

As the World turns, so does GHS

Tuesday, March 19, 2019

Premise: While the adoption of GHS is well integrated into our daily practices, there are always new developments. This Forum session will discuss the on-going implementation of GHS around the world, with a focus on Mexico and South Korea. We will also discuss strategies for tracking updates, and making compliant GHS classifications, GHS SDSs, and GHS labels. Any other challenges attendees face are also welcome to be brought to the floor!

Labels

1. Question/Prompt/Concern

Small container labeling, there is disharmony between UNTDG (orange book) and GHS (purple book). Is there any upcoming plan to provide relief for companies who regularly provide products in small containers?

Response:

The fall regulatory agenda for US OSHA indicated that there may be a proposed rule in March 2019 for revised [GHS](#), they would pick up the small labeling addressed by Revision 7 or 8 of the purple book, kit examples that were discussed at the UN may make its way into US OSHA. Example discussed included small containers and sets in kits with different means of adding the required information, including having a label adhered to the outside of the box, in combination with a tie on tag with multiple A4 size labels to include all the hazard statements, pictogram, signal words, hazard statements, precautionary statements, and storage statement for the kit on the inside of the box, see [UN GHS working papers](#).

Some additional discussion among the attendees about working to have Latin America and Canada similarly align with the proposed UN accommodation for small containers. Currently many of our colleagues have approached the disconnect with labeling for small containers by placing the samples in a larger container for practicality.

Twice a year there is a public meeting with OSHA to introduce the topics that will be discussed at the UN working group. A staff member at US OSHA (Robert Stone?) was working on label relief from the point of view of financial burden, digitization of labels for small packaging and doing research for what is technically possible for doing this type of thing. At the OSHA public meeting this past fall 2018 concerning the Hazard Communication Standard revision, it was asked how industry would feel about having to place all hazardous ingredients in section 3 even if they are below levels for concentration limits. US OSHA may additionally tackle the ranges for section 3 like Canada.

An attendee shared that there is no ISO standard for QR codes globally at this point. There are implications for workers if you don't have a reader if this is the direction in which the regulatory agencies go for labels.

2. Question/Prompt/Concern

If a product has different SDS's for Canada and US, how to combine a labeling system for things which bring HHNOC and PNOC.

Response:

One suggestion was to have two separate versions of section 2 on the SDS to call out the separate country classifications, however, it wasn't recommended to do multiple labels. As a way to do a single label for both the US and Canada it was suggested that there is guidance published by [OSHA from a letter of interpretation](#), whereby they allow you to use the exclamation point with the words HNOC underneath.

SDS

1. Question/Prompt/Concern

For SDS Canada in Section 1, question about how to place addresses for when you are sending to Canada as a foreign supplier.

Response:

Foreign exporter doesn't have any responsibility, the onus is on the Canadian importer to have everything compliant for their workplace. If the product is used in the workplace only then the US manufacturer address can be on the SDS.

2. Question/Prompt/Concern

Has anyone experienced pushback for not having 100% composition on SDS in Section 3 for Canada?

Response:

Some attendees suggested it was acceptable to ask if customers will accept a secondary document with the components adding up to 100%. Others indicated that identifying the balance as 'non-hazardous ingredients' was also acceptable.

3. Question/Prompt/Concern

Some discussion about the new Korea law with submitting CBI on the SDS to the government.

Response:

ACC and WTO had no success with having any accommodation for the not having to submit all ingredients to the Korean, Taiwanese, Chinese government.

4. Question/Prompt/Concern

Question about country-based classifications, and how does anyone handle these?

Response:

Many attendees indicated they do country based SDS and classification. There was some discussion that your company may have product liability for when you have different classifications around the world, some companies go with the most conservative classification around the world for this reason.

Some companies document the science, do toxicology evaluation and make substance level classifications that are then used as a basis for mixtures. Some companies are part of trade groups that come up with group classifications.

Related to this discussion point, Canada is considering having a list of GHS classifications, not sure about whether it will be voluntary. Quebec already has a classification list, feedback from the group indicated that it's out of date and many substances are over classified.

Malaysia has a small chemical classification list, if you want to ship in then you need to get approval for any chemicals that are not classified on their existing list. This is something heard at a recent conference in Singapore. They are also considering expanding the list as well.

Within this classification lists topic and attendee asked about the Korea mandatory list, specifically asking about ethanol and whether you can debate the classification. Is route of exposure a valid point to use for a debate of a listed classification. Attendees were not hopeful that this type of debate would have any success with the Korean authority.

[EU has draft 14th ATP concerning titanium dioxide](#) for which the comment period has closed, route of exposure is specified in the revision and so this may have limited application, it is controversial!

5. Question/Prompt/Concern

When is the newest GHS revision typically published?

Response:

Revision 8 will likely be physically printed in August or September of 2019.

6. Question/Prompt/Concern

Attendee received a request to translate from US English into UK English?

Response:

Attendees were puzzled as to why this wouldn't be a simple thing to do by reprinting the document from an authoring system by selecting the different language.

Classification

1. Question/Prompt/Concern

Flammable gas differences between GHS revisions, how will this be addressed with US OSHA revision of GHS?

Response:

OSHA will likely adopt to please industry groups which were asking for relief, in GHS revision 8 there is a decision logic to walk you through how to classify. Sustained combustion in the transportation regulations, under flammable liquids section. OSHA does not give the same notes to approach the classification, if materials flash in the workplace and sustain combustion then

something else could catch fire, other countries view as a building block. The OSHA approach didn't go anywhere with the UN, as something to adopt.