



Secretariat

Distr.
GENERAL

ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/6
24 July 2002

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE TRANSPORT OF
DANGEROUS GOODS AND ON THE GLOBALLY
HARMONIZED SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION
AND LABELLING OF CHEMICALS**

**Sub-Committee of Experts on the Globally Harmonized
System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals**
(10-12 July 2002)

**REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS
ON ITS THIRD SESSION**

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
ATTENDANCE	1-6
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	7
GLOBALLY HARMONIZED SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING OF CHEMICALS (GHS)	8-35
Comprehensibility testing of the GHS pictograms and transport of dangerous goods labels	9
Proposals for modifications to the draft GHS document	10
Proposal for editorial changes.....	11
Reformatting of the original GHS proposal.....	12-15
Procedure for the allocation of symbols	16
Use of signal words on cylinders	17-19
Intrinsic properties	20
Definition of flammable gases.....	21
Miscellaneous proposals	22 and 23
Dermal sensitizers	24
Summary tables regarding Chapter 3.10	25
Annex 5.....	26
Annex 11	27
GHS symbol for serious health effects	28-34
Numbering of paragraphs in the GHS document	35

CONTENTS (cont'd)

Paragraphs

OUTSTANDING WORK	36-46
IMPLEMENTATION	47-52
CAPACITY BUILDING	53
OTHER BUSINESS	54
ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	55

* * *

Annex 1: Adopted texts	page 11
Annex 2: Terms of reference of the Correspondence Group for editorial matters.....	page 13
Annex 3: Health hazard symbol.....	page 14
Annex 4: Draft work programme for 2003-2004	page 16

REPORT

ATTENDANCE

1. The Sub-Committee of Experts on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals held its third session in Geneva from 10 to 12 July 2002.
2. Experts from the following countries took part in the session: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom and United States of America.
3. Under rule 72 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, observers from the following countries took part: China, Denmark, Mexico, Portugal, Switzerland and Zambia.
4. Representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (Secretariat of the Basel Convention), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and of the following specialized agencies were present: International Labour Office (ILO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO).
5. The following intergovernmental organization was represented: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
6. Representatives of the following non-governmental organizations took part in the discussion of items of concern to their organizations: Compressed Gas Association (CGA), European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC), Croplife International, European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA), Federation of European Aerosol Associations (FEA), Federation Industrial Paints and Coats of Mercosul (FIPBM), Dangerous Goods Advisory Council (DGAC), International Association of the Soap, Detergent and Maintenance Products Industry (AISE), International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), International Occupational Hygiene Association (IOHA), International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA), International Organization for Standardization (ISO), Soap and Detergent Association (SDA) and International Union of Railways (UIC).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/5 (Secretariat)

Informal documents : INF.1 and INF.2 (Secretariat)

7. The Sub-Committee adopted the provisional agenda prepared by the secretariat with the addition of the late informal documents (INF.3 to INF.19).

GLOBALLY HARMONIZED SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING OF CHEMICALS (GHS)

8. It was recalled that the basic text for the GHS was contained in documents ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/11 to ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/20 to -/2001/28, as transmitted by the Chairman of the Inter-Organizational Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), and had been amended at the previous session (ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/4, annex).

Comprehensibility testing of the GHS pictograms and transport of dangerous goods labels

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/1 (United States of America)

9. The Sub-Committee noted that the expert from the United States of America had initiated a study to evaluate the GHS pictograms and their impact on the effectiveness of the transport regulations, transport emergency response, transport safety, compliance and enforcement. Phase I of the study (emergency responders) had been completed but the results were still being compiled and analysed. Phase II of the study (transport workers) had been delayed, but the expert of the United States of America intended to present the results for the two phases by next December. If these results showed no problem with the practical interpretation of the GHS symbols, he would not further pursue the issue, otherwise he would try to propose corrective action in a constructive manner bearing in mind the efforts made by the IOMC Coordinating Group to reach a consensus in this respect.

Proposals for modifications to the draft GHS document

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/4 (Belgium, Canada, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and United States of America)

10. These proposals were adopted with minor modifications (see annex 1).

Proposal for editorial changes

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/3 (Canada, Finland, United States of America)

11. The proposed editorial changes were adopted (see annex 1).

Reformatting of the original GHS proposal

Informal documents: INF.5 and addenda 1 to 9 (Secretariat)

12. The Sub-Committee noted with satisfaction that the secretariat had prepared a new consolidated text of the GHS on the basis of the request made at the last session (ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/4, para. 16 and annex) except for annexes 8 and 9 which would also soon be made available on the web site of the UNECE Transport Division.

