



Secretariat

Distr.
GENERAL

ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/22
25 July 2006

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

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS
ON ITS ELEVENTH SESSION
12 (p.m) -14 July 2006

CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraphs</u>
ATTENDANCE	1-6
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	7
UPDATING OF THE GLOBALLY HARMONIZED SYSTEM OF CLASSIFICATION AND LABELLING OF CHEMICALS (GHS)	8-38
HAZARD COMMUNICATION ISSUES	39-59
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GHS.....	60-81
CAPACITY BUILDING	82 and 83
COORDINATION AND WORK PROGRAMME	84 and 85
ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	86

Annexes:

- Annex 1:** Draft amendments to the first revised edition of the Globally
Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicalspage 15
- Annex 2:** Terms of reference of the intersessional working group
on toxic gas mixturespage 19

REPORT

ATTENDANCE

1. The Sub-Committee of Experts on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals held its eleventh session in Geneva from 12 (p.m.) to 14 July 2006 with Ms. Kim Headrick (Canada) as Chairperson, Mr. Roque Puiatti (Brazil) and Mr. Gregory Moore (Sweden) as Vice-Chairpersons.

2. Experts from the following countries took part in the session: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Qatar, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom and the 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: Cambodia, Cyprus, Gambia, Indonesia, Kenya, Korea (Republic of), Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mexico, Nigeria, Philippines, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Switzerland and Thailand.

4. Representatives of the United Nations Environment Programme/Secretariat of the Basel Convention (UNEP/SBC), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and of the following specialized agencies were present: Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), International Labour Office (ILO) and World Health Organization (WHO).

5. The following intergovernmental organizations were represented: European Commission (EC) and 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), Croplife International, Dangerous Goods Advisory Council (DGAC), European Chemical Industry Council (CEFIC), European Fertilizer Manufacturers' Association (EFMA), European Industrial Gases Association (EIGA), Industrial Federation of Paints and Coats of Mercosul (IFPCM), International Association of the Soap, Detergent and Maintenance Products Industry (AISE), International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), International Organization for Standardization (ISO), International Paint and Printing Ink Council (IPPIC), International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA), Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute (SAAMI) and Soap and Detergent Association (SDA).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Documents: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/21 Provisional agenda for the eleventh session
ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/21/Add.1 List of documents and annotations

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.1 List of documents under agenda item

7. The Sub-Committee adopted the provisional agenda prepared by the secretariat.

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

(a) Physical hazards

Gases: Updating of references to ISO standards and harmonization of pressure values

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/2 (EIGA)
ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/3 (EIGA)

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.22 (Secretariat)

8. The Sub-Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to update the references to ISO standards for the classification of oxidizing gases in paragraphs 2.4.4.1 and 2.4.4.2 of the GHS (see annex 1).

9. The Sub-Committee also endorsed the proposal to clarify the pressure values to be used in exempting gases from the scope of the GHS by amending the definition of “gas” in Chapter 1.2 and paragraphs 2.5.1 and 2.5.4.1 in Chapter 2.5 (see annex 1).

Ammonium nitrate

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/5 (Germany)

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.22 (Secretariat)

10. The GHS Sub-Committee agreed on the addition of a note to table 2.14.1 in paragraph 2.14.2 (see annex 1), as suggested by the Sub-Committee on Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods. This note is intended to solve the problem of certain types of ammonium nitrate classified as oxidizers and having explosive properties for which a warning to that effect is not required in the current system.

Substances having explosive properties but not classified as explosives

11. Following a discussion, the expert from Germany said that she would develop the proposal further in the next biennium providing additional information and test data.

Explosive substances not packaged for transport

12. The Chairman of the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods informed the Sub-Committee that according to the opinion of the experts on explosives, it would be necessary to give more guidance in the GHS on how to deal with unpackaged and repackaged explosives since the classification and related hazards of explosive substances are often dependent on the packaging.

13. The Sub-Committee accepted the recommendation made by the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to add a note to table 2.1.2 in paragraph 2.1.3 containing the specifications for the assignment of the appropriate hazard communication elements (symbol, signal word and hazard statement) to these substances (see annex 1).

