



REPORT

1ST FAO/WHO JOINT MEETING ON PESTICIDE MANAGEMENT

and

**3RD SESSION OF THE FAO PANEL OF EXPERTS ON PESTICIDE
MANAGEMENT**

**22 – 26 October 2007
Rome**



**Food and Agriculture
Organization
of the United Nations**



**World Health
Organization**

Table of contents

Abbreviations	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Opening of the meeting	6
3. Election of the chairperson and rapporteurs.....	7
4. Adoption of the agenda	7
5. Developments since the previous session of the Panel	7
5.1 FAO.....	7
5.2 WHO	9
5.3 UNEP	10
5.4 UNITAR.....	10
5.5 Pesticide industry	11
5.6 Civil society organizations	11
6. Pesticide management under SAICM	12
7. Indicators of pesticide use	13
8. Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs)	14
8.1 Identifying Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs).....	14
8.2 Priority activities for risk reduction	16
9. Monitoring and observance of the Code of Conduct	17
10. Review of new and revised guidelines	19
10.1 Guidelines on Management Options for Empty Pesticide Containers.....	19
10.2 Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising	19
10.3 Guidance on Pest and Pesticide Management Policy Development	20
10.4 Guidelines on Resistance Management for Pesticides.....	21
10.5 Guidelines on Good Labelling Practice for Pesticides.....	22
10.6 Guidelines on the Development of a Reporting System for Pesticide Incidents ...	22
11. Review of outlines for new or revised guidelines	23
11.1 Guidelines on Pesticide Registration.....	23
11.2 Guidelines for Retail Establishments for Pesticides	24
11.3 Guidelines on Pesticide Quality Control.....	24
11.4 Guidelines on Registration of Microbial Pest Control Agents.....	25
12. Recommendations	26
13. Closure of the meeting	31
Annex 1 – List of participants	32
Annex 2 – Agenda.....	38

Abbreviations

ASP	Africa Stockpiles Programme
ALINA	Asociación Latinoamericana de la Industria Nacional de Agroquímicos
CIEN	Chemicals Information Exchange Network
CLI	CropLife International
COAG	Committee on Agriculture
ECCA	European Crop Care Association
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GAP	Good Agricultural Practice
GHS	Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals
HHPs	Highly Hazardous Pesticides
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management
IFCS	Inter-governmental Forum on Chemical Safety
IEE	Independent External Evaluation
IGO	Inter-governmental Organization
IOMC	Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals
IPCS	International Programme on Chemical Safety
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IVM	Integrated Vector Management
JMPR	Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues
JMPS	Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specifications
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRL	Maximum Residue Limit
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAN	Pesticide Action Network
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
QSP	Quick Start Programme
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America
WHO	World Health Organization
WHOPES	World Health Organization Pesticide Evaluation System

1. Introduction

The 1st FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management and the 3rd Session of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Management, were held at FAO Headquarters in Rome from 22 to 26 October 2007. Mr Gero Vaagt welcomed all participants to this inaugural meeting.

The FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Management is the official statutory body that advises the Organization on matters pertaining to pesticide regulation and management, and alerts it to new developments, problems or issues that otherwise merit attention. The Panel in particular counsels FAO on the further implementation of the revised version of the *International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides*. The WHO Panel of Experts are drawn from the WHO Panel of Experts on Vector Biology and Control, or are academic or government experts invited to advise the Organization on policies, guidelines and key actions to support Member States on sound management of pesticides.

Mr Morteza Zaim welcomed the participants on behalf of WHO. He stated that management of public health pesticides has become an increasing priority for the international community, and provided several reasons for it, including: increased use of insecticides in the health sector and greater international focus and advocacy, as well as global investment in control of vector-borne diseases such as malaria; decentralized health services and challenges associated with management of public health pesticides; inadequate infrastructure and resources for sound management of public health pesticides in the majority of developing countries; and poorly-coordinated international and local response to management of pesticides in health and agriculture sectors. Mr Zaim also noted challenges faced in promoting sound management of public health pesticides in the absence of any association of manufacturers to represent this sector of industry. He thanked FAO for organizing this first Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Management in Rome, and proposed to alternate the future meetings between Rome and Geneva.

In early 2007, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed between WHO and FAO on cooperation in a joint programme for the sound management of pesticides. It was agreed that joint technical meetings would be conducted, when appropriate, to discuss and strengthen particular areas of pesticide management. This 1st FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management was held to respond to the provisions of the MoU. It allowed additional experts in the field of pesticides and public health to complement the expertise present in the FAO Panel of Experts. Implementing this MoU would furthermore ensure optimal use of the resources of the two organizations, and is an opportunity to provide the Member States with unified, coordinated and consistent advice.

Various issues were discussed during the meeting; among them a proposed new initiative to reduce the risk posed by Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs), strengthening pesticide management under the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), the development of international environmental indicators for pesticide use and a number of *ad hoc* monitoring cases of observance of the Code of Conduct. Furthermore, various new or revised guidelines, or outlines for guidelines, were reviewed that had been prepared in support of the Code of Conduct.

Experts invited to this meeting were selected for their personal expertise and experience in specific aspects of pesticide management, both in agriculture and in public health, and do not represent the position of governments or institutions they may belong to. They are appointed

in their personal capacity by either FAO or WHO. In addition, representatives from other inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), pesticide industry and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) also attended the meeting as observers.

All participants in the meeting are listed in Annex 1.

2. Opening of the meeting

Mr Peter Kenmore, Chief of the Plant Protection Service of FAO, gave the Opening Address on behalf of the Organization. He welcomed the Panel Members and in particular the new experts invited by WHO, participants from other UN organizations, representatives of pesticide industry and public interest groups to the meeting.

Mr Kenmore underlined the special nature of the occasion, it being the 1st Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Management. He noted that FAO and WHO play a unique role in the UN system in that they advise member countries on the use of pesticides for agriculture and health. Close collaboration between the two organizations is therefore required to provide unified, consistent and coordinated advice on sound management of pesticides. Mr Kenmore noted that this collaboration also underlines the international scope of the Code of Conduct, which is not an FAO Code, although FAO may take the lead in many aspects related to its promotion and implementation.

Mr Kenmore mentioned that within FAO, sound pesticide management continues to have a high priority. This view was strongly supported by the recent Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of FAO, which expressed satisfaction with the activities carried out in this field by FAO and urged continuation of the programme. Mr Kenmore warned, however, that the budgetary limitations would remain, in spite of this positive evaluation.

Mr Kenmore reminded the meeting participants that the FAO Council, in November 2006, endorsed the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) and gave strong support to FAO's involvement in pesticide management under SAICM. The Council had indicated that the Code of Conduct was to be considered an important element of the SAICM process.

As an essential activity to reduce the risks of pesticide use, in particular in developing countries, the FAO Council had requested FAO to assist countries in progressively banning HHPs. Mr Kenmore underlined that this request was reiterated by FAO's Committee on Agriculture (COAG) and noted the importance of this fact as it showed a significant evolution of opinion by the agricultural sector on the issue of banning HHPs. He stressed the need for FAO to move forward rapidly and requested the meeting to provide clear advice on how to do so.

Mr Kenmore noted that implementation of the Code of Conduct needed to be further strengthened and should focus on the promotion of integrated pest management and local capacity building in pest and pesticide management. He also indicated that the Rotterdam Convention continues to grow in both number of Parties and in scope. For instance, the Convention had recently been formally included in the work of the Asia-Pacific Plant

Protection Organization. Furthermore, China, being a very important pesticide exporter, would be having talks with the Convention's Secretariat on how best to implement its provisions.

Finally, Mr Kenmore thanked the invited experts for having accepted to participate in the meeting, and wishing all fruitful discussions, declared the 3rd Session of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Management and the 1st FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management open.

3. Election of the chairperson and rapporteurs

Ms Vibeke Bernson was elected Chairperson of the meeting, and Mr Gamini Manuweera and Ms Sandhya Kulshrestha were appointed rapporteurs.

4. Adoption of the agenda

Two amendments were made to the provisional agenda of the meeting. Item 11.6 was added to the agenda, regarding the endorsement of the *Guidelines on management options for empty pesticide containers*. Agenda item 12.1, concerning a concept paper on opportunities for harmonization, work sharing and bridging approaches, was postponed until the next Session. The definitive agenda was adopted as shown in Annex 2.

5. Developments since the previous session of the Panel

5.1 FAO

A brief summary was presented of some developments with respect to pesticide management that had taken place since the 2nd Session of the FAO Panel, in November 2006.

In November 2006, the FAO Council had endorsed SAICM and recognized FAO's role in its implementation to the extent possible within existing resources. The Council had agreed on the importance of SAICM in assisting countries to meet the goals of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 and its contribution to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. In line with the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), it recognized the importance of agencies such as FAO incorporating SAICM into their programmes, consistent with their mandate. It was also noted that the *International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides* was to be considered as an important element of the SAICM process.