13. The Sub-Committee noted that, in addition, the secretariat had introduced a number of editorial changes which would require checking, and had raised in paragraphs 1 to 14 of INF.5 a number of questions. The Sub-Committee decided to establish a Correspondence Group on editorial matters led by the Chairperson and the two Vice-chairpersons which, in cooperation with the secretariat, will check the editorial changes introduced by the secretariat and consider and resolve the questions raised, so that a final text could be prepared for submission to the next session (see annex 2 for terms of reference). Sub-Committee members were invited to provide comments by no later than 1 August 2002.

14. The Sub-Committee also noted that the secretariat had identified in paras. 15 to 24 of INF.5, a number of missing parts in the existing text, and decided as follows:

- (a) A new foreword should be drafted by the secretariat for consideration by the Correspondence Group on editorial matters;
- (b) Questions raised in paragraphs 16 and 19 would be discussed in connection with the documents relating to sensitization;
- (c) In the absence of an example for a safety data sheet, 1.5.3.4 could be deleted;

- (d) Since examples had not been drafted for Chapters 3.1, 3.6 and 3.10, references thereto could also be deleted;
- (e) Sentences indicating that further discussion was needed (3.7.2.5.10 and 3.7.3.4) could be deleted, 3.7.2.5.9 should be redrafted, but the need for further discussion should be reflected in the work programme; nevertheless it was agreed to retain Note 2b to 3.10.2.2;
- (f) Chapter 4.2 should be deleted.

15. The Sub-Committee noted that a summary table for aquatic hazards had been provided by OECD in INF.16 for inclusion in Annex 3 (Classification and labelling of summary tables) of the GHS.

Procedure for the allocation of symbols

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/9 (EIGA)

16. There was no support for the proposal to amend paragraph 46 of Chapter 1.3.

Use of signal words on cylinders

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/6 (EIGA)

17. Many delegations considered that there was no reason to exempt gas cylinders from the signal word requirement, and the proposal from EIGA was not supported.

18. The representative of EIGA drew attention to the fact that the mandatory indication of signal words could cause problems in many regions of the world where several languages were used, in particular in Europe.

19. The expert from Italy recalled that each sectoral regulatory system would apply the GHS as deemed necessary, and that requiring signal words on the label when cylinders were used did not mean that such labels had to be affixed prior to use, e.g. during international transport. However, the expert from the United States of America noted that when a cylinder is shipped to a workplace, it is required to be labelled for that use by the manufacturer or distributor prior to shipment.

Intrinsic properties (Chapter 1.1, paragraph 6, bullet point 2)

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/8 (EIGA)

20. The Sub-Committee agreed that, although the classification criteria of the GHS were based, in principle, on the intrinsic properties of substances, some criteria related to physical hazards took account of hazards arising from other properties. Therefore the Sub-Committee decided to add a footnote to Chapter 1.1, paragraph 6, intended to recognize such derogations to the general principle (see annex 1).

Definition of flammable gases

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/5 (EIGA)

Informal document: INF.8 (EFMA)

21. The representative from EIGA withdrew his proposal, which had been rejected by the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods.

Miscellaneous proposals

Informal document: INF.10 (CEFIC)

22. Proposal No. 1 was adopted. Proposal No. 2 was also provisionally adopted, except that in addition to OECD Test Guideline 431, OECD Test Guideline 430 was also considered as an acceptable validated in vitro test method for aerosol corrosion. The corresponding test of Note (e) to Figure 1 of Chapter 3.2 was placed between square brackets pending final adoption of Test Guidelines 430 and 431 by OECD (see annex 1).

23. Proposal No. 3 was withdrawn and would be submitted to the correspondence group dealing with editorial matters.

Dermal sensitizers

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2002/12 (Canada and United States of America)

Informal document: INF.6 (OECD) INF.7 (Netherlands and Sweden)

24. The proposal to replace table 1 of Chapter 3.4 (respiratory and skin sensitizers), paragraph 25, by the table and the notes proposed in ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/12 and INF.6, to take account of progress made by OECD, was adopted (see annex 1). The additional sentences proposed in INF.7 were also inserted, but placed between square brackets subject to consideration and adoption by OECD.

