



INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME ON CHEMICAL SAFETY

**Steering Committee on the
Harmonization of Approaches to the Assessment of Risk
from Exposure to Chemicals**

Report of the 7th Meeting

25-26 October 2004, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME ON CHEMICAL SAFETY (IPCS)

**Report of the 7th Meeting of the Steering Committee
on the Harmonization of Approaches to the Assessment of Risk
from Exposure to Chemicals**

25-26 October 2004, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA¹

ITEM 1: WELCOME AND OPENING OF MEETING

1. The 7th meeting of the IPCS Harmonization Steering Committee convened on 25-26 October 2004, in Cincinnati, Ohio, United States of America. The meeting was opened by the Chair of the Steering Committee and Core Group, Dr Margaret Hartley, Director, Office of Chemical Safety, Commonwealth Department of Health, Australia.
2. After a round of introductions, the Chair welcomed in particular new members of the Committee and emphasized the value of participation of the represented international and intergovernmental organizations with interests in chemical risk assessment methodologies. Dr Bill Farland, US EPA, welcomed participants to the United States and wished them an enjoyable stay in Cincinnati. A list of participants appears at Annex 1.

ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

3. The adopted agenda is at Annex 2. In accordance with Steering Committee procedures the Secretariat fulfilled the role of Rapporteur.

ITEM 3: IPCS COORDINATOR'S REPORT

4. Ms Carolyn Vickers presented the Coordinator's Report on behalf of Dr Tim Meredith, who sent his apologies to the Committee. She advised the meeting that its main tasks were to consider the Stocktake Analysis Report and other relevant information, including the current policy context, and recommend a new Strategic Plan and Workplan for the Harmonization Project. The Coordinator's Report comprised a comprehensive overview of IPCS activities and policy context, and a summary of the key recommendations from the 5th IPCS Programme Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting held in June 2004. The PAC had noted the competitive advantage of IPCS in strengthening technical support for international work on

¹ The issue of this document does not constitute a formal publication. It should not be reviewed, abstracted or quoted without the written permission of the Coordinator, International Programme on Chemical Safety, WHO, Geneva, Switzerland.

chemical risk assessment (which includes methodology work). The development of globally-harmonized methods for chemical risk assessment had also been included in Health Sector Member State priorities proposed for the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, currently being negotiated by governments. She mentioned key WHO-wide policy drivers and highlighted the need for translation of science into policy into action at country level. Turning to the Harmonization Project workplan, this should include a feasible list of high priority activities addressing a clear need, taking into account the importance of adoption and use of project outputs in risk assessment, in particular by regulatory authorities worldwide.

5. In the ensuing discussion, it was noted that activities should focus on where the Project can make the most impact and have more narrowly defined rather than broad activities, and that the Committee needed to face the challenge of improving uptake of products and to better communicate the benefits for countries. The Chair identified that the construction of the Steering Committee and Working Groups would need to be considered taking into account these issues.

ITEM 4: HARMONIZATION PROJECT STOCKTAKE: PRESENTATION AND OVERVIEW

6. The Secretariat (Carolyn Vickers) presented an overview of the preparation of the Stocktake Analysis Report and the main conclusions in the report. The Committee noted its appreciation to the consultant who had prepared Stocktake Analysis Report (Ms Beatrice Grenier) with input from the Secretariat and Dr Steve Fairhurst (the Committee Liaison for the Stocktake). Discussion of the key findings focussed at this stage on outreach and uptake issues, and the following proposals were made:
 - There is a need for general training on risk assessment, in particular in developing countries, of which harmonization could be a component. This was in particular supported by experts from Uruguay (Dr Cristina Alonzo) and Ghana (Dr Edith Clarke). In this respect IPCS could explore options to work with other IOMC organizations which are now considering capacity-building strategies to support the sound management of chemicals, e.g. with UNITAR in the context of the Globally Harmonized System (GHS) for Classification and Labelling.
 - A balance is needed between expert activities producing products and implementation activities.
 - Both print and website formats of publications are needed, but that cheaper forms of print formats needed to be explored due to the limited funds available.
 - Promotional/contact mailing lists should be enhanced to enable regular newsletter-type communications to engage and inform more experts during the process, rather than once products are completed. Material could also be included in newsletters of other bodies, such as the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), where EFSA/IPCS collaboration is taking place.