In view of the broad range of activities envisaged within SAICM, the Council had suggested that the activities of FAO could include risk reduction, including the progressive ban on HHPs, promoting Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), ensuring environmentally-sound disposal of stock-piles of obsolete pesticides and capacity-building in establishing national and regional laboratories.

With respect to risk reduction of HHPs, a side-event had been organized at the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG), in April 2007, which included presentations by various stakeholders and countries. Explicit support for the FAO initiative on HHPs was expressed by the European Union, among others.

Specific measures to reduce availability of HHPs had been reported since the last Session of the Panel, both by governments and by pesticide industry. They include the plan by Cheminova to phase out the production and sales in developing countries of WHO class I pesticides by 2010, the prohibition of several WHO class I pesticides in China, Thailand and Vietnam, and the cessation of registration of WHO class I pesticides by the nine-country Sahelian Pesticide Committee in West Africa.

It was reported that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues is now hosted by China, after having been organized for many years by The Netherlands. Its 39th Session was held in Beijing in May 2007. Some of the issues discussed during this Session were the adoption of (draft) MRLs and discontinuation of certain MRLs, the use of Codex MRLs at national level, the acceptance of procedural changes introduced by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), alternative GAP procedures, and a revision of list of methods for pesticide residue analysis.

The FAO/WHO JMPR was held in Geneva in September 2007. It evaluated 31 pesticides and discussed procedures for short-term dietary intake assessment, among other issues. A Global Minor Use Summit is planned to be held in Rome from 3-6 December 2007, in cooperation with USDA, US-EPA and IR-4.

The 6th FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specifications (JMPS) was organized in Durban in June 2007, in conjunction with the 4th Joint CIPAC/FAO/WHO Open Meeting. In the course of 2007, 10 new JMPS specifications were published for agricultural pesticides. It was also reported that the FAO/WHO procedure for equivalence determination had now been adopted in Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, the European Community, Mexico and Paraguay, while discussions about adoption were ongoing in China, the Philippines, the USA and in the OECD Working Group on Pesticides.

FAO had organized a regional Workshop on Pesticide Management in Southern Africa, also in Durban in June 2007. It brought together pesticide management specialists from 11 countries in the region. Participants to the workshop identified constraints and priorities for strengthening pesticide management and reducing pesticide risks, which included: the need to strengthen pesticide legislation and registration; the lack of laboratory facilities; the importance of improving coordination between national stakeholders; the need to raise awareness and exchange information of pesticide risks; the environmentally sound disposal of empty containers and unused pesticides; the importance of effective border control; and the need for management and evaluation of pesticides resistance.

Finally, FAO reported that it had started its activities on monitoring and observance of the Code of Conduct, as defined in the guidelines that had been adopted by the Panel in a

previous Session. The *Guidelines on Monitoring and Observance of the Code of Conduct* were being translated in all official FAO languages, to be sent out to FAO Members before the end of 2007. Results of this monitoring exercise are expected in the course of 2008 and will be presented to the next Session of the Panel.

5.2 WHO

The Panel was informed of the priority given by WHO in promoting the implementation of the Code of Conduct. It was stressed that the Code of Conduct is an international instrument that provides standards of conduct for all public and private entities engaged in, or associated with, the distribution and use of pesticides, and that references regularly being made to it as the “FAO Code” don’t do justice to its wide scope and applicability. The signing of the MoU between FAO and WHO on cooperation in a joint programme for the sound management of pesticides was expected to further ensure that public health pesticides, in addition to agricultural pesticides, would also be covered effectively under the implementation of the Code of Conduct. For instance, guidelines in support of the Code of Conduct would be redrafted to include public health pesticides, and also to provide a stronger emphasis on reducing health risks.

It was stressed that acceptance of the Code of Conduct at the national level was also required by ministries and other government institutions responsible for public health. The MoU between FAO and WHO would strengthen the vision of a common approach to pesticide management, irrespective of type of pesticide, use pattern or actors involved. This should improve collaboration also at the national level, even though different government bodies may be responsible for pesticide regulation and management.

It was noted that two of the ten WHO clusters are of particular importance to pesticide management. The cluster on HIV/AIDS, TB, Malaria and Neglected Tropical Diseases advises on pesticide use, in particular for vector-borne disease control through its WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES). The Health, Security and Environment cluster deals with the health risks of pesticide use.

The objectives of WHOPES are to facilitate the search for alternative pesticides and application methods that are safe and cost-effective; and to develop and promote policies, strategies and guidelines for the selective and judicious application of pesticides for public health use, and assist and monitor their implementation by Member States. It does so, for instance, by publishing recommendations on specific insecticides and application technologies, technical guidelines on application equipment and guidance on sound management of public health pesticides.

Other WHO activities on pesticide management in 2007 included the FAO/WHO JMPS, which has published 17 specifications for public health pesticides since the 2nd Session of the FAO Panel, in November 2006; a Consultation on Integrated Vector Management which was held in Geneva in May 2007, and a meeting on Sustainable Alternatives to DDT and Strengthening of National Vector Control Capabilities in Middle East and North Africa.

It was finally brought to the attention of the meeting that WHO had been awarded a grant by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for a programme on the reduction of health risks through sound management of pesticides. Its main objectives are i) to facilitate the

establishment of national regulatory frameworks and optimizing the registration of public health pesticides; ii) to strengthen country capacities on sound management of pesticides, including their judicious use, to reduce health and environmental impact of pesticide use/application; and iii) to reduce trade of substandard pesticide products.

5.3 UNEP

At the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the Chemicals Branch of the Department of Technology, Industry and Economics is the overall body involved in chemicals and pesticide management. The implementation of the environmental component of SAICM has been an important activity of UNEP since the last Session of the Panel. Activities included the development of guidelines for addressing chemicals in national strategic plans, strengthening technical expertise of countries, information exchange and support to chemical- and waste-related multilateral environmental agreements.

In the field of pesticides, a resource tool on the sound management of pesticides and diagnosis and treatment of pesticide poisoning was developed in collaboration with WHO, and is available on the website of the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS).

Information exchange on chemicals and pesticides is another focus of UNEP activities, mainly through the Chemicals Information Exchange Network (CIEN). CIEN is a collaborative programme between UNEP the US Environmental Protection Agency and aims to help networking and collaboration among stakeholders responsible for the environmentally sound management of chemicals, e.g. by linking people at the national level through the use of a shared website. CIEN allows stakeholders to connect to major specialized websites and databases, access distance learning tools, and exchange data on chemicals, among other options. Presently, 41 developing countries are involved in CIEN.

5.4 UNITAR

The representative of the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) briefly introduced its activities in chemicals and waste management. The focus of UNITAR is on training, methodology development and new learning methods such as e-learning. It is involved in capacity building on international instruments, such as the Rotterdam, Stockholm and Basel Conventions, the Globally Harmonised System for Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS), SAICM or specific national priorities.

It was noted that the Code of Conduct is one of the subjects raised at country level, as well as other pesticide-related areas such as the Africa Stockpiles Programme (ASP). UNITAR is therefore seeking active collaboration with FAO to ensure mutual enforcement of capacity building and awareness raising activities.

5.5 Pesticide industry

5.5.1 CropLife International

CropLife International (CLI) reported on its various activities to implement the Code of Conduct among its member companies. CLI's Vision is that members of the industry, and regional CropLife organizations, know and follow the Code of Conduct and that improvements in responsible use are recognized by stakeholders. To this end, CLI uses e-learning modules to drive awareness in the industry and is developing reporting tools to demonstrate the extent of awareness and improvements in application of the Code of Conduct.

CLI has set as objectives for 2010 a more 90 percent awareness level of the Code of Conduct in the industry; impact on reputation assessed through market research; the availability of verifiable reporting tool to collect data from countries; bi-annual reporting by of outputs and outcomes to FAO; and infringement reporting by third parties.

In 2007, the English and German versions of the e-learning tool have been tested and translated into Latin American Spanish, Brazilian Portuguese and French. For 2008, the above-mentioned versions of the tool will be rolled out, and Chinese and Japanese versions prepared. A baseline report of implementation levels of the Code of Conduct by the industry will be prepared for the next session of the FAO Panel of Experts.

5.5.2 European Crop Care Association

The European Crop Care Association (ECCA) expressed its interest in seeing a broader use of the CLI approach to implementation of the Code of Conduct to promote a common standard among pesticide industry associations.

5.5.3 Asociación Latinoamericana de la Industria Nacional de Agroquímicos

The representative of the Asociación Latinoamericana de la Industria Nacional de Agroquímicos (ALINA) informed the participants that it had organized several internal workshops to promote policies and registration systems that guarantee quality and safety of pesticides on the market, and to share and transfer best practices in used container management. Focus of attention had been the promotion of the registration of off-patent pesticides through equivalence procedures based on those recommended by the FAO/WHO JMPS.

