

**SC**

UNEP/POPS/COP.4/16

Distr.: General
4 February 2009**Stockholm Convention
on Persistent Organic
Pollutants**

Original: English

**Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm
Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
Fourth meeting**

Geneva, 4–8 May 2009

Item 5 (e) of the provisional agenda*

**Matters for consideration or action by the Conference of the Parties:
listing chemicals in Annexes A, B or C of the Convention****Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee: relevant
developments for action by the Conference of the Parties****Note by the Secretariat**

1. The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee held its third and fourth meetings in Geneva from 19 to 23 November 2007 and 13 to 17 October 2008, respectively. The meeting reports are contained in documents UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/20 and UNEP/POPS/POPRC.4/15, respectively.
2. The report by the Chair of the Committee, Mr. Reiner Arndt (Germany), contained in annex I to the present note, highlights major outcomes and issues raised at the third and the fourth meetings of the Committee.
3. The following issues are submitted for consideration by the Conference of the Parties.

A. Recommendations for listing new chemicals

4. At its third and fourth meetings, the Committee decided to recommend to the Conference of the Parties the listing of nine chemicals in Annexes A, B or C of the Convention. The recommendations are contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.4/17.
5. Consistent with Articles 21 and 22 of the Convention, the Secretariat circulated the proposals for amendment to the Parties and signatories to the Convention and to the depositary on 29 October 2008, six months in advance of the meeting.
6. Document UNEP/POPS/COP.4/18 contains draft text relevant to the nine new chemicals that the Conference of Parties may wish to consider with a view to amending the Convention's Annexes. A compilation of submissions by Parties of issues that they may wish to raise is contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.4/INF/12.

* UNEP/POPS/COP.4/1.

K0950423 120309

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

B. Terms of reference and procedures of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

7. At its fourth meeting the Committee discussed the provisions in its terms of reference and determined that they would benefit from clarification in some respects. In accordance with paragraph 34 of decision SC-1/7, the Committee at its fourth meeting decided to recommend that the Conference of the Parties should consider revising the terms of reference. The proposed revisions are set forth in annex II to the present note.

8. In reviewing chemicals proposed for listing under the Convention, the Committee follows the procedures established in Articles 8 and 19 of the Convention, in decision SC-1/7 of the Conference of the Parties and the rules of procedure of the Conference of the Parties for issues not covered in decision SC-1/7. Decision SC-1/7 also states that the Committee may establish such arrangements as are necessary to facilitate its work.

9. Since its establishment, the Committee has met four times: in November 2005, 2006 and 2007 and in October 2008. To fulfil its mandate, over time the Committee has established specific procedures, which are summarized in annex III to the present note and describe how Article 8 of the Convention has been implemented by the Committee thus far.

C. Conflicts of interest

10. Paragraph 15 of decision SC-1/7 relates to conflicts of interest and requests members of the Committee and invited experts to sign a declaration of interests as set out in decision SC-1/8 prior to participating in the work of the Committee. Decision SC-1/8 sets out the rules of procedure for preventing and dealing with conflicts of interest on the part of Committee members.

11. Paragraph 7 (j) of decision SC-1/8 indicates that, not later than five years after the adoption of the decision, the Conference of the Parties shall carry out a comprehensive assessment of the implementation of the decision with a view to making such amendments thereto as may be required.

12. During the intersessional period between the third and fourth meetings of the Committee, the Secretariat undertook a review of the conflict of interest declarations submitted by members of the Committee. The Secretariat found that all members had submitted the declarations. Of the declarations of current and former members, a number omitted or incorrectly completed answers to one or more questions. In addition, several members indicated that they had interests in the subject matter of meetings or work in which they were involved that might constitute a real, potential or apparent conflict of interest.

13. The Secretariat contacted those members who had submitted incomplete or incorrectly completed declarations and those indicating potential conflicts of interest and requested them to resubmit their declarations with all necessary information included correctly.

14. Other than the review of the declarations discussed above, no further assessment of the implementation of decision SC-1/8 has yet been undertaken.

15. The Committee considered the results of the review prepared by the Secretariat, took note of the information provided, decided to meet in closed session before the start of each meeting of the Committee to discuss any issues related to conflicts of interest and agreed to the text of a draft revised form for the declaration of conflicts of interest of members of the Committee set out in the annex to decision POPRC-4/6, which is set out in annex IV to the present note.

D. Membership

16. Consistent with paragraphs 7–9 of the Committee's terms of reference, and to promote an orderly rotation of membership, 14 of the 31 members of the Committee were nominated for an initial term of two years and were replaced or extended on 4 May 2008 after having completed their terms of office.

17. After the initial appointments, each member serves for a term of four years from the date of appointment, and for no more than two consecutive terms.

18. The remaining 17 members of each region were nominated for an initial term of four years, which will expire on 4 May 2010, between the fourth and the fifth meetings of the Conference of the Parties. Annex V to the present note contains a list of Committee members and their terms of office, including those whose terms of office expire in May 2010. The Conference of the Parties may wish to adopt a new list of Governments who should designate experts for the Committee so that the vacancies created by the outgoing members may be filled.

