UNITED NATIONS

UNEP

SC

UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/10

Distr.: General
18 November 2015

Original: English

Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee
Eleventh meeting
Rome, 19–23 October 2015

Report of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee on the work of its eleventh meeting

I. Opening of the meeting

1. The eleventh meeting of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee was held at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, Rome, from 19 to 23 October 2015. Ms. Estefania Moreira (Brazil), Chair of the Committee, declared the meeting open at 2.05 p.m. on Monday, 19 October 2015, welcoming the members of the Committee and observers. She invited Mr. Rolph Payet, Executive Secretary of the Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, to deliver his opening remarks.

2. In his opening remarks, Mr. Payet stressed that the Committee's role in conducting a full, fair and transparent evaluation of proposals to include additional chemicals in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Stockholm Convention was key to the effectiveness of the Stockholm Convention and also contributed to the success of the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and other multilateral environmental agreements. The Committee's rigorous scientific evaluations, he said, contributed to the enhancement of the science-policy interface, to which the conferences of the parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions in 2015 had attached particular importance, and to the environmentally sound management of chemicals and wastes throughout their life cycles. In view of the central place of the sound management of chemicals and wastes in the newly adopted Sustainable Development Goals, the work of the Committee, which benefitted from the additional expertise provided by increasingly active observers from industry and environmental non-governmental organizations, would also be crucial to the implementation of the Goals.

3. Emphasizing that the synergies approach, exemplified by the guidance developed to assist parties to the Rotterdam Convention and the Chemical Review Committee in their work when a chemical under consideration was a persistent organic pollutant, was crucial, he said that the current meeting, being held back-to-back with the eleventh meeting of the Chemical Review Committee, was an opportunity for information exchange and dialogue to develop further the critical guidance that countries needed to tackle persistent organic pollutants. He wished the Committee successful deliberations over the coming week.

II. Organizational matters

A. Adoption of the agenda

4. In considering the sub-item, the Committee had before it the provisional agenda (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/1) and the annotations to the provisional agenda (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/1/Add.1).

5. During the discussion of the agenda one member said that the Committee's decisions should be based on sound scientific evidence, taking into account the views of all members. In addition, he said, four information documents (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/7, UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/10, UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/11 and UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/12) had been circulated to the members of the Committee after the deadline imposed by rule 11 of the rules of procedure, which required that the provisional agenda and all "supporting documents" be circulated to the parties in the official languages of the Convention at least six weeks before the start of the meeting at which they would be considered; discussion of the agenda items to which the four information documents related, he said, should be deferred to the twelfth meeting of the Committee or to an extraordinary meeting of the Committee.

6. At the request of the Chair, the Legal Officer of the Secretariat clarified that according to the practice to date rule 11 had been understood to apply to working documents but not information documents. The Secretariat did endeavour to issue all documents and relevant information as early as possible but information documents were for various reasons sometimes issued less than six weeks before the meetings for which they were produced. A number of Committee members, as well as the Executive Secretary, pointed out that with very few exceptions information documents for the meetings of the Committee and the Conference of the Parties had always been produced in English only; therefore, they said, information documents could not be "supporting documents" subject to rule 11, as that rule required supporting documents to be issued in the six official languages of the United Nations; another member expressed agreement that rule 11 did not apply to information documents. The Chair ruled that in accordance with the explanation of the Legal Officer the information documents, and the agenda items to which they related, would be considered at the current meeting. The objecting member maintained his position, saying that rule 11 made no exception for information documents and that he reserved his rights, and it was agreed that his position would be noted in the present report.