5.6 Civil society organizations

5.6.1 Pesticide Action Network International

The representative of Pesticide Action Network International (PAN) outlined its recent activities in support to the implementation of the Code of Conduct. She informed the Meeting that PAN Germany maintains a website to facilitate the implementation of the Code of Conduct. It encourages stakeholders to become active, for instance through a number of target group specific leaflets. Furthermore, PAN UK will publish a specific more in-depth publication on implementation of the Code of Conduct for the food sector.

Community monitoring of pesticide use and risks is supported by all PAN regional centres, which allows the documentation of non compliance with provisions of the Code of Conduct. And finally, attention was drawn to the online information service for non-chemical pest management in the tropics, which is managed by PAN Germany.

5.6.2 Pesticide Action Network Benin

A presentation was also given by Pesticide Action Network Benin, as an example of activities undertaken by a national African PAN branch. The PAN Benin representative informed the Meeting about the various awareness raising exercises that were carried out at farmer level, and the great importance of such activities for pesticide risk reduction. He further noted work done on monitoring pesticide poisoning incidents, which had documented a considerable number of cases over the last few years. Finally, examples of sustainable alternatives technologies for pest management in the field and for cereal storage were outlined, as a means to reduce pesticide risks.

6. Pesticide management under SAICM

Two presentations were given on different aspects of SAICM implementation: the reporting initiative and the quick start programme.

The SAICM Secretariat, in collaboration with Canada, is developing reporting modalities of SAICM implementation. Assessing progress was one of the provisions of the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy, as agreed by the ICCM.

At present, various documents are being produced under the reporting initiative:

- indicators and questions to assess SAICM implementation, focussing on four groups of stakeholders: Government, industry, NGOs and IGOs;
- a baseline report describing the status of chemicals management in 2006, the year that SAICM was adopted;
- a guidance document for those reporting on progress in implementation SAICM.

All reporting initiative documents are planned to be completed in a testable form by late March 2008. A wider stakeholder review of the baseline report may be undertaken between April and July 2008, and documents suitable for presentation to ICCM-2 should be completed by September 2008.

While recognizing the importance of assessing progress of SAICM implementation, the Panel expressed its concern that this reporting initiative might duplicate efforts monitoring efforts carried out by other organizations. For instance, FAO is in the process of initiating global review of implementation of the Code of Conduct, and OECD carries out regular assessments of chemicals management issues among its members. It was stressed that any reporting initiative of SAICM should build on existing mechanisms, to avoid duplication and wastage. In this respect, the Meeting took note of an upcoming meeting of the Inter-Organization

Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) which will discuss a coordinated reporting approach to SAICM by all IOMC member organizations.

The Panel was also informed about the activities of the SAICM Quick Start Programme (QSP). The QSP was established by the ICCM and aims to support initial enabling activities in developing countries, least developed countries, small island developing states and countries with economies in transition. The QSP consists of a trust fund, as well as bilateral, multilateral and other forms of cooperation.

The QSP trust fund projects provide opportunities for increasing the agriculture sector involvement in SAICM. The QSP also allows for implementation of international initiatives, such as the Code of Conduct. FAO could assist countries in the development of project proposals or be involved as project executing agency. Possible activities may include the promotion of the Code of Conduct, the development of pesticide risk reduction strategies or the promotion of good agricultural practices, among others.

Three rounds of applications to the QSP trust fund have been processed so far. Most of the approved projects were multi-sectorial, but only a few had its main focus on the agricultural and/or pesticide sector. The fourth round of applications will close in March 2008.

The Panel welcomed the opportunities that the SAICM QSP provides for strengthening the sound management of pesticides in developing countries. It noted, however, the low number of project applications that have been made to the trust fund so far that concern pesticide risk reduction and the promotion of judicious pesticide use. It was suggested that this may be due to the limited awareness about SAICM by agricultural sector organizations on the one hand, and the relatively narrow focus of SAICM implementing bodies on environmental aspects of mainly industrial chemicals, on the other.

The Panel therefore recommended that FAO and WHO ensure that national authorities involved in pesticide regulation and management are made aware of opportunities under the SAICM QSP, and are invited to make use of them. The Panel also requested that the SAICM Focal Points be explicitly invited to assist the agricultural sector in becoming fully involved in implementation of SAICM. The establishment of a multi-stakeholder steering committee at national level might further ensure coordination between relevant sectors.

The Panel took note and welcomed of the offer by UNITAR to explore jointly with FAO and WHO opportunities under the SAICM QSP to support countries in developing activities on the sound management of pesticides and the implementation of the Code of Conduct. For instance, such collaboration might consist of the elaboration of several “model projects” for specific developing countries which could act as an example for others who might want to submit proposals in the field of pesticide management to the QSP trust fund.

7. Indicators of pesticide use

The Panel was informed about ongoing work at FAO to collect and make available statistics on pesticide import, export, production and use. Data collection and consolidation is done in the framework of the FAOSTAT database system, which relies mainly on statistics provided

by member countries. Collaboration with pesticide industry organizations was also being sought, as a means obtain and cross-check pesticide sales data. It is expected that an initial dataset will be publicly available on-line by June 2008.

The participants also took note of two reports on the development of environmental indicators of pesticide use, one prepared for FAO and the other for the Swedish Chemicals Directorate.

The Panel was informed of the monitoring and regular publication by WHO of the global use of insecticides for vector-borne disease control and that the publications have become a reference document used for development of guidelines on safe and effective use of insecticides as well as for investment for development of alternatives.

In the following discussion, the Panel underlined the importance of good quality statistics, whenever possible based on pesticide use data. Recognizing that pesticide use data are difficult to collect even in the best of circumstances, pesticide sales data would be an appropriate alternative, though more limited in their scope and more difficult to interpret. The collection of such pesticide use or sales statistics has high priority, since the application of any environmental indicator will strongly depend on them.

The Panel noted that, to be able to apply environmental or health indicators, pesticide statistics would need to be collected on the basis of volumes of active ingredients for individual compounds. It was stressed that very clear guidance would need to be developed to ensure that countries provide the right information in the right format. The Panel also emphasized the importance of pesticide industry participating in this process.

8. Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs)

Following its endorsement of SAICM, in November 2006, the FAO Council suggested that one of the activities that FAO could focus on was the reduction the risks posed by HHPs, including a possible progressive ban of such products.

Subsequently, the FAO COAG was informed in April 2007 of the Organization's intention to develop a new initiative for pesticide risk reduction, in response to the suggestion made by the FAO Council. COAG welcomed this initiative to reduce risks associated with the use of hazardous pesticides.

The Panel was requested to further discuss such an initiative and provide guidance to FAO on the options to define HHPs as well as activities that could be initiated to reduce their risks. A working paper in this respect was prepared by FAO as a thought-starter for the Panel.

8.1 Identifying Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs)

The Panel discussed whether risk reduction of HHPs should refer to human health or the environment, and decided that both issues should be included, although the emphasis would likely lie on human occupational risks. Furthermore, it was discussed if any classification of

HHPs should be made on hazard-based or risk-based criteria. While the final goal of the initiative is to reduce the risk posed by certain pesticides, the Panel recognized that risk-based criteria would be very unwieldy and their development might slow down much needed activities in this field. It recommended therefore that any classification of HHPs should be mainly hazard-based. These hazard criteria would then, depending on the type of toxicity being addressed, be applicable either to pesticide active ingredients or to pesticide formulations.

The Panel stressed that existing hazard classifications or criteria with wide international acceptance, such as the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard* and the GHS, should be at the basis of any listing of HHPs. The Panel underlined that the WHO classification is very widely used by pesticide regulatory authorities in developing countries. It noted, however, that the WHO classification and the GHS still need to be mutually harmonized with respect to acute toxicity. The Panel further recommended that WHO should consider incorporating the GHS criteria on carcinogenicity, mutagenicity and reproduction toxicity (“CMR” criteria) into the WHO classification.

The Panel also assessed whether a list should be produced of individual compounds that can be considered HHPs, or that only criteria should be defined. On this question, the Panel recommended that a list be prepared, and regularly reviewed and updated, to facilitate application by governments and industry.

Finally, it was stressed by participants that pesticides which had shown repeated and severe adverse effects on human health or the environment, but might not be classified as potentially high risk compounds through international hazard classification systems, might still need to be included on the list of HHPs. The Panel requested that WHO, FAO and UNEP develop criteria for inclusion of such pesticide formulations.

Based on its discussions, the Panel concluded that HHPs are defined as having one or more of the following characteristics:

- pesticide formulations that are included in classes Ia or Ib of the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*;
or
- pesticide active ingredients and their formulations that are included in carcinogenicity Categories 1A and 1B of the GHS, or are included accordingly in the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*;
or
- pesticide active ingredients and their formulations that are included in mutagenicity Categories 1A and 1B of the GHS or are included accordingly in the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*;
or
- pesticide active ingredients and their formulations that are included in reproductive toxicity Categories 1A and 1B of the GHS or are included accordingly in the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*;
or
- pesticide active ingredients listed by the *Stockholm Convention* in its Annexes A and B;

or

- pesticide active ingredients and formulations listed by the *Rotterdam Convention* in its Annex III;

or

- pesticides listed under the *Montreal Protocol*;

or

- pesticide formulations that have shown a high incidence of severe or irreversible adverse effects on human health or the environment.