Summary tables regarding Chapter 3.10

Informal document: INF.16 (OECD)

25. The tables proposed by OECD were adopted (see annex 1).

Annex 5

Informal document: INF.13 and INF.13/Corr.1 (France)

26. The expert from France explained why, in her opinion, annex 5 to document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/27 should not be included in the GHS. After lengthy discussion, where some experts expressed an opposite view, the Sub-Committee agreed to amend the two first sentences of paragraph 59, Chapter 1.3 of ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/20 as indicated in Annex 1 to this report. This amendment, in combination with the addition to paragraph 28 of Chapter 1.3 proposed in document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/4 and adopted by the Sub-Committee, would take account of the concerns expressed by France. Therefore, annex 5 would be retained in the GHS.

Annex 11

Documents: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/10 (Secretariat)
ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2002/CRP.2/Add.9

Informal documents: INF.9 (FEA)
INF.11 (Sweden)
INF.18 (Secretariat)

27. The Sub-Committee noted that these documents, related to the inclusion of procedures and test methods for classification of flammable aerosols, had already been adopted by the Sub-Committee of experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods (ST/SG/AC.10/C.3/2002/CRP.2/Add.9) for inclusion in the Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, Manual of Tests and Criteria, and concurred with the decision of that Sub-Committee. As a consequence, Annex 11 could be deleted from the GHS and replaced by references to the Manual of Tests and Criteria as proposed by the secretariat at the end of ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/10 (see annex 1).

GHS symbol for serious health effects

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/13 (Sweden)

Informal document: INF.17 (United States of America and Canada)

28. The expert from Sweden explained that, pursuant to discussions at the last session (ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/4, paras. 17-20), she had further developed four new draft symbols for serious health effects and she had consulted experts in 33 countries as to their preference for the double-exclamation mark symbol or any of the four new symbols proposed. It appeared from this consultation that the double-exclamation mark symbol was not preferred in most countries. A clear majority of the responding countries, i.e. 21 out of 27, supported symbol No. 4 and, as a consequence, she proposed to replace it with symbol No. 4 as presented in ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/13. In addition to the responses listed in Annex 2 of document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/13, responses were also received from Argentina, New Zealand, Qatar and Spain; these also indicated their preference for symbol No. 4.

29. In INF.17, the experts from Canada and the United States of America explained the long history of the adoption by the IOMC Co-ordinating Group of the double-exclamation mark as the GHS symbol for serious health effects, and the reasonings. The skull and crossbones had been deemed suitable only for conveying the poison hazard or immediate acute effects. The symbol was to be abstract because no symbol conveying suitably the various specific serious health effects could be found. The abstract symbol would be accompanied with signal words and hazard statements, and in the workplace workers would be trained. The symbol was to be simple to reproduce well, be gender neutral, and should not give misleading information or be confused with other symbols.

30. Most experts of the Sub-Committee expressed support for the proposal by Sweden. They felt that a symbol which conveys a human shape was preferable to an abstract symbol conveying a general warning, especially in those countries with a large proportion of illiterate people, or where in practice very few workers were effectively trained, or where information of the public in general could not be done appropriately. The information contained in informal document INF.4 (IAEA) also showed that using abstract symbols such as a trefoil for radioactive material appeared not to be effective for warning non-trained persons of the general public.

31. The experts from the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Australia indicated that they would prefer to keep the double-exclamation mark symbol, but that they were willing to show

flexibility and to try to find a compromise solution in the spirit of consensus that had prevailed in the development of the GHS.

32. The expert from the United States of America said that she could not accept the symbol proposed by Sweden, and suggested that this issue should be dealt with intersessionally by a correspondence group.

33. After an extensive debate on the question, many experts felt that if an alternative new symbol has to be developed, such a symbol should draw attention and should have a human shape.

34. The Sub-Committee finally agreed not to take a final decision on the recommended GHS symbol at this session. Both the double-exclamation mark symbol and symbol No.4 would be kept as two possible options for decision at the next session and no specific symbol would be indicated in the draft GHS document to be submitted to the Sub-Committee at that session (see annex 3). In addition, it was agreed to establish a correspondence group to be led by the Chairperson of the Sub-Committee, which would attempt to propose a third option in accordance with terms of reference as laid down in annex 3 to this report.