19. Furthermore, during the intersessional period between the third and the fourth meetings of the Conference of the Parties, the following new members were nominated by their Governments to fill the places of members who had been unable to complete their full terms: Mr. Jope Rinabobo Davetanivalu (Fiji) to replace Ms. Razia Zariff; Ms. Camila Arruda Boechat (Brazil) to replace Ms. Adriana Maximiano; Mr. Mohammed Khashashneh (Jordan) to replace Mr. Ziad Abu Kaddourah and Ms. Maria Delvin (Sweden) to replace Mr. Bo Wahlström.

20. The curricula vitae of all members designated after the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties are contained in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/INF/4 and UNEP/POPS/POPRC.4/INF/18.

21. Ms. Kyunghye Choi (Republic of Korea) was elected vice-chair.

E. Support for effective participation in the work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

22. In its decision SC-3/9, the Conference of the Parties requested the Secretariat to undertake activities to assist Parties that were developing countries or countries with economies in transition to participate effectively in the work of the committee, as listed in paragraph 19 of document UNEP/POPS/COP.3/12.

23. In response to this request, the Secretariat:

(a) Prepared a handbook on the work of the Committee and on what Parties and stakeholders needed to do to contribute efficiently to its work (contained in the document UNEP/POPS/COP.4/INF/9).

(b) Developed a methodology for the identification and compilation of information;

(c) Organized five regional workshops in the Latin American and Caribbean region, the South-East Asian region, the African region, the Middle East region and the Central and Eastern Europe region to enhance the participation of Committee members, focal points and national stakeholders in the review process (the reports of the workshops are contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.4/INF/8);

(d) Organized national workshops in Cambodia and Sierra Leone with the technical assistance of the Chemicals Branch of the United Nations Environment Programme Division of Technology, Industry and Economics to improve access to technical and scientific information.

24. In its decision POPRC-4/8 the Committee noted the positive feedback on the activities and their contribution towards enabling developing countries and countries with economies in transition to participate fully in the review process of chemicals being proposed for listing in Annexes A, B or C of the Convention.

25. The Committee therefore requested the intersessional working group to continue activities on effective participation as outlined in the decision, including the development of a condensed version ("pocket guide") of the handbook in the six official languages of the United Nations. The activities are listed in the workplan contained in annex VI to the present note. The Committee invited the Secretariat to make the handbook available electronically through the clearing-house mechanism of the Stockholm Convention and to continue to implement, subject to the availability of funding, further regional workshops on effective participation in the Committee. It invited Parties and observers in a position to do so to contribute and provide financial support for the activities on effective participation and invited the Conference of the Parties to endorse the handbook on effective participation, to provide financial resources to implement activities on effective participation and to request the Secretariat to develop a resource kit providing information on the Stockholm Convention and the Committee.

F. Workplans for chemicals under consideration by the Committee

26. At its fourth meeting, the Committee examined the proposal to list endosulfan in Annex A, B or C of the Convention and applied the screening criteria listed in Annex D in a flexible and transparent way. In decision POPRC-4/5 the Committee decided that it was satisfied that the screening criteria had been fulfilled for endosulfan and decided to establish an ad hoc working group to prepare a draft risk profile in accordance with Annex E to the Convention. In addition, it invited Parties and observers to submit to the Secretariat the information specified in Annex E before 9 January 2009.

27. To prepare the draft risk profile, the Committee adopted the workplan set forth in annex VI to the present note.

28. The draft risk profile for endosulfan will be considered for possible adoption by the Committee at its fifth meeting, which is scheduled to take place from 12 to 16 October 2009 in Geneva.

29. The Committee will also have on the agenda for its fifth meeting further consideration of the draft risk profile of short-chained chlorinated paraffins. It was also agreed that experts on toxicology and ecotoxicology should be invited to the Committee's next meeting to assist it in its deliberations.

30. The Committee exchanged views on the proposal to list hexabromocyclododecane in Annex A, B or C of the Convention. The Committee noted the need for further information on the environmental persistence of hexabromocyclododecane and agreed that an expert on persistence should be invited to attend the next meeting of the Committee to assist it in its considerations.

31. The fourth meeting of the Committee also established intersessional working groups on:

- (a) Support for effective participation in the work of the Committee (see workplan in annex VI to the present note);
- (b) Development of guidance documents on alternative products;
- (c) Toxicological interactions.

32. A document on guidance on feasible flame-retardant alternatives to pentabromodiphenyl ether was developed between the third and fourth meetings of the Committee. At its fourth meeting, the Committee decided to establish an intersessional working group to develop the document further. The document has been revised by the working group and published on the Stockholm Convention website. It can be found in document UNEP/POPS/COP.4/INF/24.

