



REPORT

6TH FAO/WHO JOINT MEETING ON PESTICIDE MANAGEMENT

and

**8TH SESSION OF THE FAO PANEL OF EXPERTS ON PESTICIDE
MANAGEMENT**

**9 – 12 October 2012
Rome**



**World Health
Organization**



Table of contents

Table of contents	2
Abbreviations	4
1. Introduction	6
2. Opening of the meeting	7
3. Election of the chairperson and rapporteurs	8
4. Adoption of the agenda	8
5. Declaration of interest	8
6. Developments since the previous Session of the JMPM.....	9
6.1 WHO	9
6.2 UNEP.....	11
6.3 FAO	13
6.4 Discussion	15
7. Joint COAG-JMPM meeting on the update of the Code of Conduct.....	18
7.1 Introduction	18
7.2 Process of updating the Code of Conduct	18
7.3 Discussion of the updated Code of Conduct	20
7.4 Conclusion.....	21
8. Highly hazardous pesticides.....	21
8.1 Report of survey of actions taken to regulate HHPs	21
8.2 HHP pilot project in Mozambique	22
8.3 ICCM-3 and HHPs	23
8.4 Guidance on HHPs	24
9. Pesticide registration	24
9.1 Pesticide registration toolkit.....	24
9.2 On-going pesticide registration capacity development	25
10. Survey of the use of technical guidelines.....	27
11. Draft guidelines under development	28
11.1 Guidelines on microbial pesticides.....	28
11.2 Guidelines on good labelling practice for pesticides.....	29
11.3 Guidelines on pesticides legislation	29
12. Guidelines pending finalization	30
12.1 Guidelines on prevention and management of pesticide resistance	30
12.2 Guidelines on data requirements for registration of pesticides	30

13. Emerging and priority issues..... 31

14. Other matters 31

15. Recommendations 32

16. Closure of the meeting 35

 Annex 1 – List of participants..... 36

 Annex 2 – Agenda 43

Abbreviations

APPPPC	Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CGPC	Coordinating Group of Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean
CILSS	Comité permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Sécheresse dans le Sahel
COAG	Committee on Agriculture (of FAO)
COP	Conference of Parties
CSP	Comité Sahélien des Pesticides
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EECCA	Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GAP	Good Agricultural Practice
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHS	Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals
HHP	Highly Hazardous Pesticide
IBMA	International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association
ICCA	International Council of Chemical Associations
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management
ICSC	International Chemical Safety Card
IGO	Inter-governmental Organization
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOMC	Inter-organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals
IPEN	International POPs Elimination Network
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IVM	Integrated Vector Management
JMPM	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management
JMPR	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues
JMPS	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specifications
KemI	Swedish Chemical Agency
LLIN	Long-lasting Insecticidal Mosquito Net
MRL	Maximum Residue Limit
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development

PFC	Perfluorinated Chemical
POP	Persistent Organic Pollutant
PSMS	Pesticide Stock Management System
QR code	Quick Response code
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SAPReF	Southern African Pesticide Registrars Forum
SECE	Scientific Expert Group on Chemicals and the Environment (of UNEP)
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme (of FAO)
UCT	University of Cape Town
UEMOA	Union Economique et Monétaire de Ouest Africaine
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
VCAG	Vector Control Advisory Group
WHO	World Health Organization
WHOPES	World Health Organization Pesticide Evaluation Scheme

1. Introduction

The 6th FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management (JMPM) and the 8th Session of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Management, were held at FAO Headquarters in Rome, from 9 to 12 October 2012.

The FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Management is the official statutory body that advises FAO 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 implementation of the revised version of the *International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides* (hereinafter “the Code of Conduct”). Members of 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 WHO on policies, guidelines and key actions to support Member States on sound management of pesticides.

Panel members invited to this meeting have been 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. Both FAO and WHO Panel members are requested to declare any interests they may have which could affect their opinion or advice.

In addition to Panel members, representatives from inter-governmental organizations (IGOs) pesticide industry associations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) attended the meeting as observers.

Mr Mark Davis, Senior Officer Pesticide Management of FAO, welcomed all participants to the 6th Session of the JMPM on behalf of FAO. He informed the meeting that two new institutional observers were present at the JMPM, the International Biocontrol Manufacturers Association (IBMA) and the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN), as well as Dr Donald Ward, of the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry of Australia, who had been invited as observer in his personal capacity. Mr Davis thanked all JMPM members and observers for coming to Rome again and to contribute their experience and expertise to advise FAO and WHO on pesticide management.

Dr Morteza Zaim, Coordinator Vector Ecology and Management, welcomed all JMPM members and observers to the 6th Session of the JMPM on behalf of WHO. He noted that the session had originally been planned to be held in Geneva, but that due to the meeting with the Bureau of the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) about the International Code of Conduct, had to be organized again in Rome. Dr Zaim indicated that an almost complete toolbox for life-cycle management of pesticides had been developed with support of the JMPM. He stressed, though, that this would not be the “end of the line”, but that the focus should now be on resource mobilization for implementation of these tools and strengthening pesticide management in public health and in agriculture. Dr Zaim thanked Panel members for their continuous support to the JMPM and wished all a fruitful meeting.

The participants in the meeting are listed in Annex 1.

2. Opening of the meeting

Mr Mike Robson, acting for the Director of the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division, in his opening address, welcomed the members of the WHO and FAO Expert Panels, participants from partner Organizations in the UN system and OECD, representatives of the private sector and civil society, and staff from the FAO regions and headquarters to the 6th FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticides Management.

Mr Robson noted that 2012 marks the 50th anniversary of the publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* – the book that is said to have launched the environmental movement, and which focused on the ecological impacts of pesticides that were in widespread use in the late 1950s and early 1960s. He underlined that managing pesticide risks had been a part of FAO's work since even before *Silent Spring* was published. The FAO Conference in 1961 decided that FAO *[should] provide leadership in achieving international understanding in the controversial aspects of the use of pesticides (e.g. pesticide residues, hazards to farm workers, operators and factory workers, insect resistance to insecticides, and marketing requirements) in furnishing guidance to governments*. FAO has certainly provided that leadership and continues to work to provide guidance on the challenges that were identified by the 1961 Conference, and new ones that have emerged since, such as obsolete pesticide stockpiles, environmental mobility of pesticides in air and water, and declines in pollinator populations, to name a few.

Mr Robson stressed that FAO cannot meet these challenges alone, and it is proud of its productive collaboration with partner UN Organizations WHO and UNEP, as well as with the private sector, NGOs and a host of other organizations. He indicated that this meeting is a reflection of that partnership. As an inter-Governmental Organization, FAO does not make the rules, nor does it police them. FAO's mandate is to provide the best possible guidance to member Governments. It may well be that FAO staff in Rome and in the many decentralized offices are knowledgeable and experienced, but even they would admit that they don't have all the answers. Expert Panels such as the JMPM therefore exist to provide FAO and WHO with the most current knowledge, and help to synthesize it into coherent guidance.

Mr Robson pointed out that a key component of the work of the JMPM in recent years has been the revision of the Code of Conduct. FAO was pleased to note recently that a stakeholder survey carried out by the secretariat of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) found that the Code was the most widely referenced tool on chemicals management. The desire to have the Code adopted also by WHO and UNEP is an important step forward and FAO is keen to support it. Mr Robson recognized that the process has been long, and that this will be the fifth time the JMPM has discussed the update since the process was initiated in 2008. He expressed his hope that after a comprehensive consultation process and many rounds of comments, a consensus document can be taken forward for approval by FAO's governing bodies and subsequently by the governing bodies of WHO and UNEP.

Mr Robson emphasized that the sound management of pesticides is important, and FAO invests significant resources in the topic. Fifteen people work in the pesticides management team, and another seven in the FAO part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat. FAO operates a substantial field programme currently valued at over \$60 million and there is no indication that interest in this area is waning. But Mr Robson stressed that, at the same time, it is important to FAO as an organization to make clear links between pesticides management

and the objectives of reducing hunger and poverty, increasing food production sustainably and improving rural livelihoods. Healthy crops are less susceptible to pests and diseases and therefore less dependent on pesticides. Fewer pesticides reduce risks to the health of farming communities and the agricultural environment. Food without pesticide residues is safer for consumers and more marketable. Farmers that can reduce their need for pesticides also reduce their costs. Even in a world where all farmers apply IPM and all public health professionals apply IVM, pesticides will continue to be used. In this world we need to ensure that risks and hazards are minimized and that is the role of the JMPM.

Finally, Mr Robson thanked everyone for their contribution to FAO's work and for making themselves available to attend this meeting.

3. Election of the chairperson and rapporteurs

Ms Kimberly Nesci was elected Chairperson and Mr Tan Soo Hian Vice Chairperson of the meeting. Ms Dr Andrea Rother and Mr Eric Liegeois were appointed Rapporteurs.

4. Adoption of the agenda

A number of amendments had been made by the secretariat to the agenda that was originally circulated. These were discussed and the definitive agenda was adopted as shown in Annex 2.

5. Declaration of interest

FAO and WHO received Declarations of Interest from all the Panel members participating in the 6th Session of the JMPM.

Dr Andrea Rother, from the WHO Expert Panel, declared representing an organization that is a participating member with the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN) through information exchange on pesticides. This association was evaluated by the WHO Legal Department which concluded that nature of the association did not preclude membership of the WHO Expert Panel and participation in the JMPM.

The Secretariat of the JMPM had reviewed all other Declarations of Interest and concluded that no circumstances were disclosed that could give rise to a potential or reasonably perceived conflict of interest related to the subjects discussed in the JMPM.

6. Developments since the previous Session of the JMPM

A summary was presented of some important developments with respect to pesticide management that had taken place since the 5th Session of the JMPM in October 2011.

6.1 WHO

Dr Rajpal Yadav informed the meeting of the major activities carried out by WHO on pesticide management since the previous JMPM meeting.

Chemical Safety

WHO Chemical Safety has been engaged in the following activities relating to pesticide management since the previous meeting:

The development of International Chemical Safety Cards (ICSCs) has been an on-going process. So far, 230 ICSCs for pesticides have been elaborated, and highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) will continue to be prioritized. Collaboration with International Labour Organisation to better ensure access to the ICSCs for all stakeholders will be intensified. ICSCs are made available in a number of languages via the Internet¹. The development of IOMC Toolbox for decision-making in chemicals management, reported about during the previous JMPM, is also making progress.