Numbering of paragraphs in the GHS document

35. Following a question asked by the expert from the United States of America about the numbering systems used in INF.5 and addenda, a member of the secretariat explained that the new numbering was not imposed by UN editorial rules but corresponded to the numbering system recommended by ISO. After a discussion on the pros and cons of this system, the Sub-Committee confirmed the decision taken at the previous session in favour of this ISO system.

OUTSTANDING AND FUTURE WORK

Documents: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/28 (GHS)
ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/8 (Canada, Finland, United States of America)
ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/7 (EIGA)

Informal document: INF.12 (Norway)

36. The representative of OECD informed the Sub-Committee of the status of work on outstanding issues in his organization, in particular as regards classification criteria for narcotic effects, aspiration hazards and water-activated toxicity. He further explained that the validation work of the Transformation/Dissolution Protocol had been delayed as a result of insufficient nomination of independent experts by Member Countries, but that an effort will be made to solve this issue.

37. The Sub-Committee took note of the various proposals for future work in document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/2, -/C.4/2002/7 and INF.12. It was agreed that the proposals in ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/2 could be amended by the second proposal in INF.12 with some corrections (see annex 4).

38. Several experts expressed the wish that priority in the next biennium should be given to:

- (a) with respect to Health and Environmental Hazard: on-going work of OECD, respiratory and dermal sensitization; carcinogenicity; reproductive toxicity and aquatic environmental hazards; chronic environmental issues;
- (b) with respect to hazard communication: harmonization of standard precautionary statement and guidance on the preparation of Safety Data Sheets.

39. The Sub-Committee agreed to request the OECD to consider work in the areas as laid out in amended document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/2 (see annex 4 to this report) and provide its priorities after the next session of the Sub-Committee (9-11 December 2002).

40. No decision was taken with respect to the EIGA proposal.

41. The expert from Spain wished to include the development of criteria for hazards to the terrestrial environment in the work programme. The representative of OECD explained that some discussions had already taken place at OECD level in this respect, but that there were a number of important technical and scientific disagreements which remained to be solved, and that it would be premature to include this subject in the work programme of the next biennium.

42. The expert from Germany proposed to include in the list of activities for the programme of work of the next biennium those recommended in its informal document INF.19 concerning training and capacity building. This proposal was supported by the expert from Argentina who emphasized the need for assistance to developing countries regarding the implementation of the GHS. The expert from Germany invited other countries besides Finland, the United States of America and Canada to participate in the preparation of a proposal for further work of the Sub-Committee regarding support for implementation of the GHS to be submitted to the next session.

Informal document: INF.18 (Secretariat)

43. The Sub-Committee noted that the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods had adopted a new definition for LD₅₀ in the Model Regulations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to take account of the new OECD Test Guidelines 420, 423 and 425. This decision, however, was not related to the implementation of the GHS (which would be discussed in the next biennium) but was intended to update the existing reference to OECD Test Guideline 401 which had become obsolete. The Sub-Committee recognized that the definition as included in Chapter 3.1 of the draft GHS already reflects the deletion of Guideline 401.

44. The Sub-Committee noted that the amendments adopted for the criteria for the corrosiveness of liquids and solids belonging to Class 8, packing group III, for steel and aluminium would require corresponding amendments to be made in the GHS (Chapter 2.16) which could be submitted during this biennium.

45. The definitive work programme for the next biennium will be decided at the next session.

Informal document: INF.4 (Secretariat)

46. The Sub-Committee was informed of the work undertaken by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to determine whether the pictogrammes presently required by IAEA to identify the hazard of radioactivity were suitable or should be replaced.

IMPLEMENTATION

47. The experts from Australia, Brazil and the United States of America made statements as regards GHS workshops and other awareness-raising activities undertaken in their countries.

48. The expert from Argentina expressed the wish that a GHS workshop could be organized in the South American region.

49. The expert from Germany indicated that the European Commission had undertaken work to check all directives which would be affected by the GHS and would need be amended.

50. A member of the secretariat said that, if the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods decided to amend the UN Model Regulations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to fully reflect the GHS and could complete this work during the next biennium, corresponding amendments to the international legal instruments dealing with transport of dangerous goods (RID, ADR, ADN, IMDG Code, ICAO Technical Instructions) could eventually enter into force on 1 January 2007.

51. The secretariat also intended to contact all secretariats of international conventions likely to be affected by the GHS.