7. The Committee then adopted the agenda set out below on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
    (a) Adoption of the agenda;
    (b) Organization of work.
3. Rotation of the membership.
4. Review of the outcomes of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention relevant to the work of the Committee.
5. Technical work:
    (a) Consideration of a draft risk management evaluation on decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE);
    (b) Consideration of draft risk profiles:
        (i) Dicofol;
        (ii) Short-chained chlorinated paraffins;
    (c) Consideration of a proposal for the inclusion of pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Convention;
    (d) Consideration of information on unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene;
    (e) Guidance on alternatives to perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts, perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and their related chemicals.
6. Report on activities for effective participation in the work of the Committee.
7. Workplan for the intersessional period between the eleventh and twelfth meetings of the Committee.
8. Venue and date of the twelfth meeting of the Committee.
9. Other matters.

10. Adoption of the report.

11. Closure of the meeting.

B. Organization of work

8. The Committee agreed to conduct the meeting in accordance with the scenario note prepared by the Chair (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/1) and the proposed schedule set out in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/2, subject to adjustment as necessary. The Committee also agreed to conduct its work in plenary session and to establish contact, drafting and friends of the chair groups as necessary, with no more than two such groups working at the same time. In considering the matters on its agenda the Committee had before it the documents listed in the annotations to the agenda (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/1/Add.1) and the list of pre-session documents by agenda item (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/16).

9. During discussion of the sub-item one member said that, in order to avoid any possible conflicts of interest, no member of the Committee from a party proposing the listing of a chemical in the annexes to the Convention should be selected as the chair of any small group discussing that chemical.

C. Attendance

10. The meeting was attended by the following 29 Committee members: Mr. Jack Holland (Australia), Ms. Ingrid Hauzenberger (Austria), Ms. Tamara Kukharchyk (Belarus), Ms. Estefania Moreira (Brazil), Mr. Joswa Aoudou (Cameroon), Ms. Michelle Kivi (Canada), Mr. Jorge Álvarez Álvarez (Cuba), Mr. Pavel Čupr (Czech Republic), Ms. Consuelo Meneses (Ecuador), Mr. Sylvain Bintein (France), Mr. Hubert Binga (Gabon), Mr. Ram Niwas Jindal (India), Mr. Agus Haryono (Indonesia), Mr. Seyed Jamaleddin Shahtaheri (Islamic Republic of Iran), Ms. Caroline Wamai (Kenya), Mr. Abdul Nabi Abdullah Al-Ghadban (Kuwait), Ms. Mantoa Sekota (Lesotho), Ms. Haritiana Rakotoarisetra (Madagascar), Mr. Sidi Ould Aloueimine (Mauritania), Mr. Martien Janssen (Netherlands), Ms. Liselott Säll (Norway), Mr. Zaigham Abbas (Pakistan), Ms. Kyunghee Choi (Republic of Korea), Mr. Marcus Richards (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines), Mr. Ousmane Sow (Senegal), Mr. Jayakody Sumith (Sri Lanka), Mr. Azhari Abdelbagi (Sudan), Ms. Maria Delvin (Sweden) and Mr. Armando Diaz Cortés (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

11. The members of the Committee from Oman and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia were unable to attend.

12. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following countries as observers: Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, Croatia, Denmark, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mali, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russian Federation, South Africa, Swaziland, Switzerland, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America and Zimbabwe. The European Union was also represented as an observer.

13. Non-governmental organizations were also represented as observers. The names of those organizations are included in the list of participants (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/18).

III. Rotation of the membership

14. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat drew attention to the information provided in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/3, on the membership of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee and the rotation of the membership in May 2016, noting that the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting had appointed the 17 members nominated by the parties listed in the annex to decision SC-6/14 to serve from 5 May 2014 to 4 May 2018. The terms of office of the remaining 14 members of the Committee would expire on 4 May 2016; the Conference of the Parties, also at its seventh meeting, had decided which parties would nominate 14 new members to serve from 5 May 2016 to 4 May 2020, and those parties had during and since that meeting nominated those new members. To familiarize them with the work of the Committee, the nominated members had been invited to participate in the current meeting as observers and to take part in a number of orientation sessions organized by the Secretariat. In addition, the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting had elected Ms. Moreira as the Committee's new Chair, thus confirming the Committee's selection of her at its ninth meeting in accordance with decision SC-6/14. The Committee had also at its ninth meeting selected Mr. Abdelbagi to serve as Vice-Chair and Rapporteur.