As part of its contribution to SAICM, WHO conducted a survey of SAICM stakeholders to provide the 3rd International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM-3) with baseline information on progress in implementing the Strategic Approach. The survey indicated, among others, that 70% of respondents make use of the *International Code of conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides*, while 50% of respondents use the *WHO Classification of pesticides by hazard*.

A scientific review of the human health effects of DDT use in indoor residual spraying for malaria control was conducted for the Stockholm Convention and published in 2011. This review has updated on a yearly basis since then. JMPM was informed of diversion concern of DDT to non-public health uses (e.g. the use by farmers). Furthermore, a generic risk assessment model for aircraft disinsection using insecticides is nearly completed and will be published shortly. This model is part of a series on risk assessment of pesticide use in public health.

WHO Pesticide Evaluation Scheme (WHOPES)

WHOPES has been engaged in the following activities since the previous JMPM meeting:

A Global strategy for dengue prevention and control, 2012–2020, has been elaborated and adopted. Nearly 50 million people are affected by dengue, and its scale is increasing. Guiding principles of the strategy are proactive risk assessment, implementation of sustainable preventive measures for long term reduction of mortality and morbidity, and reactive

¹ <http://www.who.int/ipcs/publications/icsc/en/index.html>

responses to emergencies. The strategy also aims to capitalize on new opportunities for dengue control, such as new diagnostic tools, improved case management, new vector control tools/approaches, development of a vaccine, and increased funding for research.

Vector control is an important aspect of dengue prevention and global insecticide use for dengue control is next only to malaria control. An integrated approach to surveillance and vector management is promoted in the strategy, with increased attention on the development of new insecticides and other vector control tools, and on the sound management of insecticide use.

Two guidelines were published by WHOPEs to strengthen public health pesticide management: The *Guidelines for procuring public health pesticides*², and the first revision of the *Generic risk assessment model for insecticide-treated nets*³. In addition, two guidelines are in an advanced stage of development and are expected to be published shortly: the revision of the *Guidelines for laboratory and field testing of long-lasting insecticidal nets*, and new *Guidelines for efficacy testing of spatial repellents: Active ingredients and formulated products*.

Various activities to support member country in strengthening public health pesticide management were undertaken since the last JMPM. A Regional consultation on public health pesticides management in the Eastern Mediterranean Region was held in Oman, in late 2011. The consultation was organized in response to an earlier resolution by the Regional WHO Committee for the Eastern Mediterranean on *Managing the use of public health pesticides in the face of the increasing burden of vector borne diseases*, which urges members, among others to ensure incorporation of sound public health pesticide management into national health policy and relevant development programmes. The Regional consultation identified major challenges and obstacles in the management of public health pesticides in the Region and developed a regional framework for action for sound management of public health⁴.

Six countries in Africa were also supported in developing policies and/or action plans for public health pesticide management. In addition, capacity strengthening workshops and training course have been conducted last year by WHO in various countries (India, Mexico, Viet Nam and the Gambia) for testing and evaluation of public health pesticides, and on improving the efficacy of indoor residual spraying.

The Vector Control Advisory Group on new tools (VCAG) was established in 2012, which is advisory body of WHOPEs and the Global Malaria Programme on new forms and paradigms of vector control for malaria and other vector-borne diseases. Its purpose is to review and assess the public health value of new tools, approaches and technologies and to make recommendations on their use for vector control.

A number of articles have been published in recent years by WHOPEs and its collaborators on aspects of public health pesticide management and global trends in the use of insecticides

² http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789241503426_eng.pdf

³ http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789241503419_eng.pdf

⁴ <http://www.emro.who.int/malaria/rbm-events/regional-consultation-on-public-health-pesticides-management-in-the-eastern-mediterranean-region.html>

for vector control. Their aim was to provide an evidence-base for policy and product development. All articles are available from open access journals⁵.

Finally, WHOPEP has continued its work of assessment of insecticide product for public health use. In this respect, the 11th Session of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specifications (JMPS) held in Dublin, Ireland, 6-11 June 2012, reviewed nine public health pesticides. WHOPEP also finalized efficacy testing of four vector control pesticides, while currently 15 additional products are under testing and evaluation.

6.2 UNEP

Dr Kaj Madsen informed the meeting about the major activities carried out by UNEP on aspects relevant to pesticide management since the previous Session of the JMPM.

Global chemicals outlook

UNEP has recently issued the *Global Chemicals Outlook*, to complement existing (e.g. OECD) reviews focussing on industrialized countries. The *Global Chemicals Outlook* covers a section on trends and indicators, which identifies resources for describing quantitative and qualitative changes in the production, use and disposal of chemicals in developing countries. Under this section, options for assessing and tracking the health and environmental effects of chemicals in developing countries are identified. The section on *Economic implications* identifies possible methodologies for exploring the economic development opportunities related to the sound management of chemicals, as well as the potential costs of inaction on chemical hazards, with a particular focus on developing countries. And finally, the part on Instruments and approaches, describes methodologies and decision making tools for the prevention of toxic chemical pollution and the promotion of safer alternatives.

The Synthesis report *Global Chemicals Outlook* was launched in September 2012, before ICCM-3, while the full report will be published in November 2012. A separate *Cost of Inaction report* is to be published in December 2012. Use of chemicals is shifting from industrialised to newly industrialized and developing countries, due to increased economic growth. But the lack of instruments and capacity to manage chemicals brings about large costs. For instance, for Africa, the cost of inaction of was estimated at about 6 billion dollars for 2009; this only focussed on health effects, not on environmental impact. UNEP therefore recommends increase priority for chemicals management and stresses the need to include chemicals into development polices and strategies.

⁵ Status of pesticide management in the practice of vector control: a global survey in countries at risk of malaria or other major vector-borne diseases (2011): <http://www.malariajournal.com/content/10/1/125>

Status of Legislation and Regulatory Control of Public Health Pesticides in Countries Endemic with or at Risk of Major Vector-Borne Diseases (2011): <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3226504/>

Global Trends in the Use of Insecticides to Control Vector-Borne Diseases (2012): <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3339467/>

Management of the use of public health pesticides in the face of the increasing burden of vector-borne diseases in the Eastern Mediterranean Region (2012): <http://www.emro.who.int/emhj-volume-18-2012/issue-1/article-10.html>

Scientific Expert Group on Chemicals and the Environment

The JMPM was informed that UNEP Scientific Expert Group on Chemicals and the Environment (SECE) is in the process of publishing a number of guidance documents for environmental risk assessment and management:

- Methods and tools for environmental fate modelling of organic chemicals – a practical approach.
- Guidance on mapping local factors in the identification of ecosystems potentially affected by chemicals: Application of the regional and relative risk model.
- Guidance documents on chemicals and the environment: Ecosystem services, water pollution and water scarcity.
- Simple approach for identifying sensitive ecosystems and their vulnerabilities to chemical stressors.
- Guidance documents on chemicals and the environment: Socioeconomic factors and analysis for pesticides management.

These documents have been tested so far in two African countries.

Under development is *Guidance on Chemicals Legislation, Administrative Infrastructures and Sustainable funding*, which focuses on industrial chemicals. Testing of the guidance document is on-going in Cambodia, Nigeria, Uruguay and Belize, and is planned in Vietnam in collaboration with the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA).

This guidance may, in the future, evolve into a Code of conduct on industrial chemicals. Experiences from the development and implementation of the International Code of conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides will then obviously be taken into account.

ICCM-3

The third International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM-3) was held in September 2012 in Nairobi. Two important issues from the discussions were highlighted by UNEP.

Mechanisms for financial and technical assistance were discussed. The Quick Start Programme was originally planned to expire by ICCM-3. However, it was decided to extend this funding mechanism for small projects and activities until ICCM-4 in 2015. Furthermore, discussions were held about more sustainable future funding for chemicals management. Two principal views had been expressed, which were to create a completely new financial mechanism or to extend the Global Environment Facility to include chemicals management. Concrete proposals will be done shortly.

The second important topic discussed were emerging issues. Those in which UNEP is directly involved are chemicals in products, lead in paints and Perfluorinated Chemicals (PFCs). The ICCM-3 decided that endocrine disruptors would be an additional emerging issue for chemicals management. It requested IOMC to develop a programme of work on this issue.

Global Alliance for alternatives to DDT

The 5th Conference of Parties (COP-5) of the Stockholm Convention, in 2011, had invited the United Nations Environment Programme to take over the administration and implementation of the Global Alliance and collaborate with the World Health Organization, which was subsequently done. A first Steering Committee meeting of the Global Alliance was held in August 2012 in Nairobi, where a first work plan was adopted. However implementation of the work plan depends on extra-budgetary funding, as UNEP does not have resources in its regular budget for this activity.

6.3 FAO

Mr Mark Davis informed the meeting about the major activities carried out by FAO on pesticide management since previous JMPM meeting.

Pesticide registration

Pesticide registration is considered by FAO as an important foundation stone for pesticide management. Effective pesticide registration forms the basis for the management of many other aspects of the pesticide life cycle. FAO increasingly finds that the focus should be on regional approaches to registration, with the aim to reduce costs and ensure effective use of scarce human resources. If richer OECD countries promote work sharing and collaboration to reduce costs, developing countries can definitely not be expected to go it alone.

Regional approaches are presently being supported by FAO in:

- CILSS/ECOWAS/UEMOA: The CILSS membership has expanded recently, and further expansion of the regional registration is now being studied to include member countries of ECOWAS and UEMOA. This would basically result in a common pesticide registration system for all of West Africa.
- In southern Africa, there are moves to establish regional collaboration for pesticide registration, through SAPReF, the Southern African Pesticide Registrars Forum.
- FAO has supported a number of ASEAN countries through a TCP project. A substantial report of this project has recently been produced.
- In the Caribbean, FAO continues to assist countries in regional collaboration through an EC funded project.
- Regional harmonization and coordination of pesticide registration is progressively advancing also in the Pacific.

FAO noted that regional approaches to pesticide registration are not obvious success stories. National political and sovereignty issues, administrative and cultural history, and differences in human resources and technical capacity complicate regional coordination and collaboration, requiring progressive development of regionally specific systems.