8.2 Priority activities for risk reduction

The Panel discussed what type of activities should be initiated to reduce the risks associated with HHPs, and in particular regarding a progressive ban on their use in circumstances where they cannot be handled with acceptable risk to the user or the environment.

The Panel recommended that FAO and WHO, as a first step, prepare a list of HHPs based on the criteria identified in section 8.1, and update it periodically in cooperation with UNEP. It further requested that such a list be made widely known to all stakeholders involved in pesticide regulation and management.

The Panel noted that HHPs are still being used because they provide low-cost and efficacious means to controlling pests or diseases, in particular in developing countries. Pesticide users would therefore require alternatives to certain HHPs, for a progressive phase-out of these products to become effective. The Panel therefore requested FAO, in collaboration with WHO, to collect information on alternatives for HHPs, both reduced risk pesticides and other pest management approaches such as biological control, Integrated Pest Management (IPM) or Integrated Vector Management (IVM), resistant varieties, among others. Such information should be made available, possible through a type of tool box that can help pesticide users decide on alternatives. Experiences with the successful replacement of HHPs by lower risk alternatives should also be made available and exchanged.

The Panel furthermore recommended that FAO and WHO invite governments and the pesticide industry to develop plans of action for progressively phasing out HHPs. Such plans could be at the national or regional level, as appropriate. The Panel stressed, however, that any related work undertaken by multilateral environmental agreements such as the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions and the Montreal Protocol, should be fully taken into account to avoid duplication.

The Panel discussed the resources needed to develop phase-out plans and develop alternatives. It estimated that considerable resources would be required to do so, and requested that FAO and WHO seek assistance from donors for those countries that wish to progressively phase out HHPs. In addition, FAO was requested to mobilize internal and external resources in order to implement this recommendation of the FAO Council, possibly through the establishment of a specific trust fund.

The Panel recognized that any ban on the use of HHPs would likely be progressive and thus require time. It therefore discussed how regulatory authorities and pesticide industry should

address the current use of HHPs. In accordance with article 7.5 of the Code of Conduct, the Panel recommended that HHPs should not be used unless:

- governments establish a clear need for their use;
- no alternatives are available; and
- control measures as well as good marketing practices are sufficient to ensure that the product can be handled with acceptable risk to human health and the environment.

In the latter circumstances, the use of such pesticides should be severely restricted.

Finally, the Panel recalled that the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) had discussed “acutely toxic pesticides” in its 4th Session. The activities proposed by the IFCS to reduce the risks of using such pesticides were still considered applicable. It was suggested that this list be updated to include more recently adopted instruments, such as GHS and the Stockholm Convention, and be used to assist countries in developing national risk reduction or phase-out plans.

9. Monitoring and observance of the Code of Conduct

The *Guidelines on Monitoring and Observance of the Code of Conduct* provide for a procedure to bring *ad hoc* monitoring cases to the attention of FAO and the Panel. Two of such *ad hoc* cases were presented and discussed during the meeting.

The first case was submitted by the National University of Costa Rica and concerned an advertising campaign for a pesticide which offered prizes consisting of various agricultural inputs to purchasers of the product. The submitter claimed that this case did not observe article 11.2.8 of the Code of Conduct which stipulates that “*Pesticide industry should ensure that advertisements and promotional activities should not include inappropriate incentives of gifts to encourage the purchase of pesticides*”.

After reception of the case, FAO invited the pesticide manufacturer concerned and the government of Costa Rica for comments. It subsequently received a reply by the former and an acknowledgement of receipt by the latter.

The Panel discussed the possible interpretations of Article 11.2.18 of the Code of Conduct. It noted that gifts, sometimes based on draws or lotteries, are regularly used to promote pesticides. The Panel heard experiences of countries where such incentives had been regulated, ranging from a total ban on lotteries, a prohibition on gifts in exchange for the product label, allowing gifts up to a certain maximum monetary value (e.g. the price of the product), to only authorizing gifts that are directly related to the judicious use of the pesticide (such as personal protective equipment). It was also suggested that an incentive or gift might be inappropriate if it encourages a farmer to buy a pesticide for another reason than to make the best choice to control a pest or disease.

The Panel noted that the interpretation of this article of the Code of Conduct would depend to a certain extent on the national cultural and economic situation. The Panel therefore recommended that specific examples of what could be considered appropriate and

inappropriate incentives, in different situations, be included in the *Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising* to assist governments in setting standards.

The Panel requested FAO to encourage governments to ensure that high standards of advertising for pesticides, in line with the Code of Conduct, are maintained, if necessary through appropriate legislation. The Panel also invited the pesticide industry to develop codes of ethics regarding pesticide advertising in line with the Code of Conduct and ensure that no differences exist in these standards among industrialized and developing countries.

The Panel finally recommended that the above mentioned recommendations be clearly reflected in the *Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising*.

The second case was jointly submitted by the non-governmental organizations Berne Declaration (Switzerland), The Pesticides Eco-alternatives Center (China), Gita Perwiti (Indonesia), Lok Sanjh (Pakistan) and Pesticide Action Network Asia-Pacific (Malaysia). It concerned surveys in China, Indonesia and Pakistan which found little awareness among pesticide dealers of the importance of recommending Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) related to a specific highly toxic pesticide. The submitters of the case also stated that few if any PPE was available in shops selling this pesticide and that most dealers did not make any recommendations about the use of PPE to their customers.

The submitters claimed that this situation showed serious failing in the implementation of article 3.5 of the Code of Conduct which stipulates that “*Pesticides whose handling and application require the use of personal protective equipment that is uncomfortable, expensive or not readily available should be avoided, especially in the case of small-scale users in tropical climates. Preference should be given to pesticides that require inexpensive personal protective and application equipment and to procedures appropriate to the conditions under which the pesticides are to be handled and used*”.

After reception of the case, FAO invited the pesticide manufacturer concerned and the governments of China, Indonesia and Pakistan for comments. It subsequently received replies by the manufacturer and the governments of Pakistan and China.

The Panel reviewed the case and its documentation, as well as the comments provided by various stakeholders. It noted that the lack of availability of appropriate PPE was a problem in many countries and not limited to this specific case. The Panel stressed the importance of effective government regulation of the availability of pesticides which require the use of more extensive PPE. It also underlined the need for training and awareness building on the judicious handling of hazardous pesticides. It finally noted the responsibility that pesticide industry has with respect to both training of pesticide distributors and the availability of affordable PPE.

In conclusion with respect to this case, the Panel requested that article 3.5 of the Code of Conduct be strictly adhered to by governments, pesticide industry, traders and pesticide users.

Finally, the Panel noted that the monitoring reports of the implementation of the Code of Conduct presented by non-governmental organizations were very useful for its work and expressed its appreciation for the efforts undertaken to prepare these reports. The Panel encouraged all stakeholders to continue such monitoring exercises and present their results to its future sessions.

10. Review of new and revised guidelines

10.1 Guidelines on Management Options for Empty Pesticide Containers

The Panel discussed the final draft of the *Guidelines on Management Options for Empty Pesticide Containers*. The Panel suggested that WHO review the guidelines in more detail and provide additional aspects on containers management specific for public health pesticides, if required, before 31 December 2007. It also requested that the table in the guidelines which lists outputs of various national container management schemes (e.g. for Germany) be updated. Finally, the Panel noted that most examples of container management schemes were from industrialized countries, while some successful cases also exist from developing countries. It therefore requested that a few additional examples from developing countries be included.

Taking into consideration the above comments, the Panel endorsed this final version of the guidelines. The Panel requested that, if the WHO review did not lead to significant amendments, FAO proceed with joint publication with WHO and UNEP, if possible, prior to its next Session.

10.2 Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising

The Panel discussed a revised draft of the *Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising*. Previous versions of this guideline had been discussed during the 1st and 2nd Sessions of the Panel, and comments received after the last Session had been incorporated in this latest draft. The Panel expressed its appreciation about the improvements made in the structure and contents of the guideline by the Task Group. The Panel noted the continued sensitive nature of this guideline, both for pesticide industry and for civil society organizations.