- In addition to links with regulatory authorities, links with professional associations continued to be useful and should be developed further, however in some countries these do not exist and links would need to be with universities and other institutions.
 - National risk assessment fora could be a useful way to further disseminate information on products and encourage use, e.g. that of the BFR in Germany.
7. In closing the discussion, the Committee noted its thanks to Steve Fairhurst, in particular for his views relating to uptake and establishing clear "success criteria" at the outset.

ITEM 5: DEVELOPMENT OF NEW STRATEGIC PLAN

8. The Committee was advised that the proposed future Strategic Plan included updated information on the policy context, and that new key directions were needed as those in the 2002-04 Plan had been achieved, or would be achieved, by the end of 2004. The Chair tabled a draft diagramme she had developed in consultation with Bill Farland and the Secretariat titled "Harmonization Improves Health Risk Assessment", addressing the key focus areas and benefits of the Project.
9. The Committee discussed the Strategic Plan and agreed on the following:
- A new goal for the Project, as follows:
To improve chemical risk assessment generally, through the pursuit of common principles and approaches and hence, strengthen national and international management practices which deliver better protection of human health and the environment within the framework of sustainability.
 - Some additional material to be brought forward from the 2002-04 Strategic Plan.
 - The Plan would cover 2005-08, reflecting two WHO budget biennia, with possible review at the half-way mark.
 - New key directions should be included based on the recommendations of the Committee on future workplan activities.
 - The diagramme to be further developed to be consistent with the revised Strategic Plan text and included in the Plan.
 - While noting the importance of the area of harmonization of environmental assessment methods (e.g. for environmental effects), WHO and the Harmonization Project could not lead such an effort. This could be referred to IOMC Participating Organizations to consider whether any are able to take this up (e.g. UNEP).
 - A revised Strategic Plan to be developed by the Secretariat in consultation with the Chair after the meeting and circulated to the Committee for final comments.

ITEM 6: DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE WORKPLAN

10. This item comprised: a status review of current projects and report against the 2002-04 Workplan in order to identify projects to be carried forward; consideration of coordination issues arising from other activities within IPCS and the represented organizations (EU/ECB, EU/EFSA, ECETOC, IARC, ILSI and OECD); and consideration of new project proposals.

Item 6.1: Status Review of Current Projects: Report against 2002-04 Workplan

11. First, the Committee noted major achievements under the current Workplan, including work on terminology, cancer, exposure assessment, reproductive and developmental toxicity, and chemical-specific adjustment factors, and that almost all of the actions had been completed. Steve Olin (Liaison: Exposure Assessment) highlighted the adoption of the Key Exposure Assessment Terminology by the International Society for Exposure Assessment (ISEA), which would be further promoted. Both the exposure terms and the Generic Hazard/Risk Assessment Terminology had been translated into the five other UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, French, Spanish and Russian). EFSA translations were also available and the Committee requested that translation into further languages be explored. The Committee noted the near-completion of the modelling guidance (out for peer review in November) and the commencement of new work on uncertainty analysis.
12. Bill Farland (Liaison: Cancer) reported on the success of the March 2004 Cancer Working Group Meeting in Arlington, USA, and plans for an International Workshop in April 2005 to develop a combined IPCS Framework that builds on the original IPCS Mode of Action Framework to address the human relevance of animal tumours.
13. Ursula Gundert-Remy (Liaison: Chemical-specific adjustment factors) reported on arrangements for finalizing the CSAF publication, including a meeting in December 2004 to consider the peer review comment received.
14. The work of the WHO Collaborating Centre at Berlin on developmental toxicity nomenclature was commended. It was decided that proposed IPCS work to develop harmonized regulatory terms for developmental toxicity should not be included in the new workplan as it was not a high priority at this time.
15. The Committee noted the benefits of the OECD/IPCS Risk Assessment Methodologies database in highlighting awareness of different methods and identifying areas for harmonization, but also considered that it had served its purpose. Internet access to regulatory authority risk assessment guidance is now widespread, and it would be resource intensive to update and maintain the OECD/IPCS database in parallel. It was agreed that the database be archived and removed from the OECD and IPCS websites.