FAO is also progressing with the development of a pesticide registration toolkit, which will be reported later.

Inspection, control, import

Post-registration activities are also key to successful pesticide management. In this respect, FAO has developed and updated in collaboration with CILSS a manual for pesticide inspectors, and conducted a regional training course. The manual has been made available to other countries and regions as well.

The Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) now includes a functional registration component. This allows countries to store pesticide registration information and share it with selected countries. Some Caribbean and African countries have started to upload data into this registration component.

Finally, the Rotterdam Convention continues to organize workshops to build capacity in countries to get better control on the import of pesticides.

IPM & alternatives

FAO considers integrated pest management (IPM) and alternatives to chemical pesticides as essential approaches to reducing the risks of pesticides. In this respect, JMPM was informed that the West Africa IPM programme has had significant successes both in the adoption of IPM by farmers and the monitoring of pesticide contamination of international waterways. The programme is presently expanding to other countries.

The 2nd phase of the Asia IPM programme is in preparation, and a TCP for IPM development in the Pacific has recently started. In eastern and southern Africa, the initial entry point has been the disposal of obsolete pesticides, but these programmes are increasingly moving towards reducing reliance on pesticides through IPM. Activities in this respect are on-gong in Mozambique, Eritrea and Malawi, among others.

Standards

FAO and WHO continue to be heavily involved in international standard setting through the Joint Meeting on Pesticides Specifications (JMPS) and the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR). These two bodies produce voluminous output of standards. There is demand to increase the output of these two bodies. However, significant difficulties exist to meet such demands as both JMPS and JMPR already operate beyond the capacity of the meetings and their participants. Therefore, the processes to generate pesticide specifications MRLs will need to be reviewed and possibly revised to make them more efficient. A discussion point is also if and to what extent fees can be accepted from applicants, which is presently not the case.

Minor Uses

FAO hosted the Global Minor Use Summit in February 2012. Regulation related to minor uses (primarily MRLs and to a lesser extent efficacy testing) is definitely an issue in many countries. FAO position is to promote emphasis on IPM and alternatives to chemical pesticides, rather than developing more MRLs. FAO has been requested to continue working on minor uses, but is considering its position. The investments needed for this activity will have to be weighed against other priority activities on pesticides which the Organization has to meet.

Obsolete pesticides, container management & contaminated sites

A substantial programme of work on disposal of obsolete pesticides, the management of empty pesticide containers and the containment and cleaning up of pesticide contaminated sites continues to be implemented by FAO. This includes projects and programmes in:

- Latin America (Paraguay, Bolivia)
- The Caribbean
- Africa (Malawi, Kenya, Eritrea, Botswana, Mozambique, Benin, Cameroon, Morocco, CILSS)
- The Near East (Syria, Oman)
- Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA – a new project)
- Afghanistan

Highly hazardous pesticides

A survey was conducted by FAO of actions taken by countries (details under chapter 8.1) with regard to highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) and a project to reduce the risk of HHPs is on-going in Mozambique. Both activities will be reported later in this meeting. A new project on HHP risk reduction has recently been approved for Paraguay.

Communications

Various new awareness building and communications materials on pesticide risk reduction have been developed by FAO. The FAO pesticide management web site was also streamlined and made more accessible, an activity that will be continued. For the recent Pesticides awareness week, organized in the Caribbean, FAO assisted in the development of communication tools including a video shown to the JMPM.

Code of Conduct revision

A major activity of FAO over the last year has been the revision of the International Code of conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides. Details on progress on the revision of the Code will be presented in Chapter 7 of this report.

6.4 Discussion

The meeting discussed the presentations made by the three organizations and requested a number of clarifications.

WHO activities

The JMPM acknowledged the progress made by WHO in elaborating and updating the International Chemical Safety Cards and recommended that WHO, in collaboration with the ILO, ensure access to the ICSC for all stakeholders.

Regarding the *Global strategy for dengue prevention and control 2012–2020*, the JMPM recommended that WHOPES should continue to support efforts to develop new pesticides,

resistance prevention and management strategies, and sustainable integrated vector management to overcome this important vector-borne disease.

The JMPM stressed the need for countries to develop national policy on pesticide management and include strategies for prevention and management of resistance, as well as inter-sector collaboration. Furthermore, the JMPM welcomed the recent progress in capacity-building for testing and evaluation of pesticides through WHO collaborating institutions.

The JMPM valued the regular updates of the health risk assessment of DDT prepared by WHO for the Stockholm Convention. In this respect, the JMPM stressed that regulatory capacity should be strengthened at national and local levels to prevent diversion of DDT to non-public health uses (e.g. the use by farming communities).

The JMPM recommended that WHO, in collaboration with UNEP and industry, should urgently finalize the guidelines on the safe disposal of used long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs). It requested WHO and UNEP to report on the results obtained in the various pilot projects on this subject and invited the organizations to present the (draft) guidelines on the safe disposal of LLINs to the JMPM at its next session.

It was pointed out that is difficult in many countries to carry out quality control of public health pesticides, due to absence of access to appropriate laboratories. The JMPM therefore stressed the importance of collaboration between Ministries of Agriculture and of Health to ensure that the latter get access to laboratories of the former, if these exist. The JMPM further recommended that WHO engage regulatory authorities, the United Nations, donor agencies and industry in developing a strategy to address substandard public health pesticides on the market.

The JMPM noted the progress made in preparing efficacy testing guidelines and risk assessment models of insecticides for aircraft disinsection.

The JMPM emphasized the importance of the recently established Vector Control Advisory Group in assessing the value to public health of new paradigms and innovative technologies (both chemical and non-chemical) for vector control. The JMPM noted, however, that there could be potential overlap with activities of the Global Alliance for Alternatives to DDT, established under the Stockholm Convention, and urged that effective coordination between the two bodies be ensured.

UNEP activities

The JMPM acknowledged the importance of UNEP's Global Chemicals Outlook in providing tools to monitor trends in pesticide use through the development of indicators. The JMPM recommended the widespread distribution of the *Costs of inaction* report as a potential tool for priority-setting in chemicals management.

The JMPM also recognized the work of the Scientific Expert Group on Chemicals and the Environment (SECE) and the important role of analysis of socioeconomic factors in developing realistic pesticide management strategies. The JMPM expressed a concern, though, that various initiatives were on-going regarding the development of similar guidance (e.g. guidelines on pesticides and on chemicals legislation) and stressed the need for collaboration among UN agencies to ensure consistency and avoid national governments "getting lost in the guidance".

The JMPM recalled the experience of FAO and WHO in strengthening pesticide management, which could inform UNEP in developing a Code of Conduct on Industrial Chemicals. The JMPM acknowledged UNEP's recommendation that sustainable financing solutions be sought in order to promote countries to be self-sustaining in chemicals management rather than relying on donor funding.

The JMPM called for rapid publication of the update of the UNEP/WHO *Global assessment of the state of the science of endocrine disruptors*.

The JMPM commended the work of the Quick Start Programme of SAICM in addressing the need for sufficient financial resources in order for countries to focus on emerging issues concerning sustainable chemical management such as chemicals (including pesticides) in products, and chemicals with endocrine disrupting effects.

The JMPM recommended that WHO and UNEP further strengthen collaboration, particularly in areas related to public health, vector control and the environment.

FAO activities

The JMPM noted the growing importance of regional approaches to strengthening pesticide management and therefore recommended that future guidelines produced by FAO and WHO include advice on pesticide management issues of specific relevance to regional bodies, where appropriate.

The JMPM noted with satisfaction that training of farmers on pesticide risk management is showing significant and sustained reductions in pesticide use, and recommended that activities to monitor waterways in regions benefiting from Farmer Field School training activities be pursued. This in order to demonstrate positive long-term effects for the environment expected to be resulting from the Farmer Field School programme. The JMPM acknowledged the further expansion of projects aimed at favouring the development of IPM and other alternatives to chemical pest control.

As a follow-up to the Global Minor Use Summit, the JMPM recommended that FAO remain involved in OECD's efforts to harmonize approaches for appropriate regulation of pesticides for minor uses. It was stressed that such approaches should include alternatives to chemical pesticides, and that international harmonization of regulations of, for instance, biopesticides would facilitate their use also for minor uses. However, the JMPM acknowledged that minor uses may not be a high priority for action in areas of the world lacking a registration programme.

The JMPM welcomed FAO's continued work on obsolete pesticides and container management and recommended increased collaboration to enhance knowledge and resource-sharing.

The JMPM also recommended that FAO work more closely with WHO regional offices to enhance collaborative work efforts, knowledge sharing and resource sharing.

7. Joint COAG-JMPM meeting on the update of the Code of Conduct

A joint meeting took place between the Bureau of the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) and the JMPM on Wednesday 10 October 2012. The objective of the meeting was for COAG to discuss various provisions of the Code with the JMPM.

The Joint COAG-JMPM meeting was chaired by the Chairperson of COAG, Mr Mario Arvelo Caamaño and attended by the COAG Bureau members listed in Annex 1, the JMPM members and observers.

7.1 Introduction

Mr Arvelo welcomed all COAG Bureau members, the COAG Secretariat, invited COAG Bureau participants, JMPM members, JMPM observers and participants of intergovernmental organizations.

In his introduction to the discussions, the Chairperson drew attention to the fact that the Code of Conduct is not an instrument of international law and does not impose commitments on countries or industry, nor does it force governments to modify national legislation. The Code is a collection of voluntary guidelines which is being updated to provide much needed clarity, precision and safety with respect to pesticide management. Mr Arvelo stressed that the Code of Conduct is of special significance to developing countries because they lack financial and human resources to deal effectively with the hazards and risks associated with the use of pesticides. In many developing countries, poisonous and biologically potent chemicals are routinely used by persons largely or completely ignorant of their potential for harm. The Code provides crucial information so that authorities are better prepared to remedy such ignorance and prevent pain and suffering than can result from it.

Mr Arvelo noted that experience in implementing the provisions of the Code now dates back 27 years, while work on this specific update has taken three years and numerous consultations. The Chairperson therefore stressed the need to reach consensus on the updates of the Code of Conduct during this meeting; if consensus would not be reached, the updated Code could not be submitted to the next FAO Council. Mr Arvelo finally underlined that the ultimate goal of FAO's work is to achieve humanity's freedom from hunger, and that the updated Code of Conduct would contribute to this goal.