Desensitized explosives

14. The Sub-Committee took note of the three possible solutions identified by the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to the problem of classification of desensitized explosives: (1) make no changes; (2) create a new chapter in Part 2 to deal with desensitized explosives; and (3) create a new Division 1.7.

15. The Sub-Committee noted the preference of the experts on explosives for the development of a new Division 1.7, even though this solution would entail a large number of consequential amendments in many regulatory texts. It concurred with the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods as regards the need to assess the consequences of the adoption of any of the proposed solutions before deciding on the best way forward.

16. In order to overcome the problem in the meantime, the Sub-Committee agreed on the addition of a new text in paragraph 1.3.2.4.5 and a reference to the new text in note 2 to table 2.1.1 in paragraph 2.1.2.2 (see annex 1).

Unstable gases

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/6 (Germany)

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.22 (Secretariat)

17. The Chairman of the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods explained that unstable gases were correctly addressed under transport regulations but that, since the UN Model Regulations did not contain hazard communication provisions in that respect, it would be preferable that unstable gases be addressed under the GHS for all sectors.

18. He also said that the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods had accepted the offer from the expert from Germany to convene an informal intersessional working group to address the issue of unstable gases. He mentioned that the terms of reference for this group would be defined before the end of the current biennium and that its work would be included in the program of work for the next biennium.

19. The Sub-Committee expressed the wish that experts from all relevant sectors would participate in the work.

Classification of ammonium nitrate emulsions, suspensions and gels

Document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.9 (Germany)

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.22 (Secretariat)

20. The Sub-Committee endorsed the decision of the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods to slightly modify the procedure for the classification of ammonium nitrate emulsions, suspensions and gels in Chapter 2.1 (Figure 2.1.4) of the GHS (see annex 1).

(b) Health hazards

Methods for carcinogenicity potency estimation

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/13 (OECD)

21. The Sub-Committee agreed that the work on methods for carcinogenicity potency estimation should be discontinued for the time being.

Classification of toxic gas mixtures

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/14 (OECD)

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.23 (Drafting group)

22. A majority of experts were of the opinion that the current GHS classification approach for toxic gas mixtures was not satisfactory and that there was a need for further work.

23. Some experts were of the opinion that the work should concentrate mainly on workplace and use sectors and that transport concerns on this matter, if any, should be addressed separately and in a different way. Others, on the contrary, considered that the development of the classification criteria for toxic gas mixtures should cover all sectors (including transport) and should be hazard based (i.e. based on the intrinsic properties of the gases) and not risk based (e.g. occupational exposure).

24. The representative of OECD explained that any new proposal had to be previously discussed and agreed by the OECD Task Force on Harmonization of Classification and Labelling and that she could not guarantee that this could be done in time for the next session of the Sub-Committee.

25. The Sub-Committee decided to set up an informal intersessional working group on toxic gas mixtures which would submit a proposal for the next session. Its terms of reference were drafted by a small informal group and adopted, as amended, by the Sub-Committee (see annex 1).

Strong versus weak sensitizers

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/16 (OECD)

26. The Sub-Committee took note of the progress of work on strong versus weak sensitizers and agreed to defer the decision to the next session, when the results of the WHO/IPCS international workshop on skin sensitization risk assessment to be held in October 2006 are

available.

Terminology in Chapters 3.8 and 3.9 of the GHS

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/15 (Secretariat)

27. The expert from the United States of America explained that the use of a “slash” in the term “Specific target organ/systemic toxicity” was intended to allow three possible interpretations: target organ toxicity only; systemic toxicity only; or both (target organ toxicity and systemic toxicity).

28. Several experts suggested the “slash” be replaced with the words “and/or”. Others, on the contrary, were of the opinion that the use of “and/or” would cause problems of implementation from a legal point of view.

29. The representative of CEFIC explained that the word “Systemic” had been initially added to distinguish the effects considered to support classification of a chemical in Category 1 or 2 from those local effects that could not justify its classification into one of these categories. He noted that since local effects were now covered under the specific target organ toxicity, the use of the word “systemic” was not necessary anymore and therefore he suggested its deletion.