52. The representative of IMO said that the GHS classification criteria had been considered by his organization, and it was most likely that legal instruments dealing with transport of chemicals in bulk from the standpoint of safety and of protection of the environment (SOLAS and MARPOL Conventions and related codes) would be amended sooner or later to reflect the new criteria, in particular those related to hazards to the aquatic environment.

CAPACITY BUILDING

53. The representative of UNITAR and the observer from Zambia informed the Sub-Committee of the training and capacity building activities undertaken since the last session in Zambia, Senegal and Sri Lanka. The Sub-Committee noted that similar activities were also planned for South Africa. UNITAR is seeking additional resources to fund additional activities and to ensure more linguistic and regional balance. UNITAR, ILO and OECD have also proposed a partnership initiative to reinforce the GHS capacity building programme in the context of the preparatory process to the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 26 August-4 September 2002)) and several organizations have already responded positively.

OTHER BUSINESS

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/11 (Secretariat)

Informal document: INF.3 (IOHA)

54. The Sub-Committee agreed to grant consultative status to IOHA.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

55. The Sub-Committee adopted the report on its third session and the annexes thereto on the basis of a draft prepared by the secretariat.

* * * * *

Annex 1**Adopted texts**

Document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/4 adopted, with modifications, as follows:

- Page 15, second box on the left side, second sentence : replace “pand” with “and”.
- Page 28, decision logic for effects on or via lactation: in the two boxes on the right side, replace “class” with “category”.
- Page 37, in the first box, replace “?” with “n”. The amended text of the box now reads:

Apply the Additivity Method:

$$\frac{? C_i}{L(E)C_{50m}} ? \frac{? C_i}{L(E)C_{50i}}$$

where:

C_i	=	concentration of component i (weight percentage)
$L(E)C_{50i}$	=	(mg/L) LC_{50} or EC_{50} for component I
n	=	number of components
$L(E)C_{50m}$	=	$L(E)C_{50}$ of the part of the mixture with test data

Document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/3, adopted, with the following modification with respect to ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/23, Chapter 3.7, page 35, Table 2: the heading of the last column should read:

"Additional category for effects on or via lactation n"

Documents UN/SCEGHS/3/INF.5 and addenda: To be checked by Correspondence Group – the following changes have been adopted:

Part 1, Chapter 1.5.3.4 (INF5/Add.1): delete the paragraph.

Part 3, Chapter 3.1 (INF.5/Add.3), after decision logic 3.1.2, delete “Examples, under review”.

Part 3, Chapter 3.6 (INF.5/Add.4), last page of the chapter, delete “Examples, under review”.

Part 3, Chapter 3.10 (INF.5/Add.4), last page of the chapter, delete “Examples, under review”.

Part 3, Chapter 7, para. 3.7.3.4 (INF.5/Add.4), last sentence, delete: “ (see Annex 11: possible areas of future work)”

Part 4, Chapter 4.2 (INF.5/Add.5): this chapter has been deleted.

Document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/8:

- Replace the existing text under Chapter 1.1, paragraph 6, bullet point 2 [i.e. 1.1.1.6 (b) of INF.5], with:

"The hazard classification process refers principally to the hazards arising from the intrinsic properties of chemical elements and compounds and mixtures thereof, whether natural or synthetic *."

- Add a footnote, and include in it the rest of former para 6, i.e:

"* *In some cases it is necessary also to take into account hazards arising from other properties, such as the physical state of the substance or mixture (e.g. pressure and temperature) or properties of substances produced by certain chemical reactions (e.g. flammability of gases produced by contact with water)".*

Document UN/SCEGHS/3/INF.10:

- In ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/22, Chapter 3.2 in Figure 1, page 23 [i.e.Fig.3.2.1 in INF.5], in the text of Step 8 - replace "irritant response" with "Non-irritant response".
- In ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/22, Chapter 3.2, note (e) to Figure 1 on page 23, replace the existing text with the following:

“[Examples of internationally accepted validated in vitro test methods for dermal corrosion are OECD Test Guidelines 430 and 431;]”

Document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/22:

- Replace Table 1 of chapter 3.4 on respiratory or skin sensitization in ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/22 with the table and related notes contained in document UN/SCEGHS/3/INF.6. In this table, in row “skin sensitizer”, in column “gas”, delete the signs.
- At the end of notes 1, 3 and 5 of the amended Table 1 of chapter 3.4, add the following sentence: *“[In addition, some competent authorities may require a special labelling phrase for all mixtures containing sensitizers above 0.1%.]”*
- After para.19 and after para.24 of Chapter 3.4, add the following sentence: *“[For special labelling required by some competent authorities, see Notes 1, 3 and 5 to Table 1 of this Chapter.]”*
- Document UN/SCEGHS/3/INF.16 adopted. The text will be inserted at the end of Annex 3 of document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/26 on classification and labelling summary tables.