7.2 Process of updating the Code of Conduct

The history of the Code of Conduct and the process of its present update, were briefly described by the Chairperson and by Mr Mark Davis, Senior Officer Pesticide Management of FAO.

They recalled that the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides was originally adopted by the FAO Conference in 1985, and subsequently revised twice. The present update therefore constitutes the third formal revision of the Code of Conduct since its first adoption.

In its work to help member countries strengthen their management of pesticides, FAO works closely with several partner organizations, principally the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). WHO has specific interests in the management and use of pesticides for public health purposes, as well as the health effects of pesticides to which humans are exposed in the workplace, as residues in food or by other ways. UNEP has a particular focus on the environmental impact of chemicals, within which pesticides are a very significant group.

Both WHO and UNEP have expressed a desire to adopt the Code through their Governing Bodies so that it will be a shared mechanism promoted in Member Countries by all three Agencies. In addition, close review of the Code reveals that certain articles would benefit from clarification or update to reflect current best practices and knowledge.

Article 12.10 of the Code states that “Governing Bodies of FAO should periodically review the relevance and effectiveness of the Code. The Code should be considered a dynamic text which must be brought up to date as required, taking into account technical, economic and social progress”.

The 2nd session of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management (JMPM), in 2008, recommended that FAO and WHO start the process to ensure that the Code of Conduct, and its implementation tools, adequately addresses all pesticides, and in particular public health pesticides. The JMPM subsequently held several meetings and consultations in which the main stakeholders were involved.

After the 5th Session of the JMPM in October 2011, FAO and WHO finalized the draft update of the Code of Conduct, based on the recommendations made by the JMPM and subsequent exchanges of correspondence for clarification and refinement of specific issues.

The updated Code, including a detailed description of all proposed changes, was subsequently submitted to the 23rd session of the COAG, held from 21-25 May 2012 in Rome. The Committee was invited to review the modifications to the Code and recommend the endorsement of the updated International Code of Conduct on Pesticides Management by the 38th FAO Conference in June 2013.

The Committee welcomed the draft updated Code of Conduct and the proposal to present the finalized Code for adoption by the Governing Bodies of FAO, WHO and UNEP. It recognized that an update of the Code requires approval of the FAO Conference, to which referral should be made by COAG. The Committee therefore reviewed the modifications to the Code that had been negotiated by the FAO and WHO Expert Panels on Pesticide Management including UNEP experts and with input from other intergovernmental organizations, the private sector and NGOs in their meetings of 2010 and 2011, and inter-sessionally.

The Committee subsequently:

- a) commended the work done on the update to date;
- b) provided a number of substantive comments, queries and suggestions for modifications to the document; and
- c) decided that countries should have the opportunity to participate in amending the draft as part of an inclusive consultation process among countries and all stakeholders.

The COAG Bureau was delegated to determine the modalities for an inclusive consultation process to prepare an amended text to be submitted to the FAO Council in November 2012 for adoption by the 38th Session of the FAO Conference in 2013 and in time for the presentations to the subsequent meetings of the Governing Bodies of WHO and UNEP.

The COAG Bureau approved a roadmap and deadline for this consultation. FAO circulated the draft updated Code of Conduct, in English, French Spanish and Arabic, to all FAO Members and stakeholders, in July 2012, with a request to review the document and provide comments on and/or endorsement of the contents. In total, 32 countries or regional organizations, 6 NGOs and private sector associations, and 3 individual experts responded and provided comments.

The comments received from this consultation were consolidated by FAO and WHO, and a new version of the updated Code of Conduct was prepared. It is this version which was under discussion at the present joint COAG-JMPM meeting.

7.3 Discussion of the updated Code of Conduct

Many of the comments provided during the consultation could be accommodated relatively easily by the FAO and WHO Secretariat, and it was not felt that these required in-depth discussion at the meeting.

The focus of the discussion was therefore on articles for which substantive comments were received, or for which comments had been contradictory or contentious. A limited number of issues were identified which needed further clarification and a consensus position from the COAG Bureau members, the JMPM members and other stakeholders present. These issues were, in particular:

- The definition of Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) and the manner in which it is addressed in the Code.

It was decided to maintain the original definition of GAP, as used in the previous version of the Code and as applied by the Codex Alimentarius, rather than broaden the concept.

- The definition of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) and the manner in which they are addressed in the Code, as well as the need to define specific criteria for HHPs in (an annex to) the Code.

The meeting amended the definition of highly hazardous pesticide and clarified the use of the term in relevant articles in the Code, in particular its relation to risk assessment and mitigation. It was also decided not to include specific criteria for HHPs in the Code. The COAG, however, requested the JMPM to urgently develop guidance for countries to clarify the new definition and the procedures outlined in Article 7.5, in view of identifying and managing HHPs.

- The definition of pesticide.

It was decided to simplify the definition of pesticide in the Code and provide a separate definition of pest. The latter was based on the definition used by the International Plant Protection Convention, but was broadened to cover pests other than those injurious only to plants or plant products.

- Pesticide manufacturing.

While recognizing that the Code does not provide provisions to cover all aspects of pesticide manufacturing, it was decided to maintain the articles referring to manufacturing as proposed in the draft revised Code.

- Prevent the use of pesticides by children

It was decided to introduce a provision recommending that countries develop legislation to prevent the use of pesticides by and sale of pesticides to children, and refer to relevant ILO Convention.

7.4 Conclusion

The COAG Bureau requested JMPM to address a limited number of technical issues, mainly details of certain definitions and specific technical terminology, in its regular Session, and inform the COAG Bureau before the end of the week.

Subsequently, and taking into account the amendments to the Code discussed and agreed during the meeting, the COAG Bureau gave its approval of the revised version of the International Code of Conduct on Pesticides Management, and recommended that it be submitted to the FAO Council for adoption.

8. Highly hazardous pesticides

8.1 Report of survey of actions taken to regulate HHPs

The JMPM was informed about experiences of countries which had taken action to reduce risks posed by highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs). A survey was conducted by FAO in 2012 in which countries were requested to describe their experiences with risk reduction and regulation/phasing out of HHPs. The main objective of the exercise is to compile case studies of country experiences which can be shared and serve other countries in taking similar actions.

A total of 35 countries had been approached to date, which resulted in the compilation of 19 individual case studies. A number of these were reported in two regional reports: A Caribbean Region case study (covering 9 countries: Antigua & Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Vincent & The Grenadines and Suriname), and a West Africa Region case study (covering 6 countries: Benin, Guinea, Mauritania, Mali, Niger and Senegal).

Further regional case study reports will likely be elaborated for East Africa, Southern Africa and South-East Asia. In addition, a number of countries with an advanced pesticide regulatory system will be approached with the request to describe how they have worked on risk reduction of HHPs.

Various commonalities were identified in the cases studied so far. Important information sources to identify alternatives for and take decisions on HHPs were the *WHO Classification of Pesticides by Hazard*, the *Stockholm* and *Rotterdam Conventions* (the most frequently banned pesticides are the ones listed by these conventions), registration status within the region or in countries with advanced regulatory systems, as well as (local) information on pesticides that have shown high incidences of severe or irreversible adverse effects on human health or the environment.

The information provided through these case studies confirms the importance of regional bodies for reaching and implementing final regulatory decisions on HHPs (e.g. the *Comité Sahélien des Pesticides* in West Africa and the *Coordinating Group of Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean* (CGPC)).

The main constraints reported by countries in regulating HHPs and implementing alternatives were insufficient access to information and lack of knowledge, inadequate funding for alternatives, difficulties to control illegal trade in HHPs, absence of appropriate legislation, the higher cost of alternatives, and lack of awareness and/or willingness of farmers to replace HHPs by less hazardous alternatives.

In the discussion that ensued, the JMPM welcomed the survey of actions taken by countries on HHPs, but stressed the need to cover other countries and regulatory systems with the aim to achieve a broader coverage. The JMPM acknowledged the important role of the *WHO Recommended classification of pesticides by hazard* in national regulation of HHPs. The finding that regional registration systems are a key information source for countries reinforces JMPM's recommendation to include advice to regional bodies in guidance documents produced and reviewed by FAO and WHO.

It was recommended that results of the survey and the case studies be incorporated in the HHP guidance document requested by COAG. However, the JMPM noted that this activity should not finish with publishing lessons learned, but that stakeholders should be actively engaged in finding hands-on solutions to the risks posed by HHPs. Given the fact that resources for risk reduction are likely to be limited, the JMPM stressed that recommendations for action should be clearly prioritized. It considered capacity-building of national and regional authorities on pesticide risk evaluation and assessment such a priority, including for public health pesticides.

8.2 HHP pilot project in Mozambique

The JMPM was informed about progress in the pilot project on reducing risks of highly hazardous pesticides in Mozambique. This project is executed by the Ministry of Agriculture Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs of Mozambique, with technical support by FAO. The project is funded through the SAICM Quick Start Program and started operating in July 2012.

The project outline is built around four phases:

1. Identify pesticides and pesticide use situations which can be considered highly hazardous under Mozambican conditions;
2. Elaborate a plan of action to reduce the risks posed by these HHPs;

3. Initiate implementation of priority risk reduction activities; and
4. Develop mid- and long-term policies, programmes and projects to reduce the risk of HHPs.

To date, phase 1 has been almost finalized. All pesticides registered in Mozambique were evaluated against HHP criteria recommended by the JMPM, using mainly international data sources. Preliminary results of this assessment indicated that about 8% of registered pesticide products could be considered as HHPs. An additional 3% of registered products were considered of concern with respect to their hazards. Import data were reviewed for all of these products as a proxy for distribution and use. A number of user surveys was planned to obtain further information on whether and how these pesticides are handled and used under Mozambican conditions.

The objective of these exercises is to compile a shortlist of HHPs, and associated use conditions, in Mozambique, which is based on the initial hazard assessment (JMPM criteria), use survey data (field work), and limited additional risk assessments. Results will be discussed in a stakeholder meeting in early 2013, with the aim to identify priority pesticides and use conditions which require risk reduction and review possible alternatives. Subsequently, a plan of action will be elaborated to reduce the risks posed by these HHPs in Mozambique.