15. The Committee took note of the information presented.

16. Subsequently, Ms. Moreira reported that the term of office of the current Vice-Chair of the Committee, Mr. Abdelbagi, would end in May 2016 and that the Committee would therefore have to

elect a new member to succeed him, subject to confirmation once the new members of the Committee had begun their terms in May 2016. The Committee elected, subject to confirmation by the Committee at its twelfth meeting, Mr. Abbas to serve as Vice-Chair of the Committee, with terms of office to begin at the closure of the current meeting.

IV. Review of the outcomes of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention relevant to the work of the Committee

17. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat summarized the information provided in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/4, on the outcomes of the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention relevant to the Committee's work. Those outcomes included decision SC-7/1, on exemptions; decision SC-7/5, on the evaluation of PFOS, its salts and PFOSF pursuant to paragraphs 5 and 6 of part III of Annex B to the Convention; decision SC-7/11, on the further consideration of hexachlorobutadiene; decision SC-7/12, on the listing of hexachlorobutadiene; decision SC-7/13, on the listing of pentachlorophenol and its salts and esters; decision SC-7/14, on the listing of polychlorinated naphthalenes; and decision SC-7/30, on "From science to action".

18. Another representative of the Secretariat then made a presentation on the development of a roadmap, in accordance with decision SC-7/30, for further engaging parties and other stakeholders in informed dialogue for enhanced science-based action in the implementation of the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention and the Stockholm Convention at the regional and national levels, taking into account the roles of the scientific bodies of the three conventions.

19. One member said that during its tenth meeting, the Committee had acted beyond its powers by denying one party its right to seek exemptions for a chemical before it was listed in Annexes A, B or C and that a decision on the chemical had subsequently been adopted by the Conference of the Parties. He asked that the Committee take corrective measures.

20. Another member highlighted the importance of building on, and not duplicating, work carried out by the United Nations Environment Programme on the Global Chemicals Outlook Report, including with regard to the current status of chemicals, challenges faced and recent activities by the scientific community.

21. The Committee took note of the information and agreed that a small informal group facilitated by the Secretariat would, in the margins of the meeting, consider possible collaboration on the roadmap provided for under the decision entitled "From science to action".

V. Technical work

A. Consideration of a draft risk management evaluation on decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE)

22. In considering the sub-item, the Committee had before it a draft risk management evaluation on decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE) (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/2); additional information related to the draft risk management evaluation on decabromodiphenyl ether (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/6); and comments and responses relating to the draft risk management evaluation on decabromodiphenyl ether (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/7).

23. One member reiterated the objection that he had made during consideration of the agenda for the meeting, saying that the Committee should not take up the agenda item because an information document pertaining to it had not been circulated at least six weeks before the meeting, which he said was required by rule 11 of the rules of procedure. The Chair, supported by most members who took the floor, said that, as she had ruled during the adoption of the agenda, the Committee would proceed with consideration of the item.

24. Mr. Holland, the chair of the intersessional working group on decabromodiphenyl ether, then gave a presentation on the draft risk management evaluation. In the ensuing discussion, members thanked the working group for its hard work. Several expressed support for completing the risk management evaluation and preparing a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties that it list decabromodiphenyl ether in the annexes to the Convention, with some noting that a number of parties had already initiated or were considering the phase-out of the chemical.

25. Several members identified elements of the draft risk management evaluation that they said should be addressed to facilitate informed decision-making on the matter. A number of members requested that more parties submit information so that it could be considered at an early stage in the evaluation process.