16. The following activities were agreed to be carried forward to the new Workplan:

- Terminology: Maintenance, translation into other languages and promotion of the IPCS/OECD generic hazard/risk assessment terms and IPCS exposure assessment terms.
- Cancer: Human relevance: Completion of the IPCS guidance extending the *IPCS Conceptual Framework for the Evaluation of a Cancer Mode of Action in Animals* to include consideration of human relevance of animal tumours.
- Uncertainty in exposure assessment: Development of *Harmonized guidance on characterizing and communicating uncertainty in exposure assessment*.
- Reproductive and developmental toxicity: WHO Collaborating Centre work on harmonization of morphological terms.

Item 6.2: Coordination with Other Activities

17. In considering the range of activities related to risk assessment methods underway elsewhere in IPCS, the Committee noted:

- An opportunity for the work on the EHC on Dermal Penetration to be coordinated with proposed work by the OECD Pesticides Working Group to develop a guidance note on this topic.
- The link between the MOA Framework and the EHC on Dose-Response Characterization. This EHC may in time lead to work on a Harmonization Project product.

18. The Chair thanked representatives of organizations for providing reports on their activities relevant to the Harmonization Project and invited them to highlight major areas of interest to the Committee.

- Ms Sharon Munn reported on the new EU/ECB workplan currently being considered which will focus primarily on REACH Implementation. Aspects most relevant to Harmonization included work on exposure scenarios, human data, and the further development of the Technical Guidance Document for Member State risk assessment.
- EFSA (Dr Juliane Kleiner) highlighted work on: assessment of genotoxic and carcinogenic substances (information exchange with WHO and ILSI is taking place); transparency in risk assessment; and uncertainty in exposure assessment (cooperation is in place with IPCS). She also mentioned proposals to work on aggregate/cumulative risk assessment and a paradigm for risk benefit analysis.
- ECETOC (Dr Michael Gribble) highlighted work on targeted risk assessment, children's environmental health and the establishment of two new Task Forces on mixtures and human data (biomonitoring and biomarkers). He advised that the report of the IPCS/ECETOC collaborative Workshop on the Use of Human Data in Risk Assessment (Cardiff, February 2004) had been published as ECETOC Workshop Report No. 3 and highlighted plans for future cooperation in this work.

- IARC (Dr Vincent Coglianò) reported on its series of publications on the relevance of certain types of tumours, proposed work on quantitative risk estimation, and a proposed revision to the IARC preamble.
- ILSI (Dr Steve Olin) reported on ILSI RSI activities relating to its human relevance framework for carcinogens, which is an input into the current IPCS work to extend its Framework to include human relevance. He also mentioned work to extend the IPCS MOA Framework to non-cancer end-points, which would also contribute to IPCS work on this issue. Other activities relate to predictive modelling (developmental toxicity), screening tools for decision-making, training in risk assessment, and the CARES software program designed to conduct complex pesticide exposure assessments.
- OECD (Dr Rob Visser) mentioned the good bilateral cooperative work ongoing between IPCS and OECD in a number of areas. The main areas of relevance to the Harmonization Project included work on test guidelines and guidance documents (on reprotoxicity, neurotoxicity and dose-selection in lifespan bioassays); further guidance for the GHS in the areas of carcinogenicity and reprotoxicity; electronic formats for reporting data and a global portal to make data available; and toxicogenomics (with IPCS).

19. The large amount of work underway in the various organizations and a number of opportunities for cooperative work were recognized by the Committee. It was noted that the current practice of involving organizations at the Working Group, as well as the Steering Committee level, is fostering harmonization of approaches generally.

Item 6.3: Consideration of New Project Proposals

20. The Committee considered a starting list of criteria/features that could be explored when considering the specific workplan proposals. It was agreed that the list, with some additions proposed by OECD, would be kept as an aide to discussion on the specific projects. This list was:

- The need/benefit of the work (what problem will be solved).
- The output (e.g. guidance document, database, other).
- Fit with other completed/current work/proposed work (does it fill a gap, does it build on an existing project, etc.).
- Application (to specific group of experts or risk assessors generally, etc.)
- Potential for implementation/uptake by regulatory authorities/other risk assessors.
- Feasibility (scientific/technical).
- Anticipated resource requirements (low/medium/high, whether direct funding would be needed or work-in-kind has been offered by an institution, etc).
- Opportunities for cooperation with other agencies.
- Does the work need to be done internationally.
- Does the work need to be done by WHO.
- Priority.

