



**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****Thirty-ninth session**

Geneva, 9-11 December 2020

Item 3 (i) of the provisional agenda

**Classification criteria and related hazard communication:
other issues****Review of the decision logics****Note by the secretariat*****Addendum****Introduction**

1. During the informal consultations held in July in preparation of the December session, some delegations proposed minor amendments to the current text of the decision logics and corrections to mistakes unintentionally introduced in document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/3. The present document takes account of these comments.

Amendments to decision logics 3.10.1 and 4.1.3 (b)**Decision logic 3.10.1**

2. The expert from the United States of America proposed to align the text in the last text box of the decision logic with that of the criteria for Category 2, by inserting a reference to note 2 to table 3.10.1. The proposal is shown below.

Proposal

3. In decision logic 3.10.1, add “(see note 2 to table 3.10.1)” at the end of the sentence “Is there evidence causing concern...measured at 40°C?”, on the last text box of the decision logic.

* 2020 (A/74/6 (Sect.20) and Supplementary, Subprogramme 2).

Decision logic 4.1.3 (b)

4. The expert from the Netherlands indicated that the reference to “or other equivalent ECx” in relation to the “no observed effect concentration” (NOEC) was missing in decision logic 4.1.3 (b) and proposed to align it with the criteria in Chapter 4.1 (see for instance paragraph 4.1.1.4 and Table 4.1.1 (b)(i) and (b)(ii)). The proposal is shown below.

Proposal

5. In decision logic 4.1.3 (b), replace (five times) “NOEC” by “NOEC or ECx”.

Consequential amendments: References to NOEC also appear in Table 4.1.1 (c) (“safety net classification”); 4.1.2.7; table 4.1.2 (category 4); table 4.1.5; A9.1.10 (a); A9.3.3.2.3 (c); A9.3.3.2.4; A9.3.4.3; A9.3.5.8; A9.7.5.1.2; A9.7.5.2.4.2; A9.7.5.3.3.3; and Figure A9.7.1.

The Sub-Committee is invited to indicate whether these references to NOEC should also be modified accordingly.

Corrections to the decision logics in document ST/SG/AC.10/C.4/2020/3

6. The Sub-Committee is invited to consider the following corrections:

Decision logic 2.3.1 (c)

The correction does not apply to the English version.

Decision logic 3.1.1

Delete the arrow from the first text box “Substance” to the box “mixture”.

Decision logic 3.1.2*For*

Apply the acute toxicity estimate calculation to determine the ATE of the mixture, where:

$$\frac{100}{ATE_{mix}} = \sum_n \frac{C_i}{ATE_i}$$

C_i = concentration of ingredient i
 n = ingredients and i is running from 1 to n
 ATE_i = Acute toxicity estimate of ingredient i

read

Apply the acute toxicity estimate calculation to determine the ATE of the mixture

$$\frac{100}{ATE_{mix}} = \sum_n \frac{C_i}{ATE_i}$$

where:
 C_i = concentration of ingredient i
 n = ingredients and i is running from 1 to n
 ATE_i = Acute toxicity estimate of ingredient i

Decision logic 3.4.1*For*

Does the mixture contain one or more ingredients classified as a respiratory sensitizer at^{3,4}:

(a) 0.1% w/w (solid/liquid)?
 (b) 1.0% w/w (solid/liquid)?
 or
 (c) 0.1% v/v (gas)?
 (d) 0.2% v/v (gas)?
 (See 3.4.3.3 and Table 3.4.5 for explanation and guidance)

read

Does the mixture contain one or more ingredients classified as a respiratory sensitizer at^{3,4}:

(a) ≥ 0.1% w/w (solid/liquid)?
 (b) ≥ 1.0% w/w (solid/liquid)?
 or
 (c) ≥ 0.1% v/v (gas)?
 (d) ≥ 0.2% v/v (gas)?
 (See 3.4.3.3 and Table 3.4.5 for explanation and guidance)

Decision logic 3.4.2*For*

Does the mixture contain one or more ingredients classified as a skin sensitizer at ^{3,4} ; (a) 0.1% ? (b) 1.0%? (See 3.4.3.3 and Table 3.4.5 for explanation and guidance)

read

Does the mixture contain one or more ingredients classified as a skin sensitizer at ^{3,4} ; (a) $\geq 0.1\%$? (b) $\geq 1.0\%$? (See 3.4.3.3 and Table 3.4.5 for explanation and guidance)
--

The correction to sub-paragraph (a) in the French version does not apply to the English version.

Decision logic 3.5.1

In the row coming down from the second to the third text box, *replace Yes with No*.

Decision logic 3.8.1

Replace Classification impossible *with* Not classified.

Decision logic 4.1.1

In the decision logic for mixtures starting with “can bridging principles be applied?”, in the horizontal arrow leading to “Acute 1” classification *replace No with Yes*.