26. A number of members said that the current draft contained insufficient information on important issues related to the production, use, management and environmentally sound disposal of decabromodiphenyl ether. Areas highlighted as requiring additional attention included items (d), (e) and (f) of Annex F to the Convention; the experience of parties related to the regulation, management and disposal of decabromodiphenyl ether and products containing it; concentrations of the substance in and emissions from various products and wastes in different countries and regions; Government and private sector monitoring programmes under way; current production levels of decabromodiphenyl ether; the amount of the substance used in various sectors and countries; the challenges faced in the transportation and recycling sectors; national systems for compulsory certification and validation of spare parts for vehicles and airplanes, including timing and costs; the possible persistent organic pollutant properties of certain alternatives to decabromodiphenyl ether; how articles currently in use would be affected if decabromodiphenyl ether were listed in the Convention, including when such articles became wastes; the identity and source of the largest waste streams and options for their management, such as incineration, and their technical and economic feasibility, including upfront investment costs; the assistance that many developing countries would require if they were to assess, monitor, manage, dispose of and phase-out imported products that contained decabromodiphenyl ether; and the data gaps that existed on those and other relevant issues. One member recalled that guidance on best available techniques/best environmental practices for the recycling and disposal as waste of articles containing polybrominated diphenyl ethers (UNEP/POPS/COP.7/INF/22) had been presented at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Another member pointed to the recommendations on the elimination of brominated diphenyl ethers from the waste stream adopted by the Committee at its sixth meeting (decision POPRC-6/2, annex).

27. A variety of views were expressed regarding the need for exemptions for the automotive, aircraft and recycling industries. Several members said that more detailed information was needed to assess the need for such exemptions. Several members said that it would be necessary to distinguish clearly and precisely between reuse and recycling and to examine a number of issues in greater detail, including the available means for assessing recycling issues in the textile and electronic equipment sectors. A number of members said that decabromodiphenyl ether had been found in plastic toys and food-related products and in sewage used as fertilizer on agricultural lands. One member said that while no decabromodiphenyl ether should be present in toys, and that laws in the European Union prohibited that, it was important to establish the precise amounts and relative toxicity of any amounts detected. One said that the percentage of all plastics that were recycled was fairly small and that a relatively small percentage of that quantity contained decabromodiphenyl ether, and one said that the levels of decabromodiphenyl ether found in recycled plastics were relatively low. One member said that recycling could make it more difficult to locate and manage materials that contained decabromodiphenyl ether, both within a country and in material that was exported. Several members sought clarification regarding the effect of note (ii) in part I of Annex A and Annex B to the Convention and Article 6 of the Convention, including their implications for the need for an exemption for recycling, in particular with regard to textiles.

28. Responding to some of the comments from the members, the drafter of the risk management evaluation said that some of the data gaps in the document, including the lack of information from some regions and on monitoring and production, was attributable to the fact that many parties and observers, including from relevant industries, had not provided information and that some information had not been provided in time to be included in the draft risk management evaluation. Additional information could be incorporated into the next draft. Many alternatives to decabromodiphenyl ether did not have persistent organic pollutant characteristics. The decabromodiphenyl ether used in plastic in vehicles was situated around the engine or in electronic parts, so its use was not very different in mining and farming vehicles than in automobiles. Page limits for the risk management evaluation and Annex F requirements had forced the drafting group to be brief on waste-related issues, but more information could be included in the next draft. The current draft did contain some information on experiences in Canada, China, the European Union, Norway and the United States with regard to phasing out some applications of decabromodiphenyl ether or its management as waste, and the next draft could include additional details from those and other parties. A balanced draft, she said, should include not only the potential costs for Governments and industry of listing decabromodiphenyl ether but also the economic and social costs relating to the health impacts of its continued use.