The JMPM welcomed the pilot project in Mozambique on reducing the risks of HHPs being conducted by the Government of Mozambique and FAO. It was noted that this is a good example of how countries can move forward on HHPs. The JMPM discussed the methodology applied and provided a number of suggestions for improvement. It was recommended that experiences from this pilot project be used in the elaboration of the HHP guidance requested by the COAG.

8.3 ICCM-3 and HHPs

The JMPM took note of discussions held at the third International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), in September 2012, about highly hazardous pesticides⁶. A draft resolution was presented at ICCM-3 calling for wider action on highly hazardous pesticides, including greater involvement on the part of United Nations bodies such as UNEP, FAO and WHO. While there was general agreement at the Conference that the issue was an important one, given the severe threat that highly hazardous pesticides posed to the environment and to the health of wildlife, livestock and human beings, several representatives indicated that they needed time to study the issue and the draft resolution. The resolution was therefore not adopted, but may be considered by the 2nd Open-ended Working Group, and possibly be re-submitted for adoption at ICCM-4.

FAO informed the Conference about its work on reducing risks of HHPs and that it would address them in the forthcoming revision of the *International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides*. FAO also indicated to the Conference that it was willing, subject to available financing, to assist countries in their efforts to reduce the risks posed by HHPs, and called on donor countries to facilitate such efforts and urged all countries not to wait until the fourth session of the Conference to act.

⁶ Report of ICCM-3: http://www.saicm.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=96&Itemid=485

The JMPM acknowledged the importance given by ICCM-3 to risk reduction of HHPs and recommended that FAO, within available resources, increase its work on advising countries how to manage this group of pesticides and, in collaboration with WHO and UNEP, develop guidance on risk reduction of HHPs as a matter of urgency.

8.4 Guidance on HHPs

The COAG has requested the JMPM to elaborate guidance on the new definition and the procedures outlined in Article 7.5 of the Code of Conduct in view of the identification and management of HHPs.

The JMPM therefore recommended to establish a working group, consisting of JMPM members and observers, to develop an outline for such guidance on HHPs, which should be discussed at its next session.

9. Pesticide registration

9.1 Pesticide registration toolkit

The JMPM was informed about progress made with the development of the Pesticide Registration Toolkit. The toolkit is a web-based decision support system for pesticide registration staff in developing countries for which a pilot is presently being elaborated by FAO.

At present, an initial design of the web site structure and contents have been developed, and working model is available as a brainstorming and development platform. Some new elements that have been added since the previous JMPM are: a registration process tool and a decision making tool (based on FAO/WHO registration guidelines), access to various pesticide properties databases; a live newsfeed from the University of Cape Town pesticide list server. Furthermore, data requirements are being entered according to newly adopted FAO/WHO guidelines.

It is expected that further development of the full toolkit will continue in 2013, with various small *ad hoc* working groups, consisting of content experts and developing country registrars, being requested to develop and peer review contents. Overall peer review of the toolkit would be done by the JMPM.

The JMPM welcomed the progress in the development of the Pesticide Registration Toolkit and encouraged the initiation of a longer term project to ensure its completion and application for the registration of all pesticides. It was suggested that modules of the toolbox be piloted as they are developed, rather than waiting with testing the system until the toolbox is complete. The JMPM appreciated the offers of several Panel members and observers to extend access to a range of resources and data for inclusion in the toolkit.

The JMPM noted that while the toolkit should be easy to use, it is not necessarily a simple system; however, it should be a comprehensive system. The JMPM recommended that small *ad hoc* working groups be established to develop and peer review the contents of the toolkit.

FAO/WHO workshops should be organized to identify gaps in the guidance that may require further development.

The JMPM also welcomed FAO's link with similar activities developed by OECD (e.g. the IOMC toolbox for decision-making on chemicals). Finally, the JMPM recommended that the toolkit would benefit, in the longer term, from a tool to assess acceptability of risks.

9.2 On-going pesticide registration capacity development

The JMPM was informed about on-going regional activities to strengthen pesticide registration.

South-East Asia

In South-East Asia, FAO assisted eight countries towards achieving greater pesticide regulatory harmonization, in collaboration with the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC). This was done through a TCP that ran in 2010 and 2011. The project's main objectives were to review existing regulatory processes, prepare guidelines for harmonization, strengthen information exchange and train pesticide regulatory officers. Outputs of the project were guidelines for harmonization of: pesticide registration requirements, data requirements for biopesticides, efficacy test protocols, pesticide labelling, and residue monitoring systems.

Pesticide regulators were trained in various fields, such as data evaluation, risk assessment and efficacy evaluation. Furthermore capacity building was carried out on pesticide residue and formulation analysis.

As follow-up steps, countries have been asked to carry out a self-assessment and develop an action plan for the short-, medium- and long term. A workshop will be held in November 2012 to review progress and identify successes, difficulties and new issues, share the country's self-assessments and action plans, consolidate registration data requirements for different types of registration, and plan future cooperation and information sharing.

Reports and other outputs of the project are available on the APPPC web site⁷

West Africa

In West Africa, the regional pesticide registration system covering the nine CILSS countries already is operational since 1992. An independent evaluation of the registration system in general, and the Comité Sahélien des Pesticides (CSP) in particular, was commissioned by CILSS and conducted by FAO. This evaluation took place in late 2011 and 2012, and was reported to CILSS in July 2012.

The evaluation concluded, among others, that the common registration system developed by CILSS can be considered a reference for harmonized registration systems in Africa. However, it was also noted that there exists a complete separation between registration and post-registration activities, the latter being insufficiently supported by and harmonized at the

⁷

[http://www.apppc.org/index.php?id=1110802&tx_publication_pi1\[showUid\]=2181846&frompage=1110931&type=publication&subtype=&L=0#item](http://www.apppc.org/index.php?id=1110802&tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2181846&frompage=1110931&type=publication&subtype=&L=0#item)

regional level. Concern was expressed at the fact that three regional economic bodies in West Africa – CILSS, ECOWAS and UEMOA, all have developed regulatory instruments for pesticide registration, with considerable overlap, and that one harmonized system for West Africa would be the recommended way forward. Such a system would cover 17 countries.

FAO is now collaborating with CILSS, ECOWAS and UEMOA to attempt to develop such a regional registration and post-registration system. A GEF project is being elaborated to support this activity.

The Caribbean

Countries in the Caribbean have been collaborating on pesticide regulatory issues for 15 years. However, very limited success has been achieved in harmonizing pesticide registration, in spite of several proposals which have been made in the past. FAO, with financial support from the EU, has been able to bring all countries together to discuss regional approaches to pesticide management, which has been boost to the potential for collaboration and harmonization. The existing Coordinating Group of Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC) was the main framework for these activities.

As a result of these consultations, countries in this region have agreed to harmonize their registration approaches. However, the required amendments to national legislation pose great problems for countries to actually implement harmonized procedures. As an alternative, steps were identified that could be taken within the existing frameworks. For instance, information sharing on registered pesticides has been facilitated through the registration module of the FAO Pesticide Stock Management System.

Countries will need to take political decisions to be able to take further steps at the regional level. Subsequently, FAO can then provide technical assistance in developing sustainable options and approaches to regional collaboration.

Southern Africa

The Southern Africa Pesticide Registrars Forum (SAPReF) is active since 2011. SAPReF covers the 14 member countries of the Southern African Development Community (SADC), and it is working towards becoming a technical committee under SADC's Sanitary and Phytosanitary Coordinating Committee. SAPReF has identified its own membership and terms of reference. The start-up phase of SAPReF has been facilitated to a limited extent by the Swedish Chemical Agency (KEMI), the University of Cape Town (UCT) and FAO.

So far, two physical meetings have been held, in addition to regular virtual meetings through the internet. It was soon realized that development of practical collaboration would need to precede any talk of formal regional harmonization. Activities focusing on data sharing have been therefore initiated.

Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS)

The registration module of the Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) has been further developed since the last Session of the JMPM. Enhancements made to the module were the inclusion of public health pesticides, the addition of Codex MRLs, further development of active ingredient lists, addition of plant growth regulators, and the inclusion of an automatic alert if pesticides are registered that are listed in the Rotterdam or Stockholm Conventions.

The JMPM noted the regional efforts to harmonize registration and emphasized that regional bodies should aim to be self-sustaining for their operation. The experiences of the various regional bodies (e.g. CILSS, APPPC, CGPC, SAPReF) should be documented and their efforts consolidated, e.g. to harmonize registration of public health pesticides. Where appropriate, such efforts should address harmonization of agricultural and public health pesticides simultaneously in order to maximize use of resources.

10. Survey of the use of technical guidelines

At its previous Session, the JMPM reviewed results of a survey of the use of technical guidelines, conducted by FAO. The main recommendations based on the survey results were that:

- More effort is needed to enhance awareness about the guidelines.
- There is an urgent need to translate the guidelines into other languages.
- There is a need for additional tools to supplement guidelines (case studies, reference lists, tool kits, guideline-presentations and -summaries, etc.).
- Better use should be made of on-going field projects to raise awareness about guidelines and to make them available.

The JMPM was informed, at its present Session, about follow-up actions taken to implement the recommendations. FAO reported, in this respect, that:

- The FAO pesticides management website has been overhauled⁸. Outdated guidelines and documents that were no official guidelines have been removed. Guidelines and tools have been separated, and links have been rationalized.
- Available translations of guidelines that were not yet on the site have been posted. Further translations have been prioritized and budget reservations have been made. Projects are also being used to translate guidelines into national working languages (e.g. legislation & quality control guidelines are now available in Russian).
- The FAO Pesticides Management Newsletter/Alerts mailing list has been expanded significantly and broadened beyond registration authorities. The Newsletter/Alerts are now also distributed in three languages.
- Non-FAO newsletters have been used to draw attention to the guidelines (e.g. SAICM bulletin).
- An enhanced annotated list of guidelines has been drafted. Once finalised, it can be used as hand-out at meetings and in electronic format.
- A PowerPoint presentation on the guidelines is under preparation. Once completed, it can be used at pesticide risk reduction workshops or related meetings to introduce the guidelines.