During the discussions a number of suggestions were made for possible further amendments or additions. They included:

- article 11.2 of the Code of Conduct sets requirements for advertising which pesticide industry should adhere to. The guidelines list different media in which pesticide advertisement may be placed. It was noted that it may not be possible that all provisions of article 11.2 be satisfied by all and any of the listed media. For example, sub-article 11.2.17 of the Code states that pesticide industry should ensure that “advertisements encourage purchasers and users to read the label carefully, or have the label read to them if they cannot read”. It may not be possible to satisfy this provision for advertising media such as t-shirts, hats and pens; or on certain billboards and posters when these are not product specific;
- the guidelines describe possible elements of legislation to regulate pesticide advertising. It was suggested that parties having the right to initiate legal action against infringements of national law should be carefully defined;

- chapter 8 of the guidelines describes monitoring of pesticide advertising and actions that may be taken in case of non-observance of the Code of Conduct and of non-compliance with national legislation. It was noted that these are fundamentally different activities which to a certain extent are treated in the same manner in the guidelines. It was therefore suggested to separate compliance monitoring of national legislation on pesticide advertising strictly from monitoring non-observance of provisions of the Code of Conduct on pesticide advertising. The entities which may or should take action, the type of activities, and the speed with which action can be taken, are all likely to be different;
- it was felt that the guidelines still very much focus on agricultural pesticides and refer only to FAO for review of monitoring cases of advertising. Since WHO had expressed its interest in jointly publishing these guidelines, it agreed to provide elements that could be included to ensure that the scope of the guidelines sufficiently covers advertising for public health pesticides;
- the Panel recalled the discussion on the monitoring case of pesticide advertising under Chapter 9, and reiterated its recommendation to include in the guidelines various examples of appropriate and inappropriate incentives or gifts related to advertisement and promotional activities.

To ensure that all stakeholders would have sufficient time to review and comments on this latest version of the *Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising*, the Panel recommended that additional comments from all be accepted until 31 January 2008. The Panel requested the Task Group for this guideline to consider such comments, in addition to those made during the meeting, and prepare a final draft to be circulated for endorsement among Panel members.

The Panel recommended that if no major comments were received, the Task Group finalize the Guidelines, and FAO and WHO subsequently proceed with joint publication prior to its next Session.

10.3 Guidance on Pest and Pesticide Management Policy Development

The Panel discussed the draft of the *Guidance on Pest and Pesticide Management Policy Development*. A partial version had been discussed during the 2nd Session and comments received subsequently had been incorporated by the Task Group into this first full draft.

The Panel noted that the guidance document concentrates mainly on agriculture. After discussing the advantages and disadvantages of a comprehensive guidance document for policy development with respect to all pesticides, it was decided to maintain the present focus. The Panel requested that this be clearly reflected in the introduction of the document, and possibly in the title. It also recommended that the extent to which elements of the guidance document could apply to non-agricultural pesticide would be also explained in the text.

A number of additional suggestions were made for further amendments or additions. They included:

- placing more emphasis on dealing with substandard or counterfeit pesticide products and with illegal trafficking;
- inclusion of a summary of the main elements of policy development at the start of the guidance document, as these are too much “hidden” in the body of the text, including issues such as a multi-stakeholder approach, information sharing, evidence-based decision making and public consultation, among others;
- inclusion of plant quarantine to the list of policy tools;
- strengthening the need for inter-agency and inter-ministerial collaboration;
- adding emphasis to the issue of pesticide misuse;
- distinguishing between occupational, intentional and accidental poisoning when discussing human health concerns;
- inclusion of the validation of indigenous knowledge when discussing alternatives to pesticides.

The Panel requested that additional comments be accepted until 31 January 2008, after which the Task Group for this guidance document would prepare a final draft of the document. It recommended that the final draft be circulated among Panel members for endorsement before July 2008. The Panel requested that, after endorsement of the guidance document, FAO proceed with publication prior to its next Session.

10.4 Guidelines on Resistance Management for Pesticides

The Panel discussed the first draft of the *Guidelines on Resistance Management for Pesticides*, which had been elaborated based on an outline agreed upon during the 2nd Session.

The Panel considered that many important aspects of resistance prevention and management were treated in the document. It noted, however that the present version of the guideline mainly focuses on agriculture. The Panel requested that the document cover both agricultural and public health pesticides. The Panel underlined that past experiences have shown that resistance prevention is the key aspect of resistance management, and requested that this be clearly reflected in the text, and possibly also in title.

A number of additional suggestions were made for further amendments or additions. They included:

- clear accentuation on prevention as key component of any resistance management scheme;
- underlining the role of IPM and IVM as resistance management approaches;
- balancing the contents of the guideline with respect the different groups of pesticides, as the present version is still somewhat biased towards insecticide resistance;

- inclusion of coordination of resistance management between agriculture and public health, given the possible causal links between pesticide use in one sector and resistance development in the other;
- inclusion of labelling as a tool for resistance management;
- focusing the body of the text on resistance prevention and management actions, and move background information (e.g. on resistance mechanisms) to annexes;
- inclusion of principles of risk analysis for resistance, at the pesticide registration stage.

The Panel requested that additional comments be accepted until 31 January 2008 and that the Task Group for this guideline considers such comments, in addition to those made during the meeting, and prepares a second draft by June 2008. It recommended that the second draft be circulated subsequently among Panel members and observers and discussed during its next Session.

10.5 Guidelines on Good Labelling Practice for Pesticides

The Panel briefly discussed the ongoing revision of the *Guidelines on Good Labeling Practice for Pesticides*, which had been commented upon during its 2nd Session. The new draft of this guideline was not yet entirely completed and therefore not presented to the meeting.

The Panel recommended that the Task Group prepare a second draft of this guideline by 29 February 2008, and circulate it among Panel members and observers for comments. The Panel requested that a final draft be prepared by May 2008, for endorsement by the Panel before its next Session.

10.6 Guidelines on the Development of a Reporting System for Pesticide Incidents

The 2nd Session of the Panel discussed a draft version of *Guidelines on Monitoring Health and Environmental Incidents*, and provided significant comments on its structure and contents. On the basis of these comments, the Task Group for this guideline redrafted the document and reoriented its contents towards incident reporting. This new focus was presented at the meeting, as the *Guidelines on the Development of a Reporting System for Pesticide Incidents*. The Panel welcomed this new focus and supported the revised outline of the guideline.

In its discussion of the document, the Panel made a number of suggestions for further amendments or additions, which included:

- ensuring that the guidelines focus not only on governments, but also on academia, NGOs and industry;
- ensuring that the definitions and terms used in the document are harmonized with those used by other relevant international entities, such as the IPCS and OECD;

- making use of existing forms and reporting formats for incident reporting, e.g. by the WHO, IPCS and Rotterdam Convention;
- underlining the importance of appropriate diagnostics of pesticide poisoning;
- inclusion of weight-of-evidence approaches in evaluating pesticide incidents, to ensure that optimal use is being made of what may sometimes be limited information on poisoning or pollution cases;
- underlining of the functional link between incident reporting and incident prevention;
- strengthening the sections on environmental incident reporting, while recognizing that monitoring of environmental incidents is complicated and may be less of a priority than reporting human poisoning incidents;
- limiting the guideline to acute incidents, because monitoring and reporting chronic pesticide poisoning or long-term environmental exposure requires considerable inputs which are at present likely to be beyond the resources of many developing countries.

The Panel recommended that further comments on the presented version of the guideline be accepted until 15 January 2008. The Panel requested the Task Group to prepare a new draft by February 2008 to be circulated subsequently for comments among Panel members and observers. The Panel requested that a final draft be available by July 2008, for endorsement by the Panel before its next Session.

11. Review of outlines for new or revised guidelines

11.1 Guidelines on Pesticide Registration

The Panel discussed the outline for the *Guidelines on Pesticide Registration* that had been modified based on the comments provided at its 2nd Session.

The Panel noted that as this guideline was expected to cover a wide range of issues relevant to pesticide registration, it risked becoming rather unwieldy. It therefore stressed that this guideline should be considered as an umbrella document with more detailed guidance on technical elements of the registration process to be provided in separate existing or to be developed guidelines.

The Panel further noted that the main audience for this guideline are pesticide regulators and registration authorities in developing countries, and that the structures and processes being recommended in the document should take into account the often limited human and financial resources being available.

The Panel stressed that this guideline should cover the registration of all pesticides regardless of their uses. It therefore welcomed WHO's proposal to organize a workshop in early 2008 to seek further inputs and advice, in particular on the registration of public health pesticides.

The Panel urged that the elaboration of this guideline be taken up as a priority, following the agreed drafting procedure, and that a first draft be circulated for comments among Panel members and observers by July 2008, in order to be able to finalize the document at its next Session.

11.2 Guidelines for Retail Establishments for Pesticides

The Panel discussed the newly elaborated outline for *Guidelines for Retail Establishments for Pesticides*. It noted that guidance is required on the one hand for governments, regarding the requirements and recommended procedures for effective and responsible retail sales of pesticides (e.g. outline of licensing or certifications systems, requirements for shop layout, training of personnel, record keeping, compliance monitoring, etc.). On the other hand, more hands-on advice is needed for shop keepers and retailers, for example in the form of brochures (e.g. on national legal requirements for pesticide sales, storage procedures and stock management, advice to farmers, etc.).