29. Responding to the request for clarification regarding the operation of note (ii) in part I of Annex A and Annex B to the Convention and Article 6 of the Convention, the Legal Officer said that

note (ii) allowed parties to notify the Secretariat of quantities of chemicals listed in the relevant annex to the Convention that were present as constituents of articles manufactured or already in use before or on the date of entry into force of the Convention with respect to those chemicals. Article 6, she added, referred to stockpiles and wastes, including products and articles upon becoming wastes. Consequently, the operation of the Article would require parties to determine whether they were dealing with a stockpile or a waste. While there was no definition of waste in the Stockholm Convention, the Convention in its preamble did recall the pertinent provisions of relevant international environmental conventions, including the Basel Convention. If parties wish to consider that "waste" under the Stockholm Convention should be defined as waste in accordance with the Basel Convention, the term would encompass substances or objects that were disposed of, intended to be disposed of or required to be disposed of under national law. Annex IV to the Basel Convention also listed disposal operations, which were also referred to in Article 6 of the Stockholm Convention. Section B of Annex IV to the Basel Convention listed disposal operations that might lead to resource recovery, recycling, reclamation, direct reuse or alternative uses, and that might also be of relevance to the operation of Article 6. Finally, she drew attention to ongoing discussions among the parties to the Basel Convention regarding the distinction between wastes and non-wastes and the initiation of a review of Annex IV to the Convention.

30. The Committee agreed to establish a contact group, chaired by Mr. Holland, to make any necessary amendments to the draft risk management evaluation and to prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Committee. It was agreed that the Legal Officer would provide further clarification regarding the operation of note (ii) in part I of Annex A and Annex B and Article 6 during the deliberations of the contact group.

31. Subsequently, the chair of the drafting group presented the revised draft risk management evaluation. In the ensuing discussion one representative said that the draft risk management evaluation did not provide adequate information on the automobile industry in Asia, including with regard to the availability of non-persistent-organic-pollutant alternative flame retardants, and that more information was required regarding the need for an exemption for the textile industry, especially relating to small and medium-sized enterprises. Another member said that the draft risk management evaluation should have more information of the type described in paragraphs (e) and (f) of Annex F, especially on the status of control and monitoring capacity. Echoing that view, another member said that the draft risk management evaluation should have more information of the kind called for in paragraphs (c)–(g) of Annex F. Noting that the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention had, in its decision BC-12/3, invited parties to submit waste-related information on decabromodiphenyl ether to the Secretariat by August 2016, he said that the lack of such information in the draft risk management evaluation made it difficult to predict how listing the chemical under the Stockholm Convention would affect waste management. He also expressed concern that, while substances listed under the Convention were often present in articles and products, many countries lacked the money and the technical capacity to identify and properly dispose of persistent-organic-pollutant-containing wastes. In response to a question, the representative of the Secretariat clarified that specific exemptions would have the duration specified in Article 4 unless the Conference of the Parties decided otherwise.

32. The Committee requested the Secretariat to produce revised versions of the draft risk management evaluation and draft decision taking into account the further discussion in plenary.

33. Subsequently the representative of the Secretariat introduced a revised draft risk management evaluation and revised draft decision. Following further discussion, the Committee adopted the draft decision, as orally amended, thus adopting the risk management evaluation, as orally amended, and deciding, in accordance with paragraph 9 of Article 8 of the Convention, to recommend to the Conference of the Parties that it consider listing decabromodiphenyl ether (BDE-209) of c-decaBDE in Annex A to the Convention with specific exemptions for some critical spare parts, to be defined, for the automotive and aerospace industries. Decision POPRC-11/1 is set out in annex I to the present report and the risk management evaluation is set out in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/10/Add.1.

B. Consideration of draft risk profiles

(a) Dicofol

34. In considering the sub-item, the Committee had before it a note by the Secretariat on a draft risk profile for dicofol (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/3), comments and responses relating to the draft risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/8) and additional information on dicofol (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/15).

35. Mr. Richards, chair of the intersessional working group on dicofol, gave a presentation on the draft risk profile.

36. In the ensuing discussion, many members expressed general agreement with the content of the document while acknowledging that some areas could be improved. Some others, however, argued that the document had significant data gaps and uncertainties, with one saying that it critically lacked a trade analysis and failed to identify breakdown products formed during separation, cleaning and extraction of environmental samples; he also said that, like the other chemicals subject to the Convention, dicofol had only been proposed for listing once developed countries had stopped using it.