G. Possible action by the Conference of the Parties

33. The Conference of the Parties may wish:

- (a) To take note of the report of the third and fourth meetings of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee;
- (b) To take note of the Chair's report as set out in annex I to the present note;
- (c) To take note of the procedures of the Committee as set out in annex III to the present note;
- (d) To encourage Parties that wish to submit proposals for listing a chemical in Annex A, B or C of the Convention to submit such proposals to the Secretariat at least 20 weeks before the meeting of the Committee at which they will be discussed;
- (e) To adopt, with any amendments, the amendments proposed by the Committee to its terms of reference;
- (f) To adopt, with any amendments, the amendments proposed by the Committee to the procedures of dealing with conflicts of interest;
- (g) To adopt a list of Parties who would be invited to nominate new Committee members for a term of office commencing on 5 May 2010;
- (h) To confirm the appointment of the new members of the Committee, whose names and relevant qualifications are contained in documents UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/INF/4 and UNEP/POS/POPRC.4/INF/18;
- (i) To take note of the standard workplans adopted by the Committee;
- (j) To request the Secretariat to continue the activities to assist Parties that are developing countries or countries with economies in transition and to report on the results of the activities to the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting;
- (k) To provide financial resources to support activities for the effective participation in the work of the Committee;
- (l) To invite Parties and observers in a position to do so to contribute the necessary resources to support members of the Committee to contribute effectively to its work and to support Parties that are developing countries or countries with economies in transition in providing information to assist the Committee in its work;
- (m) To endorse the handbook for effective participation in the work of the Committee and to recommend to Parties that they make use of it;
- (n) To request the Secretariat to develop a resource kit providing information on the Stockholm Convention and the Committee;
- (o) To take note of the guidance on feasible flame-retardant alternatives to pentabromodiphenyl ether.

Annex I

Report by the Chair of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

A. Introduction

1. The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee is a subsidiary body to the Stockholm Convention established pursuant to paragraph 6 (d) of Article 19 of the Convention. The Committee's mandate is to review scientifically chemicals proposed for listing in Annexes A, B or C and to make recommendations to the Conference of the Parties. Article 8 of the Convention describes the review process for new chemicals and Annexes D, E and F specify the information required for the review. The Committee's terms of reference were agreed upon in decision SC-1/7 of the Conference of the Parties in 2005.

B. Current status

2. So far, the Committee has met four times to review 12 chemicals that have been proposed by Parties to the Convention:

(a) Nine chemicals have undergone the full review process, including screening and the development of a risk profile, a risk management evaluation and a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties;

(b) Three other chemicals remain under review: two in the risk profile phase (short-chained chlorinated paraffins and endosulfan); and one in the screening phase (hexabromocyclododecane).

3. For short-chained chlorinated paraffins, there were diverse views expressed on their nature, characteristics and effects in the environment, with some members questioning whether the draft risk profile was ready to be adopted. As no consensus was reached on adoption of the draft risk profile, it was agreed to postpone further consideration of this document to the next meeting of the Committee to allow the members time to evaluate the information further. It was also agreed that experts on toxicology and ecotoxicology would be invited to the Committee's next meeting to assist it in its deliberations.

4. At its fourth meeting, the Committee had before it a proposal to list endosulfan in Annexes A, B or C of the Convention. Several members questioned whether the proposal to list endosulfan satisfied the screening criteria of Annex D. After lengthy discussions, the Committee decided to vote on that issue. Twenty-one members of the Committee voted that the Committee should adopt the decision that the Annex D criterion had been met, three members abstained and four members were no longer present in the meeting room. The Committee adopted decision POPRC-4/5, by which it declared itself satisfied that the screening criteria had been fulfilled for endosulfan and decided to prepare a draft risk profile during the intersessional period.

5. At its fourth meeting, the Committee had before it a proposal for listing hexabromocyclododecane in Annex A of the Stockholm Convention. As the relevant documentation for the proposal had not been made available at least three months in advance of the meeting, however, the proposal could not be evaluated by the Committee. The Committee therefore decided to not take any decision on the document, but to have only an exchange of views. During the discussions, there was some disagreement as to whether hexabromocyclododecane met the Convention's persistence criterion. The Committee therefore agreed that an expert on persistence should be invited to attend its next meeting.

6. In addition to reviewing chemicals proposed for addition to the Convention's annexes, the Committee has developed and implemented a programme on support for effective participation in the Committee (see UNEP/POPS/COP.4/INF/8 and UNEP/POPS/COP.4/INF/9) to enable developing countries and countries with economies in transition to participate fully in the review process.

7. Furthermore, during its third and fourth meetings, the Committee discussed the following issues related to its reviews of chemicals and recommendations to the Conference of the Parties:

- (a) Naming of commercial products and mixtures (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/3);
- (b) Listing of precursors (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/4);
- (c) Social and economic considerations (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/INF/6);
- (d) Environmental transport and modelling (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/INF/7);

- (e) Bioaccumulation assessment (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/2 and UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/INF/8);
- (f) Toxic interactions between persistent organic pollutants (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.4/INF/3);
- (g) Experiences in decision-making for risk profiles (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.4/INF/11);
- (h) Reductive debromination of bromo-aromatics (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.4/INF/12);
- (i) Flame-retardant alternatives to pentabromodiphenyl ether (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.4/INF/13).