30. The Sub-Committee finally agreed to replace the term “Specific target organ/systemic toxicity” and all its related terms with “Specific target organ toxicity” on the understanding that, according to paragraphs 3.8.1.1 and 3.9.1.1 of the GHS, all significant health effects that impair function (both reversible and irreversible, immediate and/or delayed) are regarded to be “target organ toxicity”, irrespective of the toxic effects being local or not.

31. The Sub-Committee noted the request of the expert from Italy that an editorial review of the whole text of the GHS aiming at harmonizing the use of the words “shall”, “should” and “must” in the text be envisaged for the next biennium.

(c) Environmental hazards

Ozone depleting chemicals

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/1 (OECD)

32. Some experts considered that there is no need to continue the work on the comparison of classification and labelling systems for ozone depleting chemicals on the grounds that the Montreal Protocol will eventually phase out their production and consumption in the future.

33. Others, on the contrary, were of the opinion that a separate hazard class for ozone depleting chemicals should be established under the GHS, given that these chemicals are already subject to classification and labelling requirements in many countries. In addition, the use of limited quantities of substances subject to the Montreal Protocol, where no alternative has been found for a particular use, will continue to be allowed.

34. The Sub-Committee agreed that the work should continue and that it would consider

any proposal or option in this respect for final decision.

Chronic toxicity for aquatic organisms

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/17 (OECD)

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.17 (France)

35. The Sub-Committee noted that OECD continued its work on the development of a classification scheme to accommodate chronic toxicity to aquatic organisms for assigning a chronic hazard category and that it would be further informed of the progress made at the next session.

Hazards for the terrestrial environment

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.13 (Spain)

36. The expert from Spain informed the Sub-Committee about the work of the expert group for the development of classification and labelling criteria for terrestrial environmental hazards. He said that a first draft had already been circulated to the members of the expert group and that a progress report would be provided during the next session of the Sub-Committee.

(d) Others

Definitions of means of containment

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/10 (Secretariat)

37. Several experts considered that the insertion of definitions for the different means of containment in the GHS could be helpful. However, it was pointed out that the definitions used under transport regulations, as provided by the secretariat, do not necessarily correspond to those used under other regulatory systems and that it might also be helpful to list and compare definitions used in other sectors.

38. Experts were invited to study this question and to submit information to the secretariat as deemed appropriate.

HAZARD COMMUNICATION ISSUES

Codification of hazard and precautionary statements

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/8;
ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/8/Add.1; and
ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/8/Add.2 (CEFIC on behalf of the correspondence working group)

Informal documents: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.7 (CEFIC)

UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.15 (Canada)

UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.24 (United States of America on behalf of the informal working group)

39. There was consensus on the use of the letter “P” for the precautionary statement codes.

40. There was general agreement on the benefits of the codification of hazard and precautionary statements since a majority of experts felt that their use would not only facilitate the translation of each statement into all languages but also their harmonization and implementation worldwide.

41. Regarding the wording in paragraphs A3.1.1.3 and A3.2.2.2 in document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/8/Add.1, opinions were divided on whether the insertion of the codes in the label together with their corresponding text should be permitted.

42. The Sub-Committee finally concluded that the possibility of including the codes in the label together with their text should be left to the discretion of the relevant competent authority. However it was pointed out that in order to achieve harmonization, the codes used in the GHS should be considered the recommended codes.

43. The Sub-Committee agreed on the codification of precautionary statements as proposed in section 2, table A3.2.1 of document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/8/Add.1. The codification of hazard statements was also adopted with some minor changes in numbering (see annex 1).

44. Regarding the introductory text of sections 1, 2 and 3, some experts considered that a more detailed review to examine the consistency of the text among the different sections was needed and the task was assigned to an informal working group.

45. The Sub-Committee adopted, with some modifications, the proposals made by the informal working group for the amendment of paragraphs A3.1.1.2, A3.1.1.3, A3.1.2.2, A3.2.1.3, A3.2.2.2, A3.2.3.6, A3.3.2.1, A3.3.4.1 together with the consequential amendments to paragraphs 1.4.10.5.2 (b) (ii) and (c) (ii) (see annex 1). It was also agreed that the codes in the tables under A3.3.5 should not be in bold print.