The Panel recommended that the underlying guideline be addressed to governments and focus on requirements for effective and responsible retail sales of pesticides. It suggested that a separate “model brochure” which addresses retailers may be developed at a later stage, and noted that several useful guidance documents in this respect have been published by pesticide industry associations such as CLI. The Panel recommended that such published guidance information be referred to in the guideline as supporting documentation.

The Panel requested that the suggestions made during the meeting be taken into account and that a complete outline and scope of this guideline be prepared by March 2008 for circulation among its member and observers for comments. The Panel requested that draft guidelines subsequently be prepared by July 2008, following the agreed drafting procedure, to be discussed at its next Session.

11.3 Guidelines on Pesticide Quality Control

The Panel discussed a scoping document for *Guidelines on Pesticide Quality Control*. It recognized that there was a risk that this guideline would overlap with existing guidance documents published by FAO and WHO on different aspects of pesticide quality control. The Panel noted, however, that such existing guidance focussed on technical aspects of quality control, such as laboratory requirements, sampling or pesticide specifications. It stressed that guidance was still needed for governments on the structure and operation of a system to safeguard quality of pesticide products on the market. The Panel recommended, however, that care be taken not to duplicate subjects which have already been covered in sufficient detail elsewhere.

Issues that were suggested for inclusion in these guidelines were, among others, design of effective approaches for quality control with limited institutional and/or financial resources, as encountered by many developing countries; inspection and compliance monitoring; dealing with illegal trafficking of pesticides or substandard pesticide products; and regional approaches to quality control.

The Panel requested that the suggestions made during the meeting be taken into account and that a complete outline and scope of this guideline be prepared by 31 January 2008 for circulation among its member and observers for comments. The Panel requested that draft guidelines subsequently be prepared, following the agreed drafting procedure, to be discussed at its next Session.

11.4 Guidelines on Registration of Microbial Pest Control Agents

The Panel discussed the outline for the revised *Guidelines on Registration of Microbial Pest Control agents*. It underlined the importance of these guidelines as a means to facilitate the use of lower risk pesticides.

The Panel confirmed that these guidelines should only cover traditionally selected microbial control agents, and not include genetically modified micro-organisms. The Panel endorsed the general outline for the guidelines, but requested that it focus on data requirements and evaluation methods; references to testing methods should be provided but not presented in too much detail.

The Panel recommended that recent updates or reviews of data requirements and registration approaches for microbial pest control agents, for example by OECD, the EU, the USA and Canada, be fully taken into account when elaborating the guidelines. It also requested that microbial pesticides used for disease vector control be covered by the guideline, taking into consideration existing international guidance.

The Panel requested the Task Group to prepare a first draft by May 2008, for subsequent circulation among Panel members and observers and to be discussed at its next Session.

12. Recommendations

Based on the working documents reviewed and the discussions held in the course of the meeting, the Panel made the following recommendations:

Implementation of the International Code of Conduct

1. Subsequent to the recommendations made during its previous session, the Panel **welcomed** the intensification of the collaboration between FAO and WHO, reflected in the recently signed Memorandum of Understanding and the establishment of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management.
2. Recognizing that implementation of the Code of Conduct is of particular importance at national and regional levels, the Panel **recommended** that FAO and WHO inform their respective national, sub-regional and regional representatives, and the National Contact Points for the Code of Conduct, of the content of the Memorandum of Understanding.
3. In view of the importance of environmental aspects in the sound management of pesticides, the Panel **reiterated** the need for strengthened collaboration with UNEP related to the implementation of the Code of Conduct.
4. The Panel recognized that in order to implement of the Code of Conduct at the national level, as envisaged under SAICM, considerable resources would be required, and **recommended** that FAO establish a trust fund for this purpose.

Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)

5. The Panel **welcomed** FAO's endorsement of SAICM and the recommendations made in relation to pesticide risk reduction. The Panel supported the priority given by FAO to addressing HHPs, which it considered a significant contribution to the sound management of chemicals.
6. Recognizing that the possibilities under SAICM for strengthening the sound management of pesticides and implementation of the Code of Conduct were not yet fully utilized, the Panel:
 - a) **recommended** that FAO and WHO ensure that national pesticide authorities were made aware and encouraged to use such opportunities, and invited the SAICM national Focal Points to help in this endeavour.
 - b) **welcomed** the offer from UNITAR to explore, together with FAO and WHO, opportunities under the SAICM Quick Start Programme to support countries on the sound management of pesticides and implementation of the Code of Conduct.

Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs)

7. The Panel discussed how to identify the group of HHPs and **recommended** that these be defined as having one or more of the following characteristics:
- pesticide formulations that are included in classes Ia or Ib of the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*;
 - or
 - pesticide active ingredients and their formulations that are included in carcinogenicity Categories 1A and 1B of the GHS, or are included accordingly in the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*;
 - or
 - pesticide active ingredients and their formulations that are included in mutagenicity Categories 1A and 1B of the GHS or are included accordingly in the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*;
 - or
 - pesticide active ingredients and their formulations that are included in reproductive toxicity Categories 1A and 1B of the GHS or are included accordingly in the *WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*;
 - or
 - pesticide active ingredients listed by the *Stockholm Convention* in its Annexes A and B;
 - or
 - pesticide active ingredients and formulations listed by the *Rotterdam Convention* in its Annex III
 - or
 - pesticides listed under the *Montreal Protocol*
 - or
 - pesticide formulations that have shown a high incidence of severe or irreversible adverse effects on human health or the environment.
8. The Panel further **recommended** that:
- a) WHO, FAO and UNEP further develop criteria for inclusion of pesticide formulations that have shown a high incidence of severe or irreversible adverse effects on human health or the environment, and that
 - b) WHO incorporate the GHS criteria on “carcinogenicity, mutagenicity and reproductive toxicity” into its *Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard* as a priority action.
9. The Panel discussed priority activities related to a progressive ban on HHPs and **recommended** that:

- a) FAO and WHO, as a first step, prepare a list of HHPs based on the criteria above, update it periodically in cooperation with UNEP, and make it widely known;
 - b) FAO, in collaboration with WHO, invite governments and the pesticide industry to develop plans of action for progressively phasing out HHPs, either at the national or the regional level as appropriate, taking into account work undertaken in existing MEAs such as the Stockholm Convention, Rotterdam Convention and the Montreal Protocol;
 - c) FAO, in collaboration with WHO, collect information on alternatives for HHPs, both reduced risk pesticides and other pest management approaches, in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders, and share experiences among countries;
 - d) FAO, in collaboration with WHO, seek assistance from donors for countries which wish to phase out HHPs with the aim of preparing, implementing and enforcing phase-out plans and search for alternatives;
 - e) FAO mobilize internal and external resources in order to implement, as a priority, the recommendations of the FAO Council with respect to HHPs.
10. The Panel discussed how to address the current use of HHPs, and **recommended** that HHPs should not be used unless (i) governments establish a clear need, (ii) no alternatives are available, and (iii) control measures as well as good marketing practices are sufficient to ensure that the product can be handled with acceptable risk to human health and the environment. In the latter circumstance, the use of such pesticides should be severely restricted.

Monitoring of observance of the Code of Conduct

11. The Panel **noted** that the monitoring reports regarding the implementation of the Code of Conduct presented by non-governmental organizations were very useful for its work and
- a) **expressed** its appreciation for the efforts undertaken to prepare these reports, and
 - b) **encouraged** all stakeholders, including non governmental organizations and the pesticide industry, to continue to monitor the implementation of the Code of Conduct and present the results to its future sessions.
12. Based on the reports on monitoring of pesticide advertising, the Panel made the following observations:
- a) the Panel discussed the possible interpretations of Article 11.2.18 of the Code of Conduct which states that “pesticide industry should ensure that advertisements and promotional activities should not include inappropriate incentives or gifts to encourage the purchase of pesticides”. It noted that the interpretation of this article would depend to a certain extent on the national cultural and economic situation, and **recommended** that specific examples be included in the *Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising* to assist governments in setting standards for pesticide advertising;

- b) the Panel **requested** FAO to encourage governments to ensure that high standards of advertising for pesticides, in line with the Code of Conduct, are maintained, if necessary through appropriate legislation;
 - c) the Panel **invited** the pesticide industry to develop codes of ethics regarding pesticide advertising in line with the Code of Conduct and to ensure that no differences exist in these standards among industrialized and developing countries;
 - d) the Panel **recommended** that its recommendations be clearly reflected in the *Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising*.
- 13 Based on the reports on monitoring of the availability of personal protective clothing, the Panel **requested** that Article 3.5 of the Code of Conduct, which states that “pesticides whose handling and application require the use of personal protective equipment that is uncomfortable, expensive or not readily available should be avoided”, be strictly adhered to by governments, pesticide industry, traders and pesticide users.