C. Procedural issues

8. At the fourth meeting of the Committee, several procedural issues were raised.
9. *Revision of the terms of reference of the Committee:* The Committee discussed the need for revisions to its terms of reference relative to the distribution and translation of documents to be examined by the Committee (see annex II to the present note).
10. *Procedures for submissions of proposals to list chemicals:* Annex III to the present note provides information on the importance of timely information of proposals to list chemicals under the Convention. Proposals have to be submitted 20 weeks in advance of the meeting at which they will be discussed to ensure adequate time to prepare for and distribute the new proposals three months in advance of the meeting.
11. *Processes for dealing with proposals and postponing work on a proposed substance:* At its fourth meeting, the Committee had before it a proposal to list endosulfan in Annexes A, B or C of the Convention. The proposal had already been submitted at the third meeting but, as vital information required for the consideration of endosulfan had not been made available at that time, the Committee had agreed to suspend consideration of the chemical until the fourth meeting. Some members argued that the Committee should not take up the proposal to list endosulfan because Article 8 did not provide for suspending consideration of proposals.
12. At the request of the Chair, the United Nations Environment Programme Senior Legal Officer, acting as the Legal Advisor for the Convention, explained that as the Committee had not examined the proposal and applied the screening criteria of Annex D, but had merely determined that it required additional information, the Committee had not yet completed the action required under paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention and reached the point at which it had to exercise one of the two options required under paragraph 4 of Article 8. Furthermore, he said, there was nothing in the Convention that prohibited the Committee from deferring its consideration of the proposal from one meeting to another. Another member of the Committee pointed out that under rule 16 of the rules of procedure of the Conference of the Parties, which applied mutatis mutandis to the Committee, any item on the agenda of a meeting that was not completed at that meeting was automatically carried over to the agenda of the next meeting. In addition, the agenda for the fourth meeting of the Committee, which included a review of the proposal to list endosulfan, had been adopted by the Committee without opposition.
13. *Votes on procedural issues:* As the members of the Committee were unable to achieve consensus on whether to take up the proposal to list endosulfan at its fourth meeting, the Chair ruled that they would vote, under paragraph 2 of rule 45 of the rules of procedure, on whether the Committee should take up the proposal to list endosulfan at the fourth meeting. Twenty-four members of the Committee voted that the Committee should consider the proposal, two members voted that it should not do so and two members abstained.
14. *Use of additional information submitted at the meeting of the Committee:* During the Committee's discussion of endosulfan, one member said that the Committee could not properly consider the draft decision and evaluation because it had been based in part on a proposal provided during the current meeting by the member from the European Union, as well as on information provided after the initial proposal by the European Union, the Party which had originally proposed the listing of endosulfan. Such information, he argued, was not part of the proposal to list endosulfan and therefore could not be considered by the Committee. He said that paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Convention required the Committee to consider only the proposal itself and the summary of the proposal.
15. The United Nations Environment Programme Senior Legal Officer, acting as Legal Advisor for the Convention, explained that, consistent with its long-standing practice, the Committee could in fact consider information provided by members of the Committee such as that provided by the member from

the European Union. Paragraph 3 of Article 8, he noted, required the Committee to “examine the proposal and apply the screening criteria specified in Annex D in a flexible and transparent way, taking all information provided into account in an integrative and balanced manner”. The Convention thus made it clear that the Committee was to take all information into account, not just information found in the proposal as originally submitted by its proponent, in an integrative and balanced manner, as applied through the working practice of the Committee.

16. Furthermore, the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention had informed the Committee members in the invitation letter dated 14 July 2008 that if they wished to provide additional or new data on any chemical at the meeting, they should also provide a copy of the full reference documentation for review by Committee Members.

17. *Voting on issues of substance:* Several rounds of discussion on endosulfan in plenary, working groups and drafting groups had yielded some progress but no consensus on whether the substance fulfilled the four screening criteria of Annex D to the Convention. In the face of the disagreement among the members, the Chair suggested suspending consideration of endosulfan until the Committee’s fifth meeting. While some members of the Committee supported the Chair’s proposal, most said that the Annex D criterion had been met and that the Committee should vote on whether to move forward to the Annex E phase. Several members expressed concern about proceeding to a vote. One member argued that according to paragraph 1 of rule 45 of the rules of procedure, issues of substance could not be resolved by a vote.

18. At the request of the Chair, the United Nations Environment Programme Senior Legal Officer, acting as the Legal Advisor for the Convention, clarified the process for voting. He indicated that Article 19, paragraph 6 (c) of the Convention stated that if all efforts to reach consensus had been exhausted then recommendations of the Committee could be adopted by a two-thirds majority of those members present and voting and that the article encompassed any decisions of the Committee leading up to its final recommendations. One member expressed reservations about this legal opinion. The Chair then ruled in accordance with the advice of the Senior Legal Officer that, as the members of the Committee were unable to achieve consensus, they would vote on whether endosulfan satisfied the criteria specified in Annex D and should move to the more rigorous risk profile phase as specified under Annex E.