⁸ See: <http://www.fao.org/agriculture/crops/core-themes/theme/pests/en/>

WHO informed the JMPM that it also took note of the outcome of this survey and implemented a number of its recommendations. For instance, the web pages on pesticides management of the WHO Pesticides evaluation scheme⁹ mirror the structure of FAO guidelines web pages, to ensure consistency and clarity. Many cross-linkages between the WHO and FAO web pages also are made. Furthermore, WHO often distributes memory sticks containing relevant guidelines at meetings and workshops, to increase awareness and access to these documents.

11. Draft guidelines under development

The Panel reviewed three draft guidelines that are presently being developed.

11.1 Guidelines on microbial pesticides

At its previous Session, the JMPM requested that a draft of guidelines on data requirements and assessment of microbial pest control agents be elaborated and circulated for comments. A new draft of this document was subsequently prepared, largely based on OECD and EU procedure, and circulated to JMPM and observers in March 2012. Comments were subsequently received from OECD and several industry organizations. These comments were partly incorporated in the guidelines, but a new version had not yet been circulated to JMPM.

Various issues were raised by the drafter which required advice from JMPM, and several of these were discussed in more detail.

The JMPM was alerted to an OECD/EU/KemI workshop on risk assessment and management of microbial pesticides which is to be held in June 2013. The objective of this workshop is to review, and if needed, revise, recommendations on data requirements and evaluation for microbial pesticide registration. The JMPM noted the importance of FAO/WHO guidance on microbial pesticides to be consistent with the OECD approach and guidance. The JMPM therefore recommended putting on hold the finalization of these guidelines until the results of the workshop are known.

The JMPM suggested to continue preparation of the draft guidelines and to incorporate comments received so far. The revised draft should then be circulated for information/comments to JMPM and observers. The JMPM further recommended that additional comments from its members and observers be included in the drafting process, that the scope of the guidelines be further clarified inter-session, and that the outcome of the international workshop on microbial pest control agents to be held in June 2013 be taken into consideration when finalizing the guidelines.

⁹ See: <http://www.who.int/whopes/en/>

11.2 Guidelines on good labelling practice for pesticides

The 3rd draft of the revision of the FAO/WHO *Guidelines on good labelling practice for pesticides* was discussed at the JMPM Session in October 2010. Subsequently, a revised Chapter 5 (hazard classifications) of the guidelines were discussed at 5th JMPM in October 2011.

Since the previous Session of the JMPM, a new draft was prepared in August 2012. A small working group was established in September 2012, to assist the secretariat in finalizing the guidelines, consisting of some JMPM members and observers. This 4th draft was circulated among working group and discussed during a conference call in early October 2012. The working group identified a number of issues that required advice from the JMPM.

A colour band is being used on the label to indicate hazards of the pesticide product, based on the WHO Classification. In the latest draft guidelines, colour bands were also proposed to indicate both acute and chronic hazards based on the GHS. The JMPM supported the use of colour bands based on the GHS but recommended to limit this to acute toxicity only. The objective of the colour band is to warn against acute risks of handling and use, and chronic hazards were considered to be sufficiently indicated by the hazard symbol and signal word.

JMPM discussed the extent of medical advice on the label. It recommended that medical advice should cover first aid, the basic treatment of poisoning and a phone number of the poison control centre or a relevant medical centre. More detailed information on poisoning treatment of (registered) pesticides should be made available to medical and/or poisoning centres through different channels. It was noted that quality control of medical information is needed at moment of authorization.

The use of braille on the label was mentioned as a means of providing basic risk information to blind persons, similar to its use on medicines in several countries. Braille text could probably be limited to the words “pesticide” and the relevant hazard signal word. However, the risk of too much cluttering on the label was also mentioned.

The use of Quick Response (QR) Codes on pesticide labels was discussed as a means of providing additional information to pesticide users, since mobile (smart) phones are now widely used in developing countries. QR codes could even be linked to messages for blind persons.

The JMPM noted the progress made in drafting the *Guidelines on good labelling practice for pesticides* and recommended that the working group take into account the comments and suggestions detailed elsewhere in this report. The JMPM underlined the urgent need to publish these guidelines and requested that a new draft be circulated to the JMPM and its observers by January 2013.

11.3 Guidelines on pesticides legislation

The first draft of the Guidelines on pesticides legislation was discussed at the previous Session of the JMPM. Based on the comments provided by the JMPM, a revised draft was finalized in April 2012 and circulated for comments to JMPM members and observers in May 2012. The draft guidelines and the comments received were subsequently reviewed by the

FAO Legal Office. A new draft was not yet elaborated, however, at the time of the present Session of the JMPM.

Various issues were identified by the JMPM which would require further attention in the guidelines, among them:

- The need to clearly address that pesticide legislation should be comprehensive, in particular covering also public health pesticides. This was considered important since legislation of public health pesticides tends to be weak or absent in many developing countries.
- The issue of parallel imports of the same pesticide product by different traders. The rights of registration holders should be clarified with respect to pesticide importation/distribution.
- How to authorize pesticides in small countries where no representatives of pesticide manufacturers or formulators are present, but where pesticides are imported and distributed by one or more small traders who may not be in a position to register pesticides.
- The need to ensure consistency with the pesticide labelling guidelines.

The JMPM underlined the urgent need to publish these guidelines and requested that a new draft be circulated to the JMPM and observers by January 2013.

12. Guidelines pending finalization

A status report on guidelines pending finalization since the previous Session of the JMPM was presented.

12.1 Guidelines on prevention and management of pesticide resistance

The *Guidelines on prevention and management of pesticide resistance* were finalized and published in September 2012.

The JMPM acknowledged the valuable contribution provided by the principal drafter of these guidelines, Mr Charles Staetz.

12.2 Guidelines on data requirements for registration of pesticides

The *Guidelines on data requirements for registration of pesticides* have been edited, and their publication is expected shortly. The JMPM acknowledged the valuable contribution of the principal drafter of these guidelines, Ms Kimberly Nesci.

13. Emerging and priority issues

As part of its terms of reference, the JMPM may be requested to review and advise on activities implemented by FAO and WHO to strengthen pesticide management in agriculture, public health and other fields of use, in particular in developing countries; and to alert FAO and WHO on new developments or issues related to pesticide use or management which may require attention from one or both Organizations.

In this respect, some members of the JMPM provided information on emerging issues for consideration by FAO and WHO, in addition to the issues discussed at the last Session, which should be discussed at its next session. The JMPM requested that FAO and WHO provide an update on emerging issues at its next Session.

14. Other matters

The JMPM recognized the difficulties in keeping momentum between sessions and therefore recommended that FAO and WHO organize at least one or two teleconferences during the inter-sessional periods to facilitate continuity of work. In addition, FAO and WHO should establish an Internet-based repository for working documents.

The JMPM was informed about the upcoming retirement of Dr Morteza Zaim, Coordinator Vector Ecology and Management of the Department of Control of Neglected Tropical Diseases of WHO. He will be replaced by Dr Rajpal Singh Yadav. Dr Zaim has been promoting the sound management of pesticides in general, and of public health pesticides in particular, for a long time. He has very successfully raised the importance of public health pesticide management in WHO and its member countries. Dr Zaim was also instrumental in increasing collaboration between WHO and FAO on pesticide management and stood at the origin of the establishment of the JMPM.

Mr Mark Davis, on behalf of all present, expressed his great appreciation for the support that Dr Zaim has provided over the years to the JMPM. Mr Davis presented him with a FAO tributary Silver Plate recognizing Dr Zaim's invaluable contributions to pesticide risk reduction.

15. Recommendations

Based on the working documents reviewed, the presentations made and the discussions held during the meeting, the 6th FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management (JMPM) made the following recommendations.

Terms of reference for observers

In order to clarify the roles of participants of the JMPM, it is recommended that FAO and WHO formalize the terms of reference of Panel members, the JMPM and its observers before the next session.

Developments since the previous session of the JMPM

The JMPM was informed of developments that had taken place since the previous session and specific actions taken by FAO, WHO and UNEP.

WHO activities

The JMPM acknowledged the progress made by WHO in elaborating and updating the International Chemical Safety Cards (230 ICSCs developed for pesticides to date) and recommended that WHO, in collaboration with the ILO, ensure access to the ICSC for all stakeholders. Regarding the *Global strategy for dengue prevention and control 2012–2020*, the JMPM recommended that WHOPEP should continue to support efforts to develop new pesticides, resistance prevention and management strategies, and sustainable integrated vector management to overcome this important vector-borne disease. The JMPM stressed the need for countries to develop national policy on pesticide management and include strategies for prevention and management of resistance, as well as intersectoral collaboration. Furthermore, the JMPM welcomed the recent progress in capacity-building for testing and evaluation of pesticides through WHO collaborating institutions.

The JMPM valued the regular updates of the health risk assessment of DDT prepared by WHO for the Stockholm Convention. In this respect, the JMPM stressed that regulatory capacity should be strengthened at national and local levels to prevent diversion of DDT to non-public health uses (e.g. the use by farming communities). JMPM recommended that WHO, in collaboration with UNEP and industry, should urgently finalize the guidelines on the safe disposal of used long-lasting insecticidal nets. The JMPM further recommended that WHO engage regulatory authorities, the United Nations, donor agencies and industry in developing a strategy to address substandard public health pesticides on the market. The JMPM noted the progress made in preparing efficacy testing guidelines and risk assessment models of insecticides for aircraft disinsection. The JMPM emphasized the importance of the recently established Vector Control Advisory Group in assessing the value to public health of new paradigms and innovative technologies (both chemical and non-chemical) for vector control.

UNEP activities

The JMPM acknowledged the importance of UNEP's Global Chemicals Outlook in providing tools to monitor trends in pesticide use through the development of indicators. The JMPM recommended the widespread distribution of the *Costs of inaction* report as a potential tool for priority-setting in chemicals management. The JMPM recognized the work of the Scientific

Expert Group on Chemicals and the Environment and the important role of analysis of socioeconomic factors in developing realistic pesticide management strategies.

The JMPM recalled the experience of FAO and WHO in strengthening pesticide management, which could inform UNEP in developing a Code of Conduct on Industrial Chemicals. The JMPM acknowledged UNEP's recommendation that sustainable financing solutions be sought in order to promote countries to be self-sustaining in chemicals management rather than relying on donor funding. The JMPM called for publication of the UNEP/WHO report on endocrine disrupting chemicals. The JMPM recommended that WHO and UNEP further strengthen collaboration, particularly in areas related to public health, vector control and the environment.