Document UN/SCEGHS/3/INF.13/Corr.1:

- In document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/20, chapter 1.3, para 59, [i.e.1.4.10.5.5.2 of INF.5] replace the first 2 sentences with the following text:

“All systems should use the GHS classification criteria based on hazard; however, competent authorities may authorize consumer labelling systems providing information based on the likelihood of harm (risk based labelling).”

Document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/10:

- In document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/21 Chapter 2.3, para. 8 [i.e. para. 2.3.4.2.2 of INF.5], replace “See Annex 11” by “See sub-sections 31.4, 31.5, and 31.6 of the Manual of Tests and Criteria”.
- In document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2001/28, delete Annex 11.

* * * * *

Annex 2

Terms of reference of the Correspondence Group for editorial matters

1. The editorial correspondence group will review the text of the GHS document as amended by the Sub-Committee, at its third session, and revisions proposed by the secretariat in INF.5, and propose such editorial and technical corrections as appropriate to ensure that the text accurately and consistently reflects the substantive decisions previously reached, including grammatical corrections and corrections needed to ensure that references are complete and accurate.
2. The group will not revisit issues already resolved in the development of the GHS, and the working paper will not contain proposals for any substantive revisions to the text.
3. The editorial and technical corrections will be introduced into the revised GHS document to be prepared for the fourth session of the Sub-Committee.
4. In addition, the group will prepare a working paper documenting the technical and editorial corrections.
5. Both documents should be ready by the deadline for formal submission to the fourth session of the Sub-Committee, i.e. by 20 September 2002.

* * * * *

Annex 3

Health hazard symbol
(CMR, TOST, respiratory sensitizer)

A. Options for the review of the health hazard pictogram to be decided at the next session of the Sub-Committee:



B. Draft Terms of Reference for intersessional work on a new alternative health hazard symbol (CMR, TOST, respiratory sensitizer)

1. Starting point

The new proposal will build upon prerequisites that have been agreed upon during the meeting, i.e:

- (a) The alternative symbol should draw attention;
- (b) The alternative symbol should show a human shape.

2. Aim

To propose an alternative symbol in time for submission to the fourth session of the Sub-Committee (9-11 December 2002).

3. Process

- (a) A small informal group consisting of members of the Sub-Committee from all regions will be set up as follows:

- Countries:
- Brazil
 - Belgium
 - Canada
 - Denmark
 - France
 - Japan
 - New Zealand
 - Norway
 - South Africa
 - United Kingdom
 - United States of America
 - Zambia;

- (b) The group will draft the proposal for consideration by the following additional interested delegations of the Sub-Committee, which will be sent by 16 August 2002:
- Argentina
 - Austria
 - China
 - Finland
 - Germany
 - Portugal
 - Spain
 - Sweden
 - FIPBM (NGO);
- (c) Reply by the members of the Sub-Committee will be requested by 13 September 2002.
- On the basis of the replies, a proposal will be submitted officially to the Sub-Committee by 20 September if there is sufficient agreement;
 - If there is not sufficient agreement, a second round of consultations should start on 20 September. For this second round, the results of the first round of consultations will be circulated to the members of the Sub-Committee, who will be invited to make new proposals. The replies in the second round will be required by 11 October, no later. The final proposal to the Sub-Committee should be ready by 25 October.

* * * * *

Annex 4

Draft work programme for 2003-2004

Text of document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2002/2 adopted with the following modification:

In para. 3.2, replace “Objective: To develop guidance...chapter 3.6, paragraph 9.” with “Objective: To develop guidance on the importance of the different factors mentioned in paragraph 9, chapter 3.6.

In paragraph 9, chapter 3.6, a number of factors are mentioned which may increase or decrease the level of concern that an agent may pose a carcinogenic hazard in humans. Guidance on the importance of these factors has to be elaborated in order to indicate their effects on the level of concern. “