19. *Achieving consensus by “every effort”:* According to Article 19, paragraph 6 (c) of the Convention, the Committee “shall make every effort to adopt its recommendations by consensus. If all efforts at consensus have been exhausted, and no consensus reached, such recommendation shall as a last resort be adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of the members present and voting”. At its fourth meeting, the Committee decided to vote on two issues: whether to proceed with the proposal to discuss the listing of endosulfan and whether the proposal satisfied the criteria specified in Annex D and could therefore pass on to the risk profile development phase. Although none of these decisions concerned a recommendation on listing new chemicals by the Committee to the Conference of the Parties, the Committee would like to receive guidance from the Conference of the Parties on what is meant by “every effort”.

Annex II

Revision to the terms of reference of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee proposed by the Committee at its fourth meeting (decision POPRC-4/7)

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee,

Having discussed at its fourth meeting the provisions of its terms of reference pertaining to the distribution and translation of documents to be examined by the Committee and determined that they would benefit from clarification in certain respects,

Recommends to the Conference of the Parties that it amend the Committee's terms of reference as follows:

- (a) Paragraph 27 should be amended to read:
“Proposals for listing chemicals in Annex A, B or C shall be distributed at least three months in advance of meetings. Other documents shall be distributed at least six weeks in advance of meetings.”
- (b) A new paragraph 27 bis should be added, reading:
“A Party proposing the listing of a chemical to Annex A, B or C of the Convention shall provide to the Secretariat, no later than five months in advance of the meeting at which it is discussed, a proposal consisting of a letter from the proposing Party, documents supporting the proposal and a summary in English of the documents supporting the proposal of up to 20 pages in length.”
- (c) Paragraph 31 should be amended to read:
“For practical reasons, only the major resource documents for a meeting will be translated into the six official languages of the United Nations and distributed at least six weeks in advance of the meeting. The term “major resource documents” means the summary in English of the documents supporting the proposal for adding a chemical to Annex A, B or C of the Convention, the risk profile, the risk management evaluation and any report or recommendation for the meeting.”
- (d) A new paragraph 31 bis should be added, reading:
“Proposals for listing chemicals in Annex A, B or C shall be distributed at least three months in advance of meetings in any official language of the United Nations in which they are submitted to the secretariat. The summary in English of the documents supporting the proposals shall be translated into the six official languages of the United Nations and distributed at least six weeks before meetings.”

Annex III

Summary of the procedure for submission and review of proposals for listing new chemicals in Annex A, B, or C of the Stockholm Convention in accordance with Article 8 of the Convention

A. Submission of a proposal for listing a chemical

1. Paragraph 1 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention states: “A Party may submit a proposal to the Secretariat for listing a chemical in Annexes A, B and/or C. The proposal shall contain the information specified in Annex D. In developing a proposal, a Party may be assisted by other Parties and/or by the Secretariat.”
2. In order to ensure adequate time to prepare for and distribute the new proposals three months in advance of the meeting at which they will be discussed, the proposals have to be submitted to the Secretariat 20 weeks before the meeting of the Committee.
3. Bulky proposals should be accompanied by a summary in English of up to 20 pages including the main data and reasons for concern. The proposal of no more than 20 pages or a summary of the proposal of no more than 20 pages will be made available in the six official languages of the United Nations. Supporting information will be presented at the Committee’s meeting as an information document in English only.
4. At its second meeting, the Committee considered approaches to listing isomers or groups of isomers of chemicals proposed for listing in Annexes A, B and/or C of the Convention (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.2/3, UNEP/POPS/POPRC.2/17).
5. At its second meeting, the Committee considered approaches to listing chemicals, the transformation products of which are chemicals proposed for listing in Annexes A, B or C of the Convention (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.2/4, UNEP/POPS/POPRC.2/17). At its third meeting, the Committee considered approach to listing of precursors (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/4, UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/20).
6. At its third meeting, the Committee considered the naming of commercial products and mixtures for the purpose of listing substances under Annexes A, B or C of the Convention (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/3, UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/20).

B. Secretariat’s verification of the proposal

7. Paragraph 2 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention states: “The Secretariat shall verify whether the proposal contains the information specified in Annex D. If the Secretariat is satisfied that the proposal contains the information so specified, it shall forward the proposal to the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee.”
8. The Secretariat verifies that it contains the required information but does not evaluate the contents. The results of the verification are presented as an information document.
9. The Secretariat posts the proposal on the website of the Convention in the original language of submission. Parties and Committee members will be informed of the submission three months in advance of the Committee’s meeting. The proposal in six official United Nations languages will be made available six weeks in advance of the meeting.