37. Several members raised issues regarding the quality and extent of relevant data. One said that his concerns could be discussed in the context of a contact group, but another recommended that the deficiencies should be corrected before any further discussion took place. One member suggested that data should be collected using standardized, internationally accepted analytical methods, but another member said that such an approach, while ideal, was impractical. A number of members said that there were challenges encountered in the measurement of dicofol in the field. It was important that those challenges be captured in the risk profile as well, and it was said that the risk profile did in fact capture them well. One representative said that the same challenges did not apply to data acquired under laboratory conditions, such as persistence data or data on the calculation of half-lives, which should be accurate because the relevant studies used radio-labelled substances and often included a validation step.

38. One member said that his Government had submitted additional data on dicofol at the tenth meeting of the Committee and that it had not been properly considered by the Committee. In response the Chair clarified that the information in question had indeed been provided and considered at the tenth meeting but was not at that time new, as the Committee had already reviewed it at its ninth meeting; she advised the members that a full description of earlier discussions on dicofol could be found in the relevant sections of the reports of the ninth and tenth meetings of the Committee.

39. With regard to the requirements of Annex E, much of the discussion centred around the question of persistence. A number of members argued that as dicofol was only persistent below a pH of 7 in water, it was not persistent in the natural environment in many locations and thus did not meet the persistence criterion. Another member concurred that the issue of persistence was of concern. Several others, however, including one who pointed out that the Committee had already found that dicofol met the persistence criterion in Annex D, said that persistence had been clearly demonstrated by monitoring data, including for sediment cores, as indicated in the draft risk profile. Furthermore, they argued, there were regions with acidic aquatic environments where dicofol would be persistent, and those should be taken into account. One member, supported by another, noted that dicofol metabolites were also persistent, some more so than dicofol itself.

40. Various views were expressed on the topic of long-range environmental transport. A number of members contended that there was no good evidence of long-range environmental transport of dicofol. One of them said that the evidence presented was only from modelling data rather than field data and furthermore that there was no information on dicofol in remote regions. Another member took issue with the latter statement, however, saying that dicofol had been clearly shown to be detected in remote areas; while that finding derived from a single study, it was a robust study. Furthermore, she said, arctic air studies provided additional evidence of long-range environmental transport, although they failed to distinguish between dicofol and its metabolites. Another member argued that long-range environmental transport of dicofol had been well established by both monitoring and modelling. Furthermore, given the analytical issues associated with field measurements, the fact that the substance could be measured at all in remote areas was an indication of long-range environmental transport.

41. With regard to dicofol's effect on human health, several members expressed the view that the draft risk profile contained sufficient evidence of adverse effects, while one characterized the evidence as inconclusive.

42. The Committee established a contact group, chaired by Mr. Richards, to revise the draft risk profile, including by identifying any gaps in the draft risk profile, taking into account the discussions in plenary.

43. Subsequently, the contact group chair reported that the contact group had made progress and suggested that a drafting group be convened. One member said that it was premature for a drafting group, arguing that the information gaps identified by the contact group should be filled first. Another representative expressed support for the establishment of a drafting group, suggesting that if the group needed additional information it could convert to a contact group again and request the participation of observers. The Chair recalled that the Committee's mandate was to complete the draft risk profile and to prepare a draft decision, saying that the formation of a drafting group was therefore necessary.

44. The Committee established a drafting group, chaired by Mr. Richards, to finalize the draft risk profile and to prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Committee.

45. At a subsequent session, the chair of the drafting group reported that the group had been unable to reach agreement on a finalized draft risk profile as, in the eyes of a number of members, there were still information gaps to address. Accordingly, he introduced a draft decision by which the Committee would, among other things, defer its consideration of the draft risk profile to its twelfth meeting; establish an intersessional working group to review and update it; and invite parties and observers to submit additional information before 11 December 2015.