Documents: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/9 and
ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/9/Add.1 (CEFIC, AISE, IPPIC)

46. There was general support for the proposal of reformatting annexes 1, 2 and 3 of the GHS, as contained in document –2006/9/Add.1, since it was felt that the new layout would improve readability and avoid current redundancies and repetitions through the text.

47. Some experts considered that the proposal should be adopted during the current biennium but it was also recognized that a thorough checking of the proposed texts should be done before the Sub-Committee decides to include them in the next revised edition of the GHS.

48. An informal intersessional correspondence group was entrusted with the task of checking the proposed texts and proposing amendments or corrections, as appropriate and

deemed necessary. The outcome of this work would be submitted to the December session for consideration by the Sub-Committee. The following countries and organizations showed interest in participating in this work: Australia, Canada, Brazil, Japan, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States of America, CEFIC, AISE, IPPIC, SDA, IFPCM and WHO. The group will be led by CEFIC.

Guidance on the interpretation of the building block approach

Informal documents: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.12 (Chair of the correspondence group)
UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.20 (France)

49. The Sub-Committee agreed on continuing the work for the development of guidance for the implementation of the building block approach on the grounds that it was essential to have a clear and common understanding on what can be considered to be a building block and how those building blocks would apply.

50. Some experts pointed out that in some cases the lack of guidance on this issue was an impediment for GHS implementation in some sectors. Others noted that it would be useful that those who are already implementing the GHS, report in writing to the Sub-Committee on the problems encountered with the implementation of the different building blocks across sectors, in order to better ascertain what could be improved.

51. Following the request of the expert from France, the Sub-Committee considered the following points: (a) the hazard classes are building blocks; (b) within a hazard class, each category is a building block; (c) Labelling elements may not be detached from the chosen hazard classes and categories and should not be considered as building blocks as such; and (d) Safety Data Sheets are building blocks.

52. There seemed to be general agreement that hazard classes are building blocks. Regarding (b), several experts supported the approach suggested by the expert from France that hazard categories are building blocks. Others, on the contrary, were of the opinion that this question needed to be considered further.

53. There was no agreement on the interpretation suggested by the expert from France on (c) and (d) regarding hazard communication elements (i.e: labels and Safety Data Sheets).

54. Some experts thought that label elements should be considered as a building block on their own, since it would be possible for a country to adopt all hazard classes and hazard categories for all sectors while having differences in the labelling requirements among sectors such as transport, workplace and consumer products.

55. Regarding Safety Data Sheets, the Sub-Committee could not reach a consensus on whether or not they could be considered as a separate building block.

56. The Sub-Committee encouraged the expert from France to continue the work on this issue and invited the experts to submit their comments in writing to the expert from France, who will submit a revised proposal for the next session.

Labelling of very small packagings

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/12 (CEFIC)

57. There was general support for the development of guidance on labelling of very small packagings. However, the Sub-Committee felt that the proposal put forward by CEFIC should be further developed and it was agreed that this issue be considered for the program of work for the next biennium.

Symbol for 1.4S explosives

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/7 (SAAMI)

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.22 (Secretariat)

58. The representative of SAAMI said that he would submit a new proposal to take account of the comments made by the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods. He will include in particular a more detailed description of all 1.4S articles to be addressed by his proposal.

Pictograms for explosives of divisions 1.5 and 1.6

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/11 (CEFIC)

59. The representative of CEFIC withdrew his proposal.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GHS

(a) Reports from Governments or organizations

Informal documents: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.2 (Secretariat)
UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.8 (Canada)
UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.14 (New Zealand)
UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.16 (FAO)
UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.19 (Brazil)
UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.21 (European Commission)

60. The Sub-Committee took note of the information regarding the implementation of the GHS through transport of dangerous goods regulations as well as other GHS related activities undertaken by different countries and organizations.

61. The observers from Nigeria, Gambia, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand and the expert from Senegal informed briefly the Sub-Committee about the status of implementation of the GHS in their countries and thanked UNITAR, the Government of Switzerland and the European Commission for their financial support. They stressed the importance of having the GHS implemented at regional level and therefore they reiterated their call for donor countries which

would be willing to contribute to the development of regional activities for the implementation of the GHS.

62. The expert from Japan informed the Sub-Committee that the English version of their “GHS classification manual” was available and that it would be soon posted on their website.

