

**Working Party on Regulatory Cooperation and Standardization Policies (WP.6)**  
**Group of Experts on Risk Management in Regulatory Systems (GRM)**  
**14 September 2023, 11:00 CET**

Item	Subject	Discussion / Action
1a	Roll call	<p><b>GRM leadership:</b> <u>Alexia Davison</u> (Chair), Valentin Nikonov (Vice-Chair)</p> <p><b>Secretariat:</b> Lance Thompson, Tauno Kangur</p> <p><b>Members:</b> Justin McCarthy, <u>Lucy Salt</u>, Leonid Dvorkin, Markus Krebsz, Paul Taylor, Peter Morfee, Richard Poate, Roland Cormier,</p> <p><b>Observers:</b> Andrei Batayeu, <u>Cherry Ann</u>, Clint Barnes, Dinesh Maharaj, <u>Iлона Kawka</u>, <u>Irina Sigua</u>, <u>Ivana Saranovic</u>, Jacques Touboul, <u>Jamila Mendoza</u>, Jean-Pierre Benoit, Jerome Hosein, <u>Joselle Wilson</u>, Kevin Atkinson, Klenworth Jones, Larry Gopechand, Lee Howell, <u>Marissa Adams</u>, Monideep Dey, Ronald Boodoosingh,</p> <p>30 participants (9 <u>were women</u>)</p> <p><b>Apologies:</b> Donald Macrae (Vice-Chair)</p>
1b	Approval of the Agenda	Agenda agreed with no modifications
1c	Approval of the previous webinar report	Meeting report of 6 July 2023 approved with no modifications
2	GRM at the Annual Session	<p>The secretariat explained that the WP.6 Annual Session will take place 23 and 24 November 2023. The member States will review all of the work of WP.6 (including GRM work) during this meeting and endorse it or request clarifications. As such, there is not much room for expert participation. There will be a high-level conference on “How to address continuous compliance – conformity assessment, legal metrology and market surveillance tools for the changing dynamic of digital goods”. Experts are welcome to attend this face-to-face conference. The secretariat is trying to get the possibility of experts listening in at a distance (but this would be without interpretation and without the possibility of asking questions).</p> <p>A third Forum of WP.6 subgroups is planned as a face-to-face meeting (tentatively in Madrid the week of 18 March 2024, to be confirmed). This week-long event will host each subgroup to meet for two days in the mornings and host a conference on a related theme in between those two meetings. The objective is to allow all groups to meet, encourage cross-fertilisation between groups and greater awareness of the work each group is doing. Experts are encouraged to try to attend this meeting.</p>
3	WP.6 working procedures	<p>The secretariat explained the working procedures of WP.6 document which groups together the current practices and ensures alignment with UNECE procedures. Two major points were underlined.</p> <p>There is a distinction between a member of a subgroup and an observer. According to the Terms of Reference of WP.6, any expert can attend meetings as an observer; according to the UNECE Terms of Reference of Teams of Specialists (and Groups of Experts), government officials and eminent experts in the related field can be members of such groups. Members will be able to run for a position as officer and nominate others for officer positions and they can propose new work items / lead projects. There is an obligation to have at least ten active members (having participated in 50% of all official meetings over the past year) in the subgroup at the time of renewal.</p>

		<p>Project development is also outlined in the working procedures. This has three main phases: an inception phase (members put forward an item; an official proposal is submitted; there must be at least six members from at least three different countries – two of which must be UNECE member States...), a project development phase (where the bulk of the work is done; project team must meet at least once per semester and report to the relevant subgroup regularly) and a project finalization phrase (final deliverable is reviewed and approved to be presented to the annual session; eventually a public review; project team is disbanded).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GRM generally accepted and appreciated this clarification of procedures, making it more transparent for everyone.</li> <li>• A question was raised on how this procedure was developed. The secretariat clarified that it is under the responsibility of the WP.6 Chair but that all of the leadership of WP.6 (WP.6 Bureau and subgroup bureaux) had been consulted in the process.</li> <li>• A question was raised concerning the coordinators that were put in place in 2022. The secretariat explained that “coordinator” is an informal role within the group and has no official status within the UNECE. All such roles are renewed on an annual basis and the GRM no longer has coordinators since its meeting in May 2023 where Chair and Vice Chairs were nominated.</li> <li>• A comment was made concerning membership, that it is normal procedure within the UN to be delegated by a country to be member of such a working group. This also provides a mandate for the individual expert and can sometimes allow the expert to request funding from the government to participate in face-to-face meetings. The secretariat clarified that this is true and that it is also possible for the group (the group’s leadership) to identify and invite eminent specialists to become members. It further clarified that there is no guarantee of any funding for participation.</li> <li>• A question was raised on the next steps of this procedural document. The secretariat clarified that it has been approved by the WP.6 Bureau and it was requested that we start to use these procedures in all groups already. It will be presented to the Annual Session of WP.6 in November for noting by member States. Member States will always have the opportunity to request clarifications or make comments or eventually suggest changes; however, it is not for an endorsement or approval of the Annual Session – it is for noting. These procedures are therefore active since July.</li> </ul>