C. Annex D screening

10. Paragraph 3 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention states: “The Committee shall examine the proposal and apply the screening criteria specified in Annex D in a flexible and transparent way, taking all information provided into account in an integrative and balanced manner.”
11. With respect to its evaluation of a proposed chemical, the Committee is only able to consider information and documents with full references which are readily available for evaluation by members at the meeting. The Committee may defer consideration of a proposed chemical to the following meeting for reasons it considers justified, e.g., lack of information, lack of time, etc.
12. Paragraph 4 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention states: “If the Committee decides that:

(a) It is satisfied that the screening criteria have been fulfilled, it shall, through the Secretariat, make the proposal and the evaluation of the Committee available to all Parties and observers and invite them to submit the information specified in Annex E”.

13. The Secretariat posts the proposal and the result of the Annex D evaluation on the website of the Convention after the meeting.

D. Annex E information request

14. Paragraph 6 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention states: “Where the Committee has decided that the screening criteria have been fulfilled, or the Conference of the Parties has decided that the proposal should proceed, the Committee shall further review the proposal, taking into account any relevant additional information received, and shall prepare a draft risk profile in accordance with Annex E. It shall, through the Secretariat, make that draft available to all Parties and observers, collect technical comments from them and, taking those comments into account, complete the risk profile.”

15. The Committee establishes a working group for the development of a draft risk profile for each chemical at the meeting. The working group prepares the draft during the intersessional period according to the workplan agreed upon at the meeting.

16. Parties may submit information specified in Annex E as well as comments on the draft, posted by the Secretariat on its website, in any of the six official United Nations languages. The rest of the working language is English only.

17. Finalization and adoption of the risk profile takes place at a meeting of the POPs Review Committee. All meeting documents, including the completed risk profile, and meeting decisions are posted on the website of the Convention after the meeting.

E. Annex F information request

18. Paragraph 7 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention states: “If, on the basis of the risk profile conducted in accordance with Annex E, the Committee decides:

(a) That the chemical is likely as a result of its long-range environmental transport to lead to significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects such that global action is warranted, the proposal shall proceed. Lack of full scientific certainty shall not prevent the proposal from proceeding. The Committee shall, through the Secretariat, invite information from all Parties and observers relating to the considerations specified in Annex F. It shall then prepare a risk management evaluation that includes an analysis of possible control measures for the chemical in accordance with that Annex”.

19. The Committee establishes a working group for the development of a draft risk management evaluation for each chemical which meets the conditions of Paragraph 7(a) of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention. The working group prepares the draft during the intersessional period according to the workplan agreed upon at the meeting.

20. Parties may submit information specified in Annex F as well as comments on the draft, posted by the Secretariat on its website, in any of the six official United Nations languages. The rest of the working language is English only.

21. Finalization and adoption of the Risk Management Evaluation takes place at a meeting of the POPs Review Committee. All meeting documents, including the completed risk management evaluation, and meeting decisions are posted on the website of the Convention after the meeting.

F. Recommendations by the Committee

22. Paragraph 9 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention states: “The Committee shall, based on the risk profile referred to in paragraph 6 and the risk management evaluation referred to in paragraph 7 (a) or paragraph 8, recommend whether the chemical should be considered by the Conference of the Parties for listing in Annexes A, B and/or C. The Conference of the Parties, taking due account of the recommendations of the Committee, including any scientific uncertainty, shall decide, in a precautionary manner, whether to list the chemical, and specify its related control measures, in Annexes A, B and/or C.”

23. For each chemical which meets the conditions of paragraph 9 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention the Secretariat sends a notification of the Committee’s recommendations as well as the results of its evaluation to the Parties in six languages, six months in advance to the next Conference of the Parties.

Annex IV

Revised form for the declaration of conflicts of interest proposed at the fourth meeting of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee (decision POPRC-4/6)

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

1. *Takes* note of the information provided in the Secretariat note on preventing and dealing with conflicts of interest on the part of members of the Committee;¹
2. *Decides* to meet in closed session before the start of each meeting of the Committee to discuss any issues related to conflicts of interest;
3. *Agrees* to the text of the draft revised form for the declaration of conflicts of interest of members of the Committee set out in the annex to the current decision;
4. *Requests* the Secretariat to provide to the Conference of the Parties at its fourth meeting information on its analysis of the declaration of conflict of interest form, submitted by members of the Committee, to enable the Conference of the Parties to assess the effectiveness of the rules of procedure for preventing and dealing with conflicts of interest relating to the activities of the Committee, contained in decision SC-1/8.

Annex to decision POPRC-4/6

DRAFT REVISED FORM FOR THE DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OF MEMBERS

Name: _____ **Designating Government:** _____

Term of office: 2008–2012

Have you or your partner any financial or other interest in the subject matter of any meeting or work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee in which you will be involved that might be considered as constituting a real, potential or apparent conflict of interest? If yes, please give details in the box below.

Yes: No:

Do you have, or have you had during the past four years, an employment or other professional relationship with any entity directly involved in the production, manufacture, distribution or sale of chemicals or pesticides or directly representing the interests of any such entity? If yes, please give details in the box below.

Yes: No:

1. Type of interest, e.g. patent, shares, employment, association, payment (including details on any compound, work, etc.)	2. Name of commercial entity	3. Belongs to you, partner or unit?	4. Current interest? (or year ceased)

¹ UNEP/POPS/POPRC.4/3.