63. The observer from Mexico said that his country is currently working to achieve GHS implementation by 2008.

64. The representative of the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) said that his organization was in the process of integrating the principles of the GHS into its guidelines for pesticide evaluation, registration and labelling as well as into other relevant documents.

65. He said that the implementation of the GHS would provide important opportunities to further strengthen and harmonize pesticide classification and labelling. However, he drew the attention to the fact that the flexibility given by the GHS for national authorities through the “building block approach” and through self-assessment might lead to different classifications and labelling in different countries and concluded that such development should be avoided.

66. The representative of the European Commission explained that the GHS implementing legislation that was currently being drafted would include all GHS hazards classes but not the GHS hazard categories that are not taken into account at present by the current EU system. She also explained that, in order to maintain the current level of protection, the hazard class for Ozone Depleting Substances would be retained irrespective of the fact that this hazard class has not yet been defined in the GHS.

67. The expert from France regretted that Category 2 flammable gases was not included in the draft of the GHS legislation, given that this hazard category was implemented in all sectors in Europe with the exception of transport, where it could be included in the future once the transport legislation has been revised, as deemed appropriate, to comply with the GHS criteria. Some other experts shared the opinion of the expert from France on this subject. The Chair noted, however, that this issue appeared to be an internal EU issue.

68. Concerning the transitional period for the effective entry into force of the new GHS implementing legislation, the representative of the European Commission said that this was still under discussion at the Commission level and that the dates would be established taking into account the requirements for the new system for registration, evaluation and authorisation of chemicals (REACH). She added that during the transitional period, the manufacturer would be allowed to use either the current or the new system but not parts of both systems simultaneously.

UNECE webpage on the status of implementation of the GHS

69. A member of the secretariat invited experts to check the information on the status of implementation of the GHS in their respective countries which was posted on the UNECE website (http://www.unece.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/implementation_e.html).

70. She encouraged members of the Sub-Committee to provide updated information on this subject, and in particular regarding the name of any legal instruments, codes or standards which may have been adopted or amended to reflect the provisions of the GHS. The information should be sent to the secretariat in writing, either by submitting informal documents for the Sub-Committee meetings or through the e-mail address created for that purpose.

(b) Cooperation with other international organizations

OECD Task Force on harmonization of classification and labelling

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.4 (OECD)

71. The Sub-Committee took note of the report of the 15th meeting of the OECD Task Force on harmonization of classification and labelling held in March 2006.

Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.6 (Secretariat of the Basel Convention)

72. The Sub-Committee reiterated its willingness to continue the cooperation with the Basel convention on matters of common concern.

73. The representative of the secretariat of the Basel Convention said that the Conference of the Parties was looking to extend the mandate of the Joint Correspondence group between the Open-ended Working group of the Basel Convention (OEWG) and the Sub-Committee of Experts on the GHS, at its eighth meeting which is scheduled to take place from 27 November to 1 December 2006.

74. Experts were invited to contact their country representatives at the Basel Convention to achieve some progress in the work of the OEWG-GHS Joint Correspondence group.

Revision of ISO Standard 11014:1: 1994 on Safety Data Sheets

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.18 (Secretariat)

75. The Sub-Committee took note of the results of the voting for the revision of ISO 11014-1: 1994 on SDS with a view to bringing it into line with GHS requirements for SDS.

(c) Miscellaneous

Document: ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/4 (United Kingdom)

76. The expert from the United Kingdom informed the Sub-Committee that the Sub-Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods acknowledged that the classification of substances on the basis of human experience raised practical problems given that this information was not always publicly available and that it was not always possible to confirm the validity of the information that is.

77. He said that the Sub-Committee of experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods had decided to follow up on the work done by the United Kingdom with a view to promoting international consistency in the use of data on human experience and he added that he would submit a revised proposal in due course.

Draft questionnaire on preparation for GHS implementation

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.10 (OECD/UNITAR)

78. The Sub-Committee expressed its appreciation for the work done by UNITAR and OECD to develop the questionnaire.

79. The representative of the OECD informed the Sub-Committee that it was expected that the questionnaire would be sent to heads of delegation to the Joint Meeting of the Chemicals Committee and the Working Party on Chemicals, Pesticides and Biotechnology by the end of July and that a period of two months would be given to receive the answers.