4	Internal skills management matrix	<p>The idea of a skills management matrix was presented at previous meetings; this is just an update. The questions that had been previously presented were finalized and with the help of the secretariat, it has been made into an on-line questionnaire. Where possible, the questions have been formulated as multiple choice (in order to facilitate the analysis of responses). It has been tested and finalized within the GRS leadership and should soon be ready to launch to a wider audience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A question was raised if this was dedicated to members only, or also to observers. And also if this was to justify expertise within this distinction of member/observer. It was suggested that it would be best to open the matrix questionnaire to all experts (members and observers) which could help identify who could be approached for each project. This would not however be a basis for the distinction of member/observer.</li> <li>• A comment was raised about the possibility of experts to make comments on the proposal. It was reminded that this discussion had been on the table for several months and that comments were requested at the May annual meeting of the GRM and the July GRM meeting documented that no comments had been received.</li> <li>• The secretariat will coordinate with the GRM Chair to have this questionnaire circulated to experts for their input in the coming weeks.</li> </ul>
5	UK Prism System presentation	<p>The <b>Product Safety Risk Methodology (PRISM)</b> system was put into place post BREXIT and was an opportunity to improve on the EU Safety Gate/RAPEX methodology. Safety Gate/RAPEX are at the heart of PRISM, so it will be familiar for users of the former systems. It is an <b>inferential methodology</b> in order to infer future events; it takes into account data that market surveillance agencies provide. It provides a transparent basis for determining action.</p> <p><b>Stages of PRISM:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage 1. Identification of problem products</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage 2. Risk tirage,</li> <li>• Stage 3. Risk assessment; this stage is further broken down <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stage I: Define the product</li> <li>○ Stage II: Identify the hazard/s</li> <li>○ Stage III: Determine who or what could be harmed</li> <li>○ Stage IV: Describe one or more harm scenarios</li> <li>○ Stage V: Determine the severity of harm</li> <li>○ Stage VI: Determine the probability of harm occurring</li> <li>○ Stage VII: Determine the level of risk</li> <li>○ Stage VIII: Consider the level of uncertainty</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Stage 4. Risk evaluation,</li> <li>• Stage 5 quality assurance and recording/reporting,</li> <li>• Stage 6. Risk management.</li> </ul> <p>Safety Gate looks at single item risk (and is aligned to PRISM); but the PRISM system is also looking at the <b>level of risk based on the total number of items</b> that could be in circulation (a single item on the market may not pose the same level of risk as 1000 or more of the same item on the market).</p> <p>PRISM also integrates an assessment of uncertainty labels, supported with a rationale. A lot of work has gone into risk evaluation (bridge between risk assessment and risk management). <b>Factors related to the nature of the risk</b> (e.g. subjects at risk, potential for psychological harm, prevalence forecast, potential for multiple casualties, people at increased risk, action taking place elsewhere) These are objective matters = the facts. <b>Factors related to how the risk is being or will be perceived</b> (e.g. media influence, political interest, inability of user to control the risk). These are subjective matters = tolerability.</p> <p><b>Risk triage</b> is a new feature. Formalises the process we regularly carry out, so the thinking and rationale is captured. It is based on five “risk predictor” questions (i.e. rational for product selection; likely maximum severity of harm; estimate of probably of harm occurring; number of hazards; product availability and prevalence).</p> <p>Products that may contain <b>multiple potential hazards</b> are considered within the system. This is often the case with electrical products. In previous system, the risk attributed would only be the highest hazard of all potential hazards; the PRISM system allows to consider that there are multiple elements and to attribute a higher hazard or flag that there could be multiple considerations.