21. The meeting discussed the proposal that the Project include "sharp-focus" activities. It was agreed that this was an approach to an activity, rather than an

activity per se, and that the subject matter would drive decisions on the best approach. The Committee decided to work through the summary lists of proposed areas for future work documented in the Stocktake Analysis Report at pages 25 and 27. The Committee also considered the proposals requested by the Core Group on Data Quality in Exposure Assessment, PBPK Modelling, and cumulative/aggregate risk assessment.

22. The below-listed projects were recommended for inclusion in the Harmonization Project. Liaisons for the activities were assigned in some cases, noting that all members of the Steering Committee were not present and that this would be finalized subsequent to the meeting by IPCS in consultation with the Chair and interested members. The Workplan would also include elements addressing the points raised earlier relating to adoption and use of the outcomes of the Project.

New Activities

- a. Aggregate/cumulative Risk Assessment. Convene a scoping scientific workshop to produce a report including an internationally-agreed framework for further work by IPCS and others, e.g. what can be achieved in the near, medium and longer term, what the harmonization issues are, which issues are most appropriate for IPCS work. This would include considering whether the work should separate aggregate (single chemical, multiple sources/pathways/routes) from cumulative exposure (multiple chemicals, possibly operating by the same MOA). Timing: 2005 (top priority activity). Liaison: to be confirmed.
- b. Guidance on good practice in PBPK Modelling. Work is underway in several countries. Conduct initial discussions with key parties to confirm that international activity led by IPCS is supported. Also discuss at December 2004 CSAF meeting. Timing: Possibly 2005. Liaison: Ms Bette Meek.

New Sharp-focus Activities

- c. Data Quality in exposure assessment. Preparation of a short paper as per the project proposal considered by the Committee. Timing: 2005. Liaison: Steve Olin.
- d. Immunotoxicity. Convene an expert workshop to produce a report on the status of testing and risk assessment approaches for skin sensitization. To be conducted in cooperation with OECD and ECETOC (to be confirmed). Timing: 2006. Liaison: Dr Ursula Gundert-Remy.
- e. Issue/problem formulation in risk assessment. Prepare a high-level brief paper, including covering the purpose for and approach to the problem formulation step in the risk assessment process. Paper to be prepared by a one-off drafting meeting, followed by peer review. Timing: 2006. Liaison: to be confirmed.

- f. Harmonization issues in assessment of chemicals of security concern. (e.g. rapid risk assessment). Prepare a short paper to investigate the issues. Initiation of this work will be dependent on WHO consideration of the policy aspects. Process would be a small drafting group. Timing: to be decided. Lead: Ms Cindy Sonich-Mullin.

Extension of Existing Activities

- g. Extension of the IPCS Cancer MOA Framework to other end-points. This work would follow the work on the human relevance project, and should have a first discussion at the Cancer Workshop in April. Timing: report back to the Core Group after the April workshop and then possible work in 2006. Liaison: to be confirmed.
- h. Consider update of 1996 IPCS Qualitative scheme for mutagenicity. To be discussed initially at the April Cancer Workshop. Timing: report back to the Core Group and then possible work in 2006. Liaison: Dr Ada Knaap.

Information exchange/status reports to Core Group/Steering Committee

The following areas were considered, but not recommended for specific Harmonization Project activities at this time. However the Committee recommended that in future harmonization work may be appropriate and requested periodic status reports on the issues.

- i. Toxicogenomics. OECD/IPCS cooperation is already underway. At some point, consider whether there is a need for harmonization and how that might be addressed. However application in risk assessment of chemicals is considered to be a long way into the future.
- j. Neurotoxicology assessment. OECD Test Guidelines activities, including development of a guidance document were noted.
- k. Communication in risk assessment, i.e. during the process, for example at the problem identification stage, and between risk assessors and risk managers.
- l. Risk benefit analysis. EFSA and EU activities are underway or planned. This may lead to harmonization work in future.
- m. Risk assessment of manufactured nanomaterials. The OECD Joint Meeting is to consider possible future work and it was noted that ECETOC had commissioned a White Paper. This discussion may inform possible future work for the Harmonization Project. Margaret Hartley offered to lead on the status reports on this issue, in conjunction with OECD.
23. The Committee noted the paper developed by the Data Quality Discussion Group "Towards a strategy for improved data quality", which listed the data quality proposal and additional proposals for work. It was agreed that this would be useful for future discussions concerning additional activities that could be undertaken.