Guidelines in support of the Code of Conduct

14. The Panel reviewed a number of draft guidelines that were developed in support of the Code of Conduct, and made the following recommendations:
- a) With respect to the draft *Guidelines on Management Options for Empty Pesticide Containers*, the Panel **endorsed** the presented version of the document, but **requested** that further examples of successful container management schemes in developing countries be included. The Panel **invited** WHO to review whether public health pesticides were appropriately covered in the guidelines and provide its comments before 31 December 2007. The Panel **requested** that, if the WHO review did not lead to significant amendments, FAO proceed with joint publication with WHO and UNEP, if possible, prior to its next Session.
 - b) With respect to the draft *Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising*, the Panel **recommended** that additional comments from all be accepted until 31 January 2008. The Panel **requested** the Task Group for this guideline to consider such comments, in addition to those made during the meeting, and prepare a final draft to be circulated for endorsement among Panel members. The Panel **recommended** that if no major comments were received, the Task Group finalize the Guidelines, and FAO and WHO subsequently proceed with joint publication prior to its next Session.
 - c) With respect to the draft *Guidance on Pest and Pesticide Management Policy Development*, the Panel **underlined** that its main focus would be agriculture. It **recommended** that additional comments be accepted until 31 January 2008, after which the Task Group for this guidance document would prepare a final draft of the document. The Panel **recommended** that the final draft be circulated among Panel members for endorsement before July 2008. The Panel requested that, after endorsement of the guidance document, FAO proceed with publication prior to its next Session.
 - d) With respect to the draft *Guidelines on Resistance Management for Pesticides*, the Panel **requested** that its focus should be both prevention and management of

resistance. It **recommended** that the guideline cover both agricultural and public health pesticides. The Panel **requested** that additional comments be accepted until 31 January 2008 and that the Task Group for this guideline consider such comments, in addition to those made during the meeting, and prepare a second draft by June 2008. It **recommended** that the second draft be circulated subsequently among Panel members and observers and discussed during its next Session.

- e) With respect to the *Guidelines on Good Labelling Practice for Pesticides*, the Panel **recommended** that the Task Group prepare a second draft by 29 February 2008, and circulate it among Panel members and observers for comments. The Panel **requested** that a final draft be prepared by May 2008 for endorsement by the Panel before its next Session.
- f) With respect to the draft *Guidelines on the Development of a Reporting System for Pesticide Incidents*, the Panel **supported** the new focus on incident reporting. The Panel **recommended** that further comments be accepted until 15 January 2008. The Panel **requested** the Task Group to prepare a new draft by February 2008 to be circulated for comments among Panel members and observers. The Panel **requested** that a final draft be available by July 2008, for endorsement by the Panel before its next Session.

15. The Panel discussed a number of outlines that were developed for new or revised guidelines in support of the Code of Conduct, and made the following recommendations:

- a) With respect to the outline for *Guidelines on Pesticide Registration*, the Panel **provided** a large number of suggestions on the content. It **stressed**, however, that the guideline was to be considered as an umbrella document with more detailed guidance on technical elements of the registration process to be provided in separate guidelines.

The Panel **stressed** that this guideline should cover the registration of all pesticides regardless of their uses. It **welcomed** WHO's proposal to organize a workshop in early 2008 to seek further inputs and advice, in particular on the registration of public health pesticides.

The Panel **urged** that the elaboration of this guideline be taken up as a priority, following the agreed drafting procedure, and that a first draft be circulated for comments among Panel members and observers by July 2008, in order to be able to finalize the document at its next Session.

- b) With respect to the outline for *Guidelines for Retail Establishments for Pesticides*, the Panel **recommended** that these be addressed to governments and focus on requirements for effective and responsible retail sales of pesticides. The Panel **requested** that the suggestions made during the meeting be taken into account and that a complete outline and scope of this guideline be prepared by March 2008 for circulation among its member and observers for comments. The Panel **requested** that draft guidelines subsequently be prepared by July 2008, following the agreed drafting procedure, to be discussed at its next Session.
- c) With respect to the outline for *Guidelines on Pesticide Quality Control*, the Panel **recommended** that this guideline focus on the structure and operation of a system to

safeguard quality of pesticide products on the market. The Panel **requested** that the suggestions made during the meeting be taken into account and that a complete outline and scope of this guideline be prepared by 31 January 2008 for circulation among its member and observers for comments. The Panel **requested** that draft guidelines subsequently be prepared, following the agreed drafting procedure, to be discussed at its next Session.

- d) With respect to the outline for *Guidelines on Registration of Microbial Pest Control agent*, the Panel **recommended** that its suggestions for modifications be taken into account in the definitive outline. The Panel **requested** the Task Group to prepare a first draft by May 2008, for subsequent circulation among Panel members and observers and to be discussed at its next Session.

13. Closure of the meeting

The 1st FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management, and the 3rd Session of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Management, was closed by Mr Gero Vaagt, Senior Officer of the Pesticide Management Group of FAO and by Mr Morteza Zaim, Scientist in charge of the WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme. They gratefully acknowledged the fruitful discussions and valuable contributions made by Panel members and other participants in the meeting, and expressed their satisfaction about the progress that was made, in particular with respect to the issue of HHPs and a number of guidelines.

Mr Zaim announced that WHO would be very pleased to host the 2nd Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Management in Geneva, Switzerland, which is provisionally planned for 6-10 October 2008.

Finally, Mr Zaim and Mr Vaagt expressed their sincere thanks to all participants for having come to Rome for this meeting and wished everyone a safe journey back home.

Annex 1 – List of participants

FAO PANEL MEMBERS

Mr Jonathan Akhabuhaya

Chief Research Scientist
Tropical Pesticides Research Institute
PO Box 3024
Arusha

Tanzania

Tel: (+255) 27 250 5871
Fax: (+255) 27 250 58 71
E-mail: akhabuhaya@yahoo.co.uk

Ms Cathleen McInerney Barnes

Office of Pesticide Programs (7506-P)
United States Environmental Protection
Agency
Washington, D.C. 20460

U.S.A.

Tel: (+1) 703 305 7101
Fax: (+1) 703 308 1850
E-mail: barnes.cathleen@epa.gov

Ms Vibeke Bernson

Advisor to the Director General in
International Affairs
Swedish Chemicals Agency
Box 2
S-172 13 Sundbyberg

Sweden

Tel: (+46) 8 519 41139
Fax: (+46) 8 735 7698
E-Mail: vibeke.bernson@kemi.se

Mr Julio Sergio de Britto

General Coordination of Pesticides
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food
Supply
Esplanada dos Ministerios
Bloco D, Anexo A, Sala 340
Brasilia 70043-900

Brazil

Tel: (+55) 61 321 82 445
Fax: (+55) 61 322 55 341
E-mail: jsbritto@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Gu Bao-Gen

Deputy Director General
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals
Ministry of Agriculture (ICAMA)
22, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District
Beijing 100026

China

Tel: (+86) 10 6419 4079
Fax: (+86) 10 6593 7005
E-mail: gubaogen@agri.gov.cn
or ggbgg868@yahoo.com.cn

Mr Halimi Bin Mahmud

Deputy Director
Pesticides Board
Pesticides Control Division
Department of Agriculture
4-6 Floors, Wisma Tani
Jalan Mahameru, 50 480
Kuala Lumpur

Malaysia

Tel: (+603) 2030 1480
Fax: (+603) 2691 7551
E-mail: halimi_mahmud@yahoo.com
or halimi@doa.gov.my

Mr Gamini Manuweera

Registrar of Pesticides
Office of the Registrar of Pesticides
PO Box 49 Peradeniya

Sri Lanka

Tel: (+94) 811 238 8076
Fax: (+94) 811 238 8135
E-mail: pest@slt.lk

Ms Maristella Rubbiani
Senior Scientific Researcher
Dangerous Substances and Preparations
Environment and Primary Prevention
Department
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena 299
00161 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 499 02353
Fax: (+39) 06 493 87068
E-mail: maristella.rubbiani@iss.it

Mr Gary Whitfield
Science Director – Integrated Pest
Management
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada
Greenhouse and Processing Crops Research
Centre, R. R. #2
2585 County Road #20
Harrow, Ontario, N0R 1G0
Canada
Tel: (+519) 738 2251 402
Fax: (+519) 738 3756
E-mail: whitfieldg@agr.gc.ca

Mr Wolfgang Zornbach
Deputy Head
Plant Protection Division
Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture
and Consumer Protection,
Rochusstrasse 1
D-53123 Bonn
Germany
Tel: (+49) 228 529 4317
Fax: (+49) 228 529 5535 95
E-mail: wolfgang.zornbach@bmelv.bund.de

WHO EXPERTS

Ms Cristina Alonzo
Chemical Safety Unit
Department of Environmental Health
Ministry of Public Health
Avenida 18 de Julio 1892
4to piso, Anexo B, Montevideo
Uruguay
Tel: (+598) 2 402 8032
Fax: (+598) 2 402 8032
Email : aloncris@adinet.com.uy