FAO activities

The JMPM noted the growing importance of regional approaches to strengthening pesticide management and therefore recommended that future guidelines produced by FAO and WHO include advice on pesticide management issues of specific relevance to regional bodies, where appropriate. The JMPM noted with satisfaction that training of farmers on pesticide risk management is showing significant and sustained reductions in pesticide use, and recommended that activities to monitor waterways in regions benefiting from Farmer Field School training activities be pursued in order to demonstrate positive long-term effects for the environment. The JMPM acknowledged the further expansion of projects aimed at favouring the development of IPM and other alternatives to chemical pest control.

The JMPM acknowledged the importance given by the 3rd International Conference on Chemicals Management to risk reduction of highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) and recommended that FAO, within available resources, increase its work on advising countries how to manage this group of pesticides and, in collaboration with WHO and UNEP, develop guidance on risk reduction of HHPs as a matter of urgency.

The JMPM welcomed the survey of actions taken by countries on HHPs and the pilot project in Mozambique on reducing their risk being conducted by FAO as a model for other countries. The JMPM acknowledged the important role of the WHO *Recommended classification of pesticides by hazard* in national regulation of HHPs. The finding that regional registration systems are a key information source for countries reinforces JMPM's recommendation to include advice to regional bodies in guidance documents produced and reviewed by FAO and WHO. The JMPM acknowledged the finding that countries lack access to information, toolkits, manuals, etc., and recommended that case studies and additional guidance be prepared to assist countries in assessing and reducing the risks of HHPs and, where relevant, progressively banning HHPs. Capacity-building of national and regional authorities on pesticide risk evaluation and assessment is a specific priority, including for public health pesticides.

As a follow-up to the Global Minor Use Summit, the JMPM recommended that FAO remain involved in OECD's efforts to harmonize approaches for appropriate regulation of pesticides for minor uses, but acknowledged that such uses may not be a high priority for action in areas of the world lacking a registration programme. The JMPM welcomed FAO's continued work on obsolete pesticides and container management and recommended increased collaboration to enhance knowledge and resource-sharing.

The JMPM noted the regional efforts to harmonize registration and emphasized that regional bodies should aim to be self-sustaining for their operation. The experiences of the various regional bodies (e.g. CILSS, APPPC, CGPC, SAPReF) should be documented and their efforts consolidated, e.g. to harmonize registration of public health pesticides. Where appropriate, such efforts should address harmonization of agricultural and public health pesticides simultaneously in order to maximize use of resources.

The JMPM welcomed the progress in the development of the Pesticide Registration Toolkit and encouraged the initiation of a longer term project to ensure its completion and application for the registration of all pesticides. The JMPM appreciated the offers of several Panel members and observers to extend access to a range of resources and data for inclusion in the toolkit. The JMPM recommended that small ad hoc working groups be established to develop and peer review its contents. FAO/WHO workshops should be organized to identify gaps in the guidance that may require further development. The JMPM also welcomed FAO's link with similar activities developed by OECD (e.g. the IOMC toolbox for decision-making on chemicals). Finally, the JMPM recommended that the toolkit would benefit, in the longer term, from a tool to assess acceptability of risks.

Revision of the International Code of Conduct

The JMPM welcomed the opportunity of a joint meeting with the FAO Committee On Agriculture (COAG) to advise on finalizing the text of the revised International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides (the revised Code).

The JMPM, at the request of the COAG Bureau, welcomed the opportunity to address six remaining technical issues and completed that task.

The JMPM endorsed the technical contents of the revised Code.

The JMPM welcomed the adoption by COAG of the revised Code, acknowledged COAG's recommendation that a guidance document on HHPs be developed urgently to provide succinct guidance to developing countries, and recommended that this be inscribed in its programme of work.

The JMPM recommended that the adoption of the revised Code of Conduct be used by all stakeholders as an opportunity for further advocacy and resource mobilization.

Guidelines in support of the Code of Conduct

Guidelines on microbial pesticides

The JMPM noted with satisfaction the progress made in preparing the *Guidelines on microbial pesticides* and recommended that further comments from its members and observers be included in the drafting process, that the scope of the guidelines be further clarified inter-session, and that the outcome of the international workshops on microbial pest control agents to be held in June 2013 be taken into consideration when finalizing the guidelines.

Guidelines on good labelling practice for pesticides

The JMPM noted the progress made in drafting the *Guidelines on good labelling practice for pesticides* and recommended that the working group take into account the comments and

suggestions detailed elsewhere in this report. The JMPM underlined the urgent need to publish these guidelines and requested that a new draft be circulated to the JMPM and its observers by January 2013.

Guidelines on pesticide legislation

The JMPM noted the progress made in preparing the *Guidelines on pesticide legislation* and recommended that the secretariat take into account the comments and suggestions detailed elsewhere in this report. The JMPM underlined the urgent need to publish these guidelines and requested that a new draft be circulated to the JMPM and observers by January 2013.

Emerging issues

Some members of the JMPM provided information on emerging issues for consideration by FAO and WHO, which should be further developed for discussion at its next session. The JMPM requested that FAO and WHO provide an update on emerging issues at its next session.

Organization of inter-sessional work

The JMPM recognized the difficulties in keeping momentum between sessions and therefore recommended that FAO and WHO organize at least one or two teleconferences during the inter-sessional periods to facilitate continuity of work. In addition, FAO and WHO should establish an Internet-based repository for working documents.

16. Closure of the meeting

Mr Mark Davis, in his closure address, underlined that this Session of the JMPM had resulted in a new revised version of the Code of Conduct, which is an important achievement. He thanked all participants for their valuable inputs in the discussions and noted that the revised Code of Conduct had become a better, stronger, and clearer instrument to support judicious pesticide management. He thanked WHO for their willingness to reschedule the location of meeting, and expressed his appreciation to the chair, co-chair and rapporteurs, and the FAO secretariat of the JMPM.

The 6th FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management was closed by its Chairperson, Ms Kimberly Nesci. She thanked FAO and WHO for organizing the meeting and wished everyone a safe journey home.

Annex 1 – List of participants

FAO PANEL MEMBERS

Mr Amadou Diarra

Département Intrants Agricoles et
Réglementations
Comité Sahélien des Pesticides
Institut du Sahel,
Bamako
Mali
Tel: (+223) 2022 47 06
Fax: (+223) 2022 78 31
E-mail: csp@insah.org

Mr Gu Bao-Gen

Deputy Director General
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals
Ministry of Agriculture (ICAMA)
No. 22, Maizidian Street
Chaoyang District
Beijing 100125
China
Tel: (+86) 10 59 19 4079-6593 7005
Fax: (+86) 10 6502 5929
E-mail: ggbgg868@163.com
gubaogen@agri.gov.cn

Mr David Kapindula

Principal Inspector
Pesticides and Toxic Substances
Zambia Environmental Management
Agency (ZEMA)
Corner of Suez and Church roads
P.O. Box 35131
10101 Lusaka
Zambia
Tel: +260 211 254130/254023/59
Fax: +260 211 254164
Email: dkapindula@zema.org.zm
dkapindula@yahoo.com

Mr Eric Liégeois

European Commission
Avenue d'Auderghem, 45
Office: Brey 11/213
1050 - Brussels
Belgium
E-mail: Eric.LIEGEOIS@ec.europa.eu

Ms Kimberly Nesci

US Environmental Protection Agency
(EPA)
Office of Pesticide Programs (7511P)
Pennsylvania Avenue, 1200, NW
Washington, DC 20460
United States of America
Tel: +703 308 8059
E-mail: nesci.kimberly@epa.gov

Ms Maristella Rubbiani

Head of the Unit
Hazard Evaluation of Preparations and
Mixtures
National Center for Chemicals
Istituto Superiore di Sanità
Viale Regina Elena 299 – 00161
Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 49906140 - 2353
Fax: (+39) 0649902062
E-mail maristella.rubbiani@iss.it

Mr Gary Whitfield

Research and Development Director
Agriculture & Agri-Food Canada
Greenhouse and Processing Crops Research
Centre, R. R. #2
2585 County Road #20
Harrow ON N0R 1G0
Canada
Tel: (+519) 738 1219
E-mail: Gary.Whitfield@AGR.GC.CA

WHO PANEL MEMBERS

Dr Sandhya Kulshrestha
Deputy Director General
Directorate General of Health Services
M/o Health & Family Welfare
West Block, Wing 6
R.K. Puram
New Delhi
India
Telefax: 91-11-26101268
Email: sandhyak@nic.in
or skulsh57@yahoo.co.in

Dr Irma R. Makalinao
Professor
Department of Pharmacology and
Toxicology
College of Medicine
University of the Philippines
No. 547 Pedro Gil St Ermita
Manila 1000
Philippines
Tel:(+63) 521.8251
Email: irmakalinao@gmail.com

Mr Somchai Preechathaveekid
Director
Technical and Policy Administration
Division
Food and Drug Administration - FDA
Ministry of Public Health
Tiwanon Road
Nonthaburi 11000
Thailand
Tel: 662 5907281
Fax: 662 591 8457
Email: psomchai@health.moph.go.th

Dr Hanna-Andrea Rother, Ph.D.
Programme Head - Health Risk
Management
Centre for Occupational & Environmental
Health Research
School of Public Health & Family Medicine
University of Cape Town
Anzio Rd., Observatory 7925
South Africa
Tel: + 27 21 406 6721
Email: andrea.rother@uct.ac.za

Mr Tan Soo Hian
21 Lorong Abang Openg Lima,
Taman Tun Dr. Ismail,
60000 Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia
Tel: +603 7729 6034
E-mail address: tansh@pd.jaring.my

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM (UNEP)

Mr Kaj Madsen
UNEP Chemicals
11-13 chemin des Anémones
CH 1219 Chatelaine
Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: (+41) 22 917 8193
E-mail: kaj.madsen@unep.org

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO- OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (OECD)

Ms Sylvie Poret
Principal Administrator
ENV/EHS
OECD
Marshall Building 0356
2 rue André-Pascal
75016 Paris
France
Tel: (+33-1) 45 24 89 45
Fax: (+33 1) 44 30 61 80
E-mail: Sylvie.PORET@oecd.org