24. The Secretariat was tasked with fine-tuning the Workplan proposals and developing the presentation of the Workplan itself, subsequent to its consideration by the IPCS Coordinator, Tim Meredith.

ITEM 8: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

25. The meeting agreed to re-order the agenda to conduct the election of officers at this time, to enable any necessary consultation to take place. For this item the Secretariat (Carolyn Vickers) assumed the Chair. The Committee expressed its thanks to Margaret Hartley for her dedication to the Project and her leadership and requested that she continue as Chair, with Ursula Gundert-Remy as Vice-Chair, thereby providing a transition process for a new Chair. Both agreed to take on these roles. It was agreed that the Core Group would comprise the Liaisons for the main activity areas for the new Workplan (and hence would be finalized in conjunction with the Workplan to commence in 2005).

ITEM 6: DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE WORKPLAN

Item 6.4: Adoption and Use of Project Outcomes in Countries.

26. The Committee referred back to the actions recommended during the discussion at Item 4. The role of members of the Steering Committee in promoting adoption and use of Harmonization Project products was emphasized. It was agreed that an "implementation plan" for each activity should be developed in consultation with the relevant Working Party and the Harmonization Steering Group in parallel with the technical work. The Secretariat was asked to refine this approach, including development of a generic aide to the development of such plans, for comment by the Committee prior to its application.

Item 6.5: Working Group Procedures

27. The meeting noted the suggestions made by Stocktake Survey respondents for improving procedures, and also that over time, some practices had been improved but not captured in the current written procedures for Project (i.e. Steering Committee Terms of Reference and the Roles and Responsibilities document). The Secretariat was tasked with preparing proposed revised procedures in consultation with the Chair, for subsequent comment by the Steering Committee, and ultimately finalization by the IPCS Coordinator.

ITEM 7: COMMUNICATIONS: INCLUDING PUBLICATIONS AND THE WEBSITE.

28. Discussions at Items 4 and 6.4 had largely covered this topic. In addition, it was agreed that a short paper be developed to provide feedback to respondents to the Stocktake Survey on the main findings and actions to be taken. Similar material should also be included on the IPCS website.

ITEM 9: ANY OTHER BUSINESS

29. Following the invitation of the Chair at the commencement of the meeting, the Committee was asked to identify whether they perceived any major gaps in their membership, keeping in mind their role in facilitating the adoption and use of Harmonization Project products in countries. Although no proposals were made at this time, participants were invited to consider this matter further and provide any suggestions to the Secretariat.

ITEM 10: CLOSURE AND NEXT MEETING

30. In closing the meeting, the Chair thanked participants for their input to the discussions and their continued efforts in progressing the activities of the Harmonization Project. On behalf of IPCS, Carolyn Vickers thanked Margaret Hartley for her excellent Chairing of the meeting and participants for their contributions to a very interesting and relevant future plan of work for the Project. She expressed special thanks to Cindy-Sonich Mullen and her staff for their generous hospitality and their efficient organization of the local arrangements for the meeting. Bill Farland, with Cindy Sonich-Mullin, also thanked those participants able to stay in Cincinnati to participate in the EPA-hosted International Symposium on "The Role of Risk Assessment in Protecting our Homelands....Striving for Harmonization" to take place on the day following the meeting.