Is there anything else that could affect your objectivity or independence with respect to any meeting or work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee in which you will be involved, or the perception by others of your objectivity or independence? If yes, please give details in the box below.

Yes: No:

Declaration:

I hereby declare that the disclosed information is correct and that no other situation of real, potential or apparent conflict of interest is known to me. I undertake to inform you of any change in these circumstances, including if an issue arises during any meeting or the conduct of any work.

I hereby declare that I shall regulate my conduct in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 3 and 4 of decision SC-1/8 of the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention.

Signature

Date

Annex V

List of members of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

Country	Expert	Term	
		Start	End
Armenia	Ms. Anahit Aleksandryan	2006	2010
Australia	Prof. Ian Rae	2006	2010
Brazil	Ms. Camila Arruda Boechat ¹	2006	2010
Bulgaria	Mr. Ivan Panayotov Dombalov	2008	2012
Burkina Faso	Mr. Désiré Ouédraogo	2006	2010
Cambodia	Mr. Ken Choviran	2008	2012
Canada	Dr. Robert Chénier	2006	2010
Chad	Mr. Abderaman Mahamat Abderaman	2006	2012
Chile	Mr. Ricardo Barra	2008	2012
China	Prof. Jianxin Hu	2006	2010
Czech Republic	Prof. Dr. Ivan Holoubek	2006	2010
Ecuador	Dr. Alfredo Cueva	2006	2010
France	Mr. Sylvain Bintein	2008	2012
Germany	Dr. Reiner Arndt (Chair)	2006	2010
Ghana	Mr. John Pwamang	2008	2012
Honduras	Ms. Mirtha Ferrary	2008	2012
India	Dr. G. K. Pandey	2008	2012
Japan	Prof. Masaru Kitano	2006	2010
Jordan	Dr. Mohamad Khashashneh ²	2006	2010
Mauritius	Mr. Mohammad Aslam Yadallee	2006	2012
Mexico	Dr. Mario Yarto	2006	2010
Morocco	Dr. Farah Bouqartacha	2006	2010
Portugal	Ms. Maria da Conceição Machado Alvim Ferraz	2008	2012
Republic of Korea	Ms. Kyunghee Choi (Vice-chair)	2008	2012
Sierra Leone	Dr. Thomas Brima Rick Yormah	2006	2010
South Africa	Prof. Henk Bouwman	2006	2010
Sweden	Ms. Maria Devlin ³	2006	2010
Switzerland	Ms. Bettina Hitzfeld	2008	2012
Syrian Arab Republic	Mr. Fouad Elok	2008	2012
Thailand	Dr. Jarupong Boon-Long	2006	2010
Togo	Mr. Sanda Komla	2008	2012

1 Ms. Camila Arruda Boechat was designated in 2008 replacing Ms. Amarilis Neder.

2 Dr. Mohamad Khashashneh was designated in 2007 replacing Dr. Ziad Mahmoud Abu Kaddourah.

3 Ms. Maria Delvin was designated in 2008 replacing Dr. Bo Wahlström.

Annex VI

A. Workplan for the preparation of draft risk profiles (2007–2008)

Scheduled date	Period from previous activity (weeks)	Activity (for each chemical under review)
23 November 2007	-	The Committee establishes an ad hoc working group.
27 November 2007	<1	The Secretariat requests Parties and observers to provide information specified in Annex E for development of draft risk profiles.
15 January 2008	7	The Secretariat sends a reminder to Parties and observers regarding the request for information specified in Annex E .
5 February 2008	3	Parties and observers submit Annex E information to the Secretariat.
4 March 2008	4	The working group chair and drafter complete the first draft . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafter prepares the first draft and sends it to the chair: 26 February 2008 • Chair sends the first draft to the working group: 4 March 2008
25 March 2008	3	The working group members provide comments on the first draft to the chair and drafter.
8 April 2008	2	The working group chair and drafter complete review of the first comments from the working group and complete the second draft . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafter prepares the second draft and sends it to the chair: 4 April 2008 • Chair sends the second draft to the Secretariat: 8 April 2008
11 April 2008	<1	The Secretariat distributes the second draft to Parties and observers for comments.
16 May 2008	5	Parties and observers submit their comments to the Secretariat.
3 June 2008	2	The working group chair and drafter review the Party and observer comments and complete the third draft . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafter prepares the third draft and sends it to the chair: 30 May 2008 • Chair sends the third draft to the working group: 3 June 2008
17 June 2008	2	The working group members provide final comments on the third draft to the chair and drafter.
1 July 2008	2	The working group chair and drafter review the final comments and complete the final draft . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafter prepares the final draft and sends it to the chair: 27 June 2008 • Chair sends the final draft to the Secretariat: 1 July 2008
4 July 2008	<1	The Secretariat sends the final draft to Conference Services for editing and translation.
27 August 2008	7	Conference Services completes editing and translation .
1 September 2008	<1	The Secretariat distributes the final draft risk profiles in the six official United Nations languages.
13–17 October 2008	6	Fourth meeting of the Committee