OBSERVERS

Dr Donald Alan Ward

Agricultural Productivity Division
Agvet Chemicals (Domestic and
International)
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and
Forestry
18 Marcus Clarke Street
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Tel: (+61) 06 62724420
E-mail: Donald.Ward@daff.gov.au

AGRO-CARE

Dr Roman Macaya

Vice-President
Agrocare
Apartado 1325-1250
Escazu, Costa Rica
Tel: +506 (2573) 7751/ 506 8705-2383
Email: rmacaya@rimacsa.com

Mr Roberto Muñoz¹⁰

Treasurer
Agrocare
(5147) Córdoba
Argentina
Tel: (+54 3543) 440090
Fax: (+54 3543) 442212
E-mail: rmunoz@genbra.com.ar
robermunoz@yahoo.com

Mr Jürgen Wenzel¹¹

Helm Ag, Hamburg
Manager Regulatory Affairs
Nordkanalstrasse 28
D-20097 Hamburg
Germany
Tel.: (+49) 40 2375-1372
Fax: (+49) 40 2375-1845
E-mail: j.wenzel@helmag.com

CROPLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Mr Bernhard Johnen

Director, International Regulatory Policy,
Crop Protection,
CropLife International
Avenue Louise 326, Box 35
B-1050 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: (+32) 2 542 0410
Tel: (+32) 2 541 1668
E-mail: bernhard.johnen@croplife.org

Mr Richard Brown

CropLife International
c/o Syngenta Crop Protection
Schwarzwaldallee, 215
Basel CH-4002
Switzerland
E-
mail: richard_anthony.brown@syngenta.com
[m](#)

INTERNATIONAL POPS ELIMINATION NETWORK (IPEN)

Ms Meriel Watts
Co-Chari
IPEN Pesticides Working Group
P.O. Box 296, Ostend
Waiheke Island
Auckland 1971
New Zealand
E-mail: merielwatts@xtra.co.nz

INTERNATIONAL BIOCONTROL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION (IBMA)

Mr David Cary
Executive Director
15 Shelford Road
Guildford,
Surrey GU4 8 BL
United Kingdom
E-mail: david.cary@ibma-global.org

¹⁰ On 09-10 October 2012

¹¹ On 11-12 October 2012

PESTICIDE ACTION NETWORK

Mr Keith Tyrell

Director
Pan UK
Development House
56-64 Leonard Street
London, EC2A 4LT
United Kingdom
Tel: (+44) 207 0650905
E-mail: keithtyrell@pan-uk.org

Mr Sarojeni Rengam

Director of PAN Asia Pacific
P.O. Box 1170
10850 Penang
Malaysia
Tel: (+604) 6570271
E-mail: sarojeni.rengam@panap.net

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) OFFICE OF U.S. FOREIGN DISASTER ASSISTANCE (OFDA)

Mr Yeneneh Belayneh,

Senior Technical Advisor for
Pesticides and Pests and
AELGA Project Manager
USAID/DCHA/OFDA
Tel: (+1) 202-254-0226
Fax: (+1) 202-254-0260
E-Mail: ybelayneh@usaid.gov

COAG BUREAU¹²

Ms Sultana Afroz (via Skype)

Deputy Secretary (UN)
Economic Relations Division
Ministry of Finance
Government of the People's Republic of
Bangladesh
E-mail: sultana_afroz@post.harvard.edu

Mr Mario Arvelo Caamaño,

Chair, COAG
Permanent Representative to FAO
Representación Permanente de la
República Dominicana ante la FAO
Via Marco Aurelio, 42 int. B-2
00184 Rome
Italy
E-mail: mario@marioarvelo.com

Mr Mohamed Eltayeb Elfaki Elnor

Embassy of the Republic of the Sudan
Via Panama, 48
00198 Rome
Italy
E-
Mail: permreoffice_sudanembassyrome@yahoo.it

Ms Monique Ouli Ndongo

Secrétaire Général
Ministère de l'Élevage, des Pêches
et des Industries Animales
Yaoundé
Cameroon
E-mail: moniqueoulindongo@yahoo.fr

Mr François Pythoud (via Skype)

François Pythoud, PhD
Vice-chair, COAG
Head
International sustainable agriculture Unit
Department for economic affairs
Federal office of agriculture
Mattenhofstrasse 5
CH-3003 Bern
Switzerland
E-mail: francois.pythoud@blw.admin.ch

Mr Michael V. Michener

Minister Counsellor
United States Mission to the
United Nations Agencies
Via Boncompagni 2
00187 Rome
Italy
E-mail: Michael.Michener@fas.usda.gov

¹² On 10 October only

Mr Matthew Worrell
Minister Counsellor
Embassy of Australia
Via Antonio Bosio, 5
00161 Rome
E-mail: faorep@dfat.gov.au

COAG INVITED PARTICIPANTS¹³

Ms Christina Grieder
Minister, Permanent Representative
Permanent Representation of Switzerland at
FAO, IFAD and WFP
Via Aventina 32
00153 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 8958 151
E-mail: roa.vertretung@eda.admin.ch

Ms Gothami Indikadahena
Embassy of the Democratic Socialist
Republic of Sri Lanka
Permanent Representation to FAO
Via Salaria 322
00198 Rome,
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 8554 560
E-mail: embassy@srilankaembassyrome.org

Embassy of Japan
Via Quintino Sella 60
00187 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 4879 9415
E-mail: fao@ro.mofa.go.jp

COAG SECRETARIAT¹⁴

Mr Robert Guei
Senior Technical Officer
FAO Plant Production
and Protection Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 570 54920
E-mail: robert.guei@fao.org

FAO SECRETARIAT

Mr Shoki Al Dobai
Crop Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for the Near East
11 Al Eslah El Zerai St.
Dokki, Cairo
Egypt
Tel: (+202) 641 4941771
E-mail : Shoki.AIDobai@fao.org

Mr Jan Breithaupt
Agricultural Officer
Pesticide Management
FAO Plant Production
and Protection Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+49) 641 4941771
E-mail: jan.breithaupt@fao.org

Ms Carmen Bullon
Legal Officer
Legal Office
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 570 54162
E-mail: carmen.bullon@fao.org

¹³ On 10 October only

¹⁴ On 10 October only

Mr Mark Davis
Senior Officer
Pesticide Management
FAO Plant Production
and Protection Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 570 55192
E-mail: mark.davis@fao.org

Mr Avetik Nersisyan
Plant Production and Plant Protection
Officer
FAO Regional Office for Europe
and Central Asia
Benzur utca 34
H-1068 Budapest, Hungary
Tel: (+36) 1 461 2000
Fax: (+36) 1 351 7029
E-mail: avetik.nersisyan@fao.org

Ms Marta Pardo
Legal Officer
Legal Office
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 570 53022
E-mail: marta.pardo@fao.org

Mr Yongfan Piao
Senior Plant Protection Officer
Executive Secretary of APPPC
Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (RAP)
39 Phra Atit,
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
66-2-6974268
66-2-6974445 (fax)
E-mail: Yongfan.piao@fao.org

Mr Harold van der Valk
Consultant
Vissersdijk 14
4251 ED Werkendam
The Netherlands
Tel: (+31) 183 500410
E-mail: harold.vandervalk@planet.nl

Mr Harry van der Wulp
Senior Policy Officer
FAO Plant Production
and Protection Division
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome
Italy
Tel: (+39) 06 570 55900
Fax: (+39) 06 570 53057
E-mail: harry.vanderwulp@fao.org

WHO SECRETARIAT

Dr Richard Brown
Technical Officer
Chemical Safety Team
Evidence and Policy on Environmental
Health Unit (EPE)
Department of Public Health and
Environment (PHE)
World Health Organization
Avenue Appia 20
1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland
Tel: +41-22 791.2755
E-mail: brownri@who.int

Ms Anne Mazur
Principal Legal Officer
World Health Organization
Avenue Appia 20
1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland
Tel: (+41) 22 791 2685
Email: mazura@who.int

Dr Rajpal Singh Yadav
Scientist, WHO Pesticide Evaluation
Scheme
Vector Ecology and Management
Department of Control of Neglected
Tropical Diseases
World Health Organization
Avenue Appia 20
1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 791 2961
E-mail: yadavraj@who.int

Dr Morteza Zaim

Coordinator

Vector Ecology and Management

Department of Control of Neglected

Tropical Diseases

World Health Organization

Avenue Appia 20

1211 Geneva 27

Switzerland

Tel: +41 22 791 3841

E-mail: zaimm@who.int

Annex 2 – Agenda

Closed Session

1. Declaration of interest
2. Panel working procedures and programme of work
3. Any other matters

Open Session

4. Opening of the meeting and welcome address
5. Appointment of Chairperson and Rapporteurs
6. Adoption of the agenda
7. Introduction of meeting procedure, working arrangements and housekeeping matters
8. Summary of developments and actions taken after the 5th joint meeting in October 2011.
 - a. Presentations by WHO, FAO and UNEP
 - b. Discussion
9. Preparatory discussions for the JMPM-COAG meeting on updating the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides

Joint COAG-JMPM meeting on updating the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides

10. Updating the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides
 - a. Introductory remarks by the COAG Chair
 - b. Feedback from the 23rd COAG and subsequent actions taken
 - c. Discussion of the new draft of the Code
 - d. Conclusions and recommendations

JMPM continued

11. Highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs)
 - a. Report on Survey of actions taken on HHPs [*document no. 10a*]
 - b. First experiences from the Mozambique HHP project
 - c. Report on ICCM discussions regarding HHPs
12. Pesticide registration
 - a. Implementation of the Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) – Registration Module

- b. Development of the Pesticide Registration Toolkit *[document no. 9b]*
 - c. On-going work on registration capacity development in different regions
13. Draft Guidelines under development
- a. Survey on the use of technical guidelines – follow up actions *[document no. 12 – Introduction]*
 - b. Guidelines on pesticide legislation
 - c. Guidelines on microbial pesticides
 - d. Guidelines on good labelling practice for pesticides
14. Draft Guidelines reviewed in previous meetings and pending finalization – status report.
- e. Guidelines on resistance prevention and management
 - f. Guidelines on data requirements for the registration of pesticides
15. Emerging and priority issues in pesticide management – alerts and advice to FAO and WHO.
16. Any other matters

Closed Session followed by Open Session

- 17. Recommendations
- 18. Closure of meeting