</p> <p>PRISM also takes into consideration <b>people at increased risk</b>. It encourages broader thinking beyond traditional concepts such as age. It aims to also consider intended and unintended uses.</p> <p>The system further considers <b>risk differential</b>, i.e., that even compliant products can be risky. The product itself may be risky, such as a trampoline or an angle grinder, but may be made more risky, for example by adding chain saw disc attachments to an angle grinder. The system also considers <b>relative risk</b>: where do you start the harm scenario? For protective equipment like a car seat, the relative risk allows to start the assessment from the after the trigger event (in this case, a car accident) to see how the product will react.</p> <p>PRISM has been well received and has been well adopted. Training rolled out to users, monitoring and reviewing, development of a digital tool to replace Excel, development / adaptation to suit construction products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GRM greatly appreciated the clear explanation and exposé of the PRISM system in the UK and expressed interest in having further presentations of this nature during its meetings.</li> <li>• The difference mentioned between risk of a compliant product and the risk of a non-compliant product was praised as this is a concept which was developed also within the work of GRM recommendations, using predictive risk management tools for targeting non-compliance (noncompliant delta).</li> </ul>
6	IRM & SW	<p>The project team has developed a questionnaire on applying the principles of WP.6 Rec.V in a Single Window. We will be identifying relevant stakeholders to receive the questionnaire in a number of countries. The questionnaire has been approved by the Bureau. After the circulation, the team will be conducting interviews.</p>

		<p>The questionnaire document starts with the context, explaining Rec.V and the link to UN/CEFACT Rec.33 and demonstrates how these two concepts have a good deal of similarities. The responses will not be individually published. There will be different questionnaires for different types of stakeholders; the first is for single window operators. Hoping to also approach product regulators.</p> <p>There are 32 questions with various subjects covered such as testing risk criteria, use of historic data, cooperation among government agencies, building profiling system by regulatory agencies, getting data on incoming shipments, assessment of incoming shipments, shipment clearance...</p> <p>Next steps: we will be sending out the survey shortly and then conducting interviews if needed. Then processing the data and identifying best practice and drafting a guideline paper.</p>
7	Risk Mgmt & SDG 14	<p>A brief updated was provided on a potential project on risk management on SDG 14 Life below water as this was largely discussed on the previous meetings. The technical measures needed for this type of work focus on how well we really understand how well the control of risk of life below water is applied. A paper was published on this topic last year.</p> <p>Key considerations are currently concentrating on the technical measures which can be assessed scientifically. This will allow us to verify how well policy decided at a higher management level are actually being implemented. This can assist to measure how well policies such as the SDGs are actually being implemented.</p> <p>There are currently two projects in this area: A project called GCS with 25 institutes in Europe which is looking at collecting measures and how to manage activities and human activities. The other is called marine planning which will try to figure out the effectiveness of measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question was raised on the next steps of this project idea. Roland Cormier is checking how this topic relates to the type of work that his organization is conducting to see if the proposal of UNECE fits with that.</li> </ul>
8	Risk Mgmt & UN Global Survey	<p>A closer look at the trade facilitation survey 2023 which is coordinated by the regional commissions and UNCTAD ranks risk management as the 7<sup>th</sup> most implemented measure in the survey (this has evolved from the 6<sup>th</sup> most implemented measure in 2021).</p> <p>At the same time, the WTO runs a database on the implementation of TFA measures. In that database, it is the 5<sup>th</sup> least implemented measure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comment was raised that there are countries who claim to implement risk management processes, but who still continue to do 100% scans of all incoming consignments and 85% inspection rates...</li> </ul>
9	ISO TC262	<p>ISO TC 262 will have its virtual plenary on 3-5 October and a conference on the 8<sup>th</sup> of October. There is a proposal to create a study group on risk and to harmonize the definitions of risk / hazard. The standard 31000:2018 is being considered for revision; there is perhaps momentum to revise this.</p> <p>We do have a category A liaison with ISO TC 262 so we should prepare a report for the October meeting.</p>
10	Related events	<p>The UK OPSS is organizing an event on “Prosperity and Protection: Effective regulation for growth, trade and innovation” on 2 to 5 October 2023 in London.</p>