B. Workplan for the preparation of draft risk management evaluation (2007–2008)

Scheduled date	Period from previous activity (weeks)	Activity (for each chemical under review)
23 November 2007	-	The Committee establishes an ad hoc working group.
27 November 2007	<1	The Secretariat requests Parties and observers to provide information specified in Annex F for the development of draft risk management evaluations.
15 January 2008	7	The Secretariat sends a reminder to Parties and observers regarding the request for information specified in Annex F .
5 February 2008	3	Parties and observers submit Annex F information to the Secretariat.
4 March 2008	4	The working group chair and drafter complete the first draft . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafter prepares the first draft and sends it to the chair: 26 February 2008 • Chair sends the first draft to the working group: 4 March 2008
25 March 2008	3	The working group members provide comments on the first draft to the chair and drafter.
8 April 2008	2	The working group chair and drafter complete review of the first comments from the working group and complete the second draft . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafter prepares the second draft and sends it to the chair: 4 April 2008 • Chair sends the second draft to the Secretariat: 8 April 2008
11 April 2008	<1	The Secretariat distributes the second draft to Parties and observers for comments.
16 May 2008	5	Parties and observers submit their comments to the Secretariat.
3 June 2008	2	The working group chair and drafter review the Party and observer comments and complete the third draft . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafter prepares the third draft and sends it to the chair: 30 May 2008 • Chair sends the third draft to the working group: 3 June 2008
17 June 2008	2	The working group members provide final comments on the third draft to the chair and drafter.
1 July 2008	2	The working group chair and drafter review the final comments and complete the final draft . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drafter prepares the final draft and sends it to the chair: 27 June 2008 • Chair sends the final draft to the Secretariat: 1 July 2008
4 July 2008	<1	The Secretariat sends the final draft to Conference Services for editing and translation.
27 August 2008	7	Conference Services completes editing and translation .
1 September 2008	<1	The Secretariat distributes the final draft risk profiles in the six official United Nations languages.
13–17 October 2008	6	Fourth meeting of the Committee

C. Workplan for the preparation of draft risk profiles during the period between the fourth and fifth meetings of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee (2008–2009)

Scheduled date	Period from previous activity (weeks)	Activity (for each chemical under review)
17 October 2008	-	The Committee establishes an ad hoc working group.
24 October 2008	<1	The Secretariat requests Parties and observers to provide information specified in <i>Annex E</i> .
9 January 2009	11	Parties and observers submit <i>Annex E</i> information to the Secretariat. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat sends a reminder to Parties and observers regarding the request for information: 12 December
3 March 2009	7	The working group chair and drafter complete the <i>first draft</i> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drafter prepares the first draft and sends it to the chair: 27 February. Chair sends the first draft to the working group: 3 March.
17 March 2009	2	The working group members provide <i>comments</i> to the chair and drafter.
7 April 2009	3	The working group chair and drafter complete review of the first comments from the working group and complete the <i>second draft</i> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drafter prepares the draft and sends it to the chair: 4 April. Chair sends the draft to the Secretariat: 7 April.
10 April 2009	<1	The Secretariat distributes the second draft to Parties and observers for comments.
26 May 2009	7	Parties and observers submit their <i>comments</i> to the Secretariat.
9 June 2009	2	The working group chair and drafter review the Party and observer comments and complete the <i>third draft</i> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drafter prepares the draft and sends it to the chair: 5 June. Chair sends the draft to the working group: 9 June.
23 June 2009	2	The working group members provide <i>final comments</i> to the chair and drafter.
7 July 2009	2	The working group chair and drafter review the final comments and complete the <i>final draft</i> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drafter prepares the final draft and sends it to the chair: 3 July Chair sends the final draft to the Secretariat: 7 July.
10 July 2009	<1	The Secretariat sends the final draft to Conference Services for editing and translation.
28 August 2009	7	Conference Services completes <i>editing and translation</i> .
31 August 2009	<1	The Secretariat <i>distributes the final draft</i> risk profiles in the six official United Nations languages.
12–16 October 2009	6	Fifth meeting of the Committee

D. Workplan for the intersessional working group on effective participation (2008–2009)

Revise the draft handbook based on comments received during the regional workshops and at the Committee's fourth meeting in October 2008, as well as comments received from Parties and observers	November 2008
Distribute the revised version to the intersessional working group for final comments	December 2008
Edit final draft	January 2009
Develop additional guidance and an explanatory note for Annex E and Annex F for consideration by the Committee at its fifth meeting	January–June 2009
Facilitate the implementation of regional workshops on effective participation	Until October 2009
Work on condensed version ("pocket guide") of the handbook	March–June 2009
Launch the handbook on effective participation during a side event at the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties	May 2009
Invite Parties and observers to provide comments on the pocket guide by 30 June 2009	June 2009
Revise the pocket guide according to the comments received	July 2009
Present the pocket guide to the Committee at its fifth meeting	October 2009