80. The representative of UNITAR said that UNITAR is expected to follow a similar schedule.

81. The representatives of OECD and UNITAR will inform the Sub-Committee of the preliminary results of the questionnaire.

CAPACITY BUILDING

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF.5 (Secretariat)

82. The Sub-Committee was informed about the first workshop on GHS held in Ecuador in March 2006. Sub-Committee members were invited to consider the allocation of financial resources for GHS capacity building activities in developing countries when discussing international cooperation possibilities at national level.

Informal document: UN/SCEGHS/11/INF. 11 (UNITAR)

83. The representative of UNITAR provided updated information on the activities of the UNITAR/ILO Global GHS Capacity building Programme and the UNITAR/ILO/OECD WSSD GHS Partnership during the last six months.

COORDINATION AND WORK PROGRAMME

84. Experts were invited to submit proposals for working items to be included in the work programme for the biennium 2007-2008.

85. The expert from the United States informed the Sub-Committee about the progress of the work of the Correspondence Group on the pilot project for the classification of mixtures. She said that the Group has decided to extend the pilot project to more complex mixtures (including,

in a near future, pesticides and paints) and that on the basis of the results obtained, they would consider the need to give further guidance in the GHS for the classification of mixtures.

ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

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

* * * * *

Annex 1

Draft amendments to the first revised edition of the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals

Chapter 1.2

In the definition of “Gas”, insert the word “(absolute)” after “300 kPa”.

Chapter 1.3

1.3.2.4.5 Renumber existing paragraph as 1.3.2.4.5.1 and add a new paragraph 1.3.2.4.5.2 to read as follows:

“1.3.2.4.5.2 Certain physical hazards (e.g. due to explosive or oxidizing properties) may be altered by dilution, as is the case for desensitized explosives, by inclusion in a mixture or article, packaging or other factors. Classification procedures for specific sectors (e.g. storage) should take experience and expertise into account.”.

Chapter 1.4

1.4.10.5.2 (b): Current paragraph becomes (i). Add a new sub-paragraph (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) Hazard statements and a code uniquely identifying each one are listed in section 1 of Annex 3. The hazard statement code is intended to be used for reference purposes. It is not part of the hazard statement text and should not be used to replace the hazard statement text.”.

1.4.10.5.2 (c): Current paragraph becomes (i). Add a new sub-paragraph (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) Precautionary statements and a code uniquely identifying each one are listed in section 2 of Annex 3. The precautionary statement code is intended to be used for reference purposes. It is not part of the precautionary statement text and should not be used to replace the precautionary statement text.”.

Chapter 2.1

2.1.2.2 In Note 2 to table 2.1.1, insert “, see 1.3.2.4.5” at the end of the paragraph after “(e.g. transport)”.

2.1.3 Insert the following note after table 2.1.2:

“NOTE: Unpackaged explosives or explosives repacked in packages other than the original or similar packages shall have the following label elements:

- (a) Symbol: exploding bomb;
- (b) Signal word: “Danger”; and
- (c) Hazard statement: “explosive; mass explosion hazard”

unless the hazard is shown to correspond to one of the columns of this table, in which case the corresponding symbol, signal word and/or the hazard statement shall be assigned.”.

Figure 2.1.4: In the first box on the right from the top, replace the text “Too unstable to be classified as an oxidizing liquid or an oxidizing solid. Go to Figure 2.1.2, Test Series 1” with “Classify as unstable explosive”.

Chapter 2.4

2.4.4.1 In the introductory text before the decision logic, insert “and ISO 10156-2:2005 “Gas cylinders, Gases and gas mixtures. Part 2: Determination of oxidizing ability of toxic and corrosive gases and gas mixtures” before “should be performed.

2.4.4.2 Amend the end of the title to read “...according to ISO 10156:1996 and ISO 10156-2:2005”.

Chapter 2.5

2.5.1 In the definition, replace “280 kPa at 20° C or as a refrigerated liquid” with “200 kPa (gauge) or be a liquefied or a refrigerated liquefied gas”.

2.5.4.1 In the decision logic, 2nd box from the top on the left hand side, in (a), replace “3 bar” with “300 kPa (absolute)”.

