit

## Annex 7

### Papers Issued to WATCH in 2006/7

- WATCH/Agenda/2006/2 - Agenda for 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 20<sup>th</sup> June 2006
- WATCH/2006/4 - October 2005 horizon-scanning priorities: where are we up to?
- WATCH/2006/5 – Disease Reduction Programme: an introduction to the Cancer Project and detailed review of the profiling exercise
- WATCH/SecReport/2006/3 – Secretary’s Report for 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 20<sup>th</sup> June 2006
- WATCH/MIN/2006/2 – Minutes of the 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 20<sup>th</sup> June 2006
  
- WATCH/Agenda/2006/3 – Agenda for 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 9<sup>th</sup> & 10<sup>th</sup> November 2006
- WATCH/2006/6 – COSHH 2002 (as amended): communicating the changes
- WATCH/2006/7 – Cancer Disease Reduction Programme: nature and extent of use of, and occupational exposure to, chemical carcinogens in the UK
- WATCH/2006/8 – Derivation of DNELs and risk characterisation of non-threshold effects under REACH
- WATCH/2006/9 – New and emerging issues 2006
- WATCH/2006/10 - Nanotechnology – occupational health aspects
- WATCH/2006/11 – Improvements in Exposure Data Assessment
- WATCH/2006/12 – REACH Competent Authority: current state of play
- WATCH/SecReport/2006/3 – Secretary’s Report for 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 9<sup>th</sup> & 10<sup>th</sup> November 2006
- WATCH/MIN/2006/3 – Minutes of the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> November 2006
  
- WATCH/Agenda/2007/1 – Agenda for 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2007
- WATCH/2007/1 – How to progress the identified ‘emerging issue’ of reviewing appropriate levels of control and associated terminology for ‘nuisance dusts’
- WATCH/2007/2 – The risk of ill health from low-level exposures to asbestos – exploring what can (and can’t) be reliably discerned about the dose-response relationships involved in ‘low level exposure’ – initial discussion about scope of project and best means of its progression.
- WATCH/2007/3 – Towards a modern exposure intelligence strategy
- WATCH/SecReport/2007/1 – Secretary’s report for 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2007
- WATCH/MIN/2007/1 – Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting, 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2007

Papers are available on the HSE website at:

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/hsc/iacs/acts/watch/index.htm>