**IPCS Harmonization Steering Committee
7th Meeting, 25-26 October 2004, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA
List of Invited Participants**

AFRO

Dr Edith Clarke, Ministry of Health, Occupational Health Department, Accra, Ghana

AMRO

Dr Christina Alonzo, Coordinator, Chemical Safety and Environmental Health Department, Ministry of Public Health, Montevideo, Uruguay

** Dr P. Michael Bolger, Director, Division on Risk Assessment, US Food and Drug Administration, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, USA

Dr William Farland, Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Science, Office of Research and Development, US Environmental Protection Agency, USA

Ms B. Meek, Environmental Health Center, Ottawa, Canada

EMRO

** Dr Omid Sabzevari, Associate Professor in Molecular Toxicology and Drug Metabolism, Department of Toxicology and Pharmacology, Faculty of Pharmacy, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

EURO

** Dr Steven Fairhurst, Health and Safety Executive, United Kingdom

** Dr Sten Flodstrom, National Chemicals Inspectorate, KEMI, Sweden

Professor Dr Ursula Gundert-Remy, Federal Institute for Health Protection of Consumers and Veterinary Medicine, Berlin, Germany

Dr Ada Knaap, Head, Toxicology Advisory Centre, National Institute of Public Health and Environmental Protection (RIVM), Bilthoven, Netherlands

** Dr Gyorgy Ungvary, Hungarian Inst. Of Occupational Health, Budapest, Hungary

** Invited, but unable to participate.

SEARO

- ** Dr Mathuros Ruchirawat, Vice President for Research, Office of Academic Affairs Chulabhorn Research Institute, Bangkok, Thailand

WPRO

Dr Margaret Hartley, Director, NICNAS, Sydney, Australia

Dr Tohru Inoue, Director, Center for Biological Safety and Research, Tokyo, Japan

- ** Dr Yiqun Wu, Think Tank Research Center for Health Development, Beijing, P.R. China

REPRESENTATIVES

Dr Michael Gribble, ECETOC, Belgium

Ms Sharon J. Munn, European Chemicals Bureau, Italy

Dr Robert Visser, Environmental Health and Safety Division, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris

Dr Stephen Olin, Deputy Director, ILSI Risk Science Institute, Washington, D.C.

Dr Juliane Kleiner, Senior Scientist of Scientific Expert Services, European Food Safety Authority, Brussels

SECRETARIAT

Ms Cindy Sonich-Mullin, c/- International Programme on Chemical Safety, World Health Organization

Dr Vincent Cogliano, Chief, Unit of Carcinogen Identification and Evaluation International Agency for Research on Cancer, France

Ms Carolyn Vickers, International Programme on Chemical Safety, World Health Organization, Switzerland

- ** Invited, but unable to participate.

**WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION
UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME ON CHEMICAL SAFETY

**7th Meeting of the Steering Committee
on the
Harmonization of Approaches to the Assessment of Risk
from Exposure to Chemicals**

**25-26 October 2004, Cincinnati, Ohio, United States
Commencing at 9:00 am on 25 October
Mt Auburn Room, Marriott Kingsgate Conference Centre**

Adopted Agenda

1. Welcome and Opening of Meeting.
2. Approval of the Agenda (IPCS/HSC-7/04.1)
3. IPCS Coordinator's Report. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.2)
4. Harmonization Project Stocktake: Presentation and Overview. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.3)
5. Development of New Strategic Plan. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.4)
6. Development of Future Workplan. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.5)
 - 6.1 Status review of current projects: Report against 2002-04 Workplan. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.6)
 - 6.2 Coordination with Other Activities
 - 6.2.1 Activities Relevant to Harmonization Underway in IPCS: Other methodology work updates (IPCS/HSC-7/04.7)
 - 6.2.2 Activities Relevant to Harmonization Underway in Represented Organizations and WHO Expert Agencies (IPCS/HSC-7/04.8)
 - a. EU/ECB
 - b. EU/EFSA
 - c. ECETOC
 - d. IARC
 - e. ILSI
 - f. OECD

- 6.3 Consideration of new project proposals. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.9)
- 6.4 Adoption and Use of Project Outcomes in Countries. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.10)
- 6.5 Working Group Procedures. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.13)
- 7. Communications: Including publications and website. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.11)
- 8. Election of Officers. (IPCS/HSC-7/04.12)
- 9. Any Other Business
- 10. Closure and Next Meeting (Scheduled meeting closure time is 5:00 pm).

List of Relevant Background Documents

Final Report of the 6th Harmonization Steering Committee Meeting, Geneva, 2002
(IPCS/HSC-6/02/Report)

Final Report of the 1st Meeting of the Core Group, Sydney, 2003
(IPCS/HSC-CG-1/03/Report)

Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee.

Roles and Responsibilities in Activities.