Chapter 2.14

2.14.2 Current note under table 2.14.1 becomes note 2. Insert a new note 1 to read as follows:

“NOTE 1: Some oxidizing solids may also present explosion hazards under certain conditions (e.g. when stored in large quantities). For example, some types of ammonium nitrate may give rise to an explosion hazard under extreme conditions and the Resistance to Detonation Test (BC Code^{*}, Annex 3, Test 5)

^{*} *Code of Safe Practice for Solid Bulk Cargoes, IMO, 2005.*

may be used to assess this hazard. Appropriate comments should be made in the Safety Data Sheet.”.

Chapters 3.8 and 3.9

In the text of Chapters 3.8 and 3.9, delete “systemic” in relation to “specific target organ systemic toxicity” and all its related terms.

Annex 3

Replace Annex 3 of the first revised edition of the GHS with the text in document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2006/8/Add.1 with the following additional modifications:

A3.1.1.2 Amend to read as follows:

“This section contains the recommended codes assigned to each of the hazard statements applicable to the hazard categories under the GHS.”

A3.1.1.3 Amend to read as follows:

“The hazard statement codes are intended to be used for reference purposes. They are not part of the hazard statement text and should not be used to replace the hazard statement text.”.

A3.1.2.2 Replace the paragraph after “Column (2), The hazard statement text;” with:

“The text in bold should appear on the label, except as otherwise specified. The information in italics should also appear as part of the hazard statement when the information is known.”

In table A3.1.1, Codes “H201” to “H206” become “H200” to “H205”.

In table A3.1.2:

“H301” to “H306” become “H300” to “H305”;
“H350” and “H351” become “H340” and “H341”, respectively;
“H352” and “H353” become “H350” and “H351”, respectively;
“H354” to “H356” become “H360” to “H362”; and
“H360” to “H363” become “H370” to “H373”.

In table A3.1.3, codes “H401” to “H403” become “H400” to “H402”.

A3.2.1.3 Amend to read as follows:

“This section contains the recommended codes for each of the precautionary statements included in this annex.”

A3.2.2.2 Amend to read as follows:

“The precautionary statement codes are intended to be used for reference purposes. They are not part of the precautionary statement text and should not be used to replace the precautionary statement text.”

A3.2.3 Amend the heading to read as follows: “**Structure of the precautionary statement codification tables**”

A3.2.3.6 In the second sentence, replace “may be” with “may relate to”.

A3.3.2.1 Add “where relevant.” at the end of the last sentence.

A3.3.4.1 Amend the paragraph to read as follows:

“The tables making up the matrix show the core part of the precautionary statements in bold print. This is the text, except as otherwise specified, that should appear on the label. However, it is not necessary to insist on identical sets of words in all situations. Derogations from the recommended statements are at the discretion of competent authorities. In all cases, clear plain language is essential to convey information on precautionary behaviour.”.

Annex 2**Terms of reference of the informal intersessional working group on toxic gas mixtures**

The Sub-Committee agreed on the following terms of reference for the informal intersessional working group on toxic gas mixtures:

Lead country: United States of America

Membership: Compressed Gas Association (CGA), United States of America, Germany and France.

Note: Other experts interested in participating in the work are invited to contact the expert from the United States of America before 28 July.

Scope of the work: Classification of mixtures of toxic gases within the scope of the GHS.

Task: To develop draft text to extend the coverage of the GHS for inhalation of toxic gas mixtures suiting the need of all sectors. If the working group cannot provide consensus text, it shall provide options with a consequence analysis.

If necessary and if time permits, the criteria for inhalation of pure gases may also be considered.

Deadline

Text to be submitted as an official document to the 12th session of the Sub-Committee.

The deadline for submission of official documents is 18 September (if the document is submitted in English or in French) and 27 October if the document is submitted in English and in French

Deliverables

Text to be submitted as an official document to the 12th session of the Sub-Committee.

Practicalities for the meeting

Action	Who	Deadline
Draft text and circulate	United States of America	mid August
Web conference	All	first week of September
Finalize the text	United States of America	one week before submission date
Translate	France	two days before submission date

CGA to provide web conference facilities.