Ms Sandhya Kulshrestha
Secretary , Central Insecticides Board and
Registration Committee
Directorate of Plant Protection
Dept of Agriculture & Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
N.H. - IV
Faridabad (Haryana)
India
Tel: (91) 129 241 3002
Fax: (+91) 129 2412125
Email : sandhyak@nic.in
skulsh57@yahoo.co.in

Mr Somchai Preechathaveekid
Director
Hazardous Substances Control Division
Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
Ministry of Public Health
Tiwanon Road, Nonthaburi 11000
Thailand
Tel: (+662) 5918481, 5907300
Fax: (+662) 591 8483
Email : psomchai@health.moph.go.th

Ms Tiina Santonen
Finnish Institute of Occupational Health
Topeliuksenkatu 41aA
00250 Helsinki
Finland
Tel: (+358) 9 4747 2666
Fax (+358) 9 4747 2110
Email : tiina.santonen@ttl.fi

IGOs

UNEP

Ms Agneta Sundén Byléhn

Senior Scientific Affairs Officer

UNEP – Chemicals

15, Chemin des Anémones

CH-1219 Châtelaine

Geneva

Switzerland

Tel: (+41) 22 917 8193

Fax: (+41) 22 797 3460

E-mail: ASunden@chemicals.unep.ch

UNITAR

Mr Jan van der Kolk

UNITAR

Senior Special Fellow

Van Deventerlaan 41

2271 TV Voorburg

The Netherlands

Tel: (+31) 70 3861141

E-mail: janvanderkolk@ecoconseil.nl

OBSERVERS

ALINA

Mr Juan Carlos Iglesias Perez

Coordinator

Cap.Juan de San Martín 1168

(1609) Boulogne, Buenos Aires

Argentina

Tel: (+54 11) 4710 3439

Cell: (+54 9 11) 5966-4591

E-mail: j-iglesias@arnet.com.ar

Mr Roman Macaya

President

Asociación Latinoamericana de la Industria

Nacional de Agroquímicos (ALINA)

Apartado Postal 1869-7050, Cartago

Costa Rica

Tel: (+506) 573 7751

Fax: (+506) 573 7285

E-mail: rmacaya@rimacsa.com

Mr Roberto Muñoz

Secretary

Asociación Latinoamericana de la Industria

Nacional de Agroquímicos (ALINA)

Tycho Brahe 5905

(5147) Córdoba

Argentina

Tel: (+54 3543) 440090

Fax: (+54 3543) 442212

E-mail: rmunoz@genbra.com.ar

robermunoz@yahoo.com

CropLife International

Mr Richard Brown

CropLife International

Head of Product Stewardship

Syngenta Crop Protection AG

Schwarzwaldallee 215

P.O. Box

CH-4002 Basel

Switzerland

Tel: (+41) 61 323 7525

Fax: (+41) 61 323 7680

E-mail:

richard_anthony.brown@syngenta.com

Bernhard Johnen

CropLife International

Manager, International Regulatory Policy,

Crop Protection,

CropLife International

Avenue Louise 143

B-1050 Brussels

Belgium

Tel: (+32) 2 542 0410

Tel: (+32) 2 541 1668

Fax : (+32) 2 542 0419

E-mail: bernhard@croplife.org

ECCA

Mr David van Hoogstraten

European Crop Care Association Secretary -
General

Poenaardlaan 7
B-3090 Overijse

Belgium

Tel: (+32) 2 687 9767

Fax: (+32) 2 687 9767

E-mail: ecca.secretary@skynet.be

PAN

Ms Linda Craig

Pesticide Action Network UK

Development House
56-64 Leonard Street
London EC2A 4LT

England

Tel: (+44) 20 7065 0905

Fax: (+44) 20 7065 0907

E-mail: lindacraig@pan-uk.org

Mr François Meienberg

Berne Declaration

Postfach

8026 Zürich

Switzerland

Tel: (+41) 44 277 70 04

Fax : (+41) 44 277 70 01

E-mail: food@evb.ch

Mr Simplicite Davo Vodouhe

Pesticide Action Network Benin

2, Allée des Cocotiers Cité Houéyiho

BP02-8033 Cotonou

Benin

Tel: (+22 9) 21351497

Tel: (+22 9) 21301975

E-mail : dsvodouhe@yahoo.com

Ms Carina Weber

Program Director

Pesticide Action Network Germany

Nernstweg 32

22765 Hamburg

Germany

Tel: (+49) 40 399 19 10-23

Fax: (+49) 40 390 75 20

E-mail: carina.weber@pan-germany.org

WHO

Ms Nida Besbelli

Technical Officer, Chemical Safety

WHO ECEH Bonn

Hermann-Ehlers-Str. 10

53113 Bonn

Germany

Tel.: +49 228 815 0432

Fax: +49 228 815 0440

Fax: 41 22 791 4869

E-mail: nbe@ecehbonn.euro.who.int

Mr Morteza Zaim

WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)

Vector Ecology & Management

Department of Control of Neglected Tropical
Diseases

World Health Organization

20 Avenue Appia

CH-1211 Geneva 27

Switzerland

Tel: (+41) 22 791 3841

Fax: (+41) 22 791 4869

E-mail: zaimm@who.int

FAO

Mr Dominic Ballayan

Statistician
FAO Statistics Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 56268
E-mail: Dominic.Ballayan@fao.org

Mr Jean Pierre Chiaradia Bousquet

Senior Legal Officer
FAO General Legal Affairs Service
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 53953
E-mail:
JeanPierre.ChiaradiaBousquet@fao.org

Mr Peter Kenmore

Chief
FAO Plant Protection Service
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 52188
Fax: (+39) 06 570 56347
E-mail: Peter.Kenmore@fao.org

Ms Oluwatobi Martins

Volunteer
FAO Plant Protection Service
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 53765
Fax: (+39) 06 56347/3224
E-mail: Oluwatobi.Mmartins@fao.org

Mr Robert Mayo

Senior Statistician
FAO Statistics Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 54105
E-mail: Robert.Mayo@fao.org

Ms Marta Pardo

Legal Officer
FAO Development Law Service
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 53022
E-mail: Marta.Pardo@fao.org

Mr Yongfan Piao

Plant Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the
Pacific
Maliwan Mansion
39, Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200

Thailand

Tel: (+66 2) 697 4268
Fax: (+66 2) 697 4445
Email: yongfan.piao@fao.org

Mr Gero Vaagt

Senior Officer
Pesticide Management Group
FAO Plant Protection Service
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 55757
Fax: (+39) 06 570 56347/3224
E-mail: Gero.Vaagt@fao.org

Mr Harold van der Valk

Consultant
Vissersdijk 14
4251 ED Werkendam

The Netherlands

Tel: (+31) 183 500410
E-mail: harold.vandervalk@wxs.nl

Mr Harry van der Wulp

Senior IPM Policy Officer
Global IPM Facility
FAO Plant Protection Service
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 55900
Fax: (+39) 06 570 56347
E-mail: harry.vanderwulp@fao.org

Ms Yong Zhen Yang

Agricultural Officer
Pesticide Management Group
FAO Plant Protection Service
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome

Italy

Tel: (+39) 06 570 54246

Fax: (+39) 06 56347/3224

E-mail: YongZhen.Yang@fao.org

Annex 2 – Agenda

1. Opening of the meeting and welcome address.
2. Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson and appointment of Rapporteurs.
3. Adoption of agenda.
4. Introduction of meeting procedure, working arrangements and housekeeping matters.
5. Summary of developments and actions taken after the 2nd session of the Panel in November 2006:
 - Report on activities of FAO related to the implementation of the revised version of the Code of Conduct;
 - Memorandum of Understanding between FAO and WHO for the development of a joint programme for the sound management of pesticides;
 - Report on the status of the implementation of the Rotterdam Convention;
 - Reports from other organizations.
6. Addressing Highly Toxic Pesticides (HTPs).
7. Strengthening pesticide management under the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM).
8. Development of international environmental indicators of pesticide use.
9. Monitoring and observance of the Code of Conduct.
 - *ad hoc* monitoring cases
10. Status of development and updating of Guidelines in support of the Code of Conduct.
11. Draft Guidelines to be reviewed:
 1. Guidelines on Pesticide Advertising (revised draft new guideline);
 2. Guidelines on Monitoring Incidents of Pesticide Poisoning and Adverse Environmental Effects (revised draft new guideline);
 3. Guidelines on Pest and Pesticide Management Policy (final draft of new guideline)
 4. Guidelines on Resistance Management for Pesticides (draft of new guideline)
 5. Guidelines on Pesticide Registration (revised guideline).
 6. Guidelines on Management Options for Empty Pesticide Containers (final version of new guideline)

12. Draft outlines for Guidelines to be reviewed:
 1. Guidelines on retail establishment.
 2. Guidelines on pesticide quality control.
 3. Guidelines on data requirements and test guidelines for microbial pest control agents & guidelines on evaluation for microbial pest control agent registration.
13. Any other matters.