46. Further discussion ensued in which many members expressed concern at the prospect of further intersessional work. Several members said that no additional information was needed and that the draft risk profile already satisfied the requirements of Annex E. One member, however, supported by a number of others, insisted that information gaps had been identified and had to be addressed. Many members said that the work on dicofol should be concluded without further delay; to that end it was suggested that the draft decision specify who was to provide any additional information so that the Committee would not be further delayed by additional calls for information and would be in a position to take the appropriate action at its twelfth meeting.

47. The Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare a revised version of the draft decision, taking into account the discussion in plenary.

48. The representative of the Secretariat subsequently presented a revised version of the draft decision, which the Committee adopted as orally amended. Decision POPRC-11/2 is set out in annex I to the present report and the revised draft risk profile to be worked on by the intersessional working group is set out in UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/17.

(b) Short-chained chlorinated paraffins

49. In considering the sub-item, the Committee had before it a note by the Secretariat on a revised draft risk profile for short-chained chlorinated paraffins prepared by the intersessional working group on short-chained chlorinated paraffins (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/4), a compilation of comments and responses related to the draft risk profile (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/5) and additional information submitted to the Secretariat on 7 October 2015 on the measurement of short-chained chlorinated paraffins in environmental samples and in humans (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/14).

50. Mr. Sow, chair of the intersessional working group, gave a presentation on the revised draft risk profile.

51. In the ensuing discussion, general appreciation was expressed for the revised draft risk profile produced by the intersessional working group, which, according to several speakers, provided a substantial basis for further discussion, with a number of members also expressing an interest in assessing the additional information with a view to its possible inclusion in the draft risk profile. One member drew attention to recently available monitoring information from air and biota in remote areas, and another to new data documenting human toxicity, that could be considered for inclusion in the draft risk profile. Most of those that spoke expressed the view that the requirements of Annex E to the Convention had been met in respect of short-chained chlorinated paraffins, with one member saying that they were possible endocrine disrupting chemicals and possible carcinogens with possible adverse effects on aquatic organisms and a number of others saying that while there was some doubt as to human health effects the data were clear regarding harm to the environment. One member, however, questioned that view, saying, among other things, that the scope of the source data appeared to have been extended to include long-chained and medium-chained chlorinated paraffins and that the assessment of long-range environmental transport had been based solely on modelling data.

52. In response, one member, supported by another, said that references to long-chained and medium-chained chlorinated paraffins could be removed without weakening the draft risk profile with regard to short-chained chlorinated paraffins. On the second point, the drafter pointed out that the assessment of the modelling data had been backed by an abundance of monitoring data from remote areas, air and biota. Responding to requests for clarification on whether data pertained to long-chained and medium-chained chlorinated paraffins rather than short-chained, he explained that some of the available production data did not distinguish between different substances by chain length; in such cases the draft risk profile referred to them collectively as “chlorinated paraffins”; with regard to persistence, bioaccumulation and toxicity, however, the data were clearly presented as pertaining to short-chained chlorinated paraffins.

53. One member, echoed by another, said that the draft risk profile lacked data from developing countries on the health impacts of short-chained chlorinated paraffins, in response to which the Chair

noted that no studies from developing countries had been made available to the intersessional working group, while the chair of the group highlighted what he said was a paucity of research on the chemicals in question in developing countries, especially in Africa. Another member said that developing countries and countries with economies in transition should be assisted in producing such data.

54. Several members and observers suggested changes to improve the revised draft risk profile regarding matters such as mixtures containing short-chained chlorinated paraffins, the chemical identity of the chemicals proposed for listing and information on unintentional production.

55. The Committee established a contact group, chaired by Mr. Sow, to further revise the draft risk profile, taking into account the discussions in plenary, and to prepare a draft decision on short-chained chlorinated paraffins based on an initial text to be prepared by the Secretariat.

56. At a subsequent session, the chair of the contact group reported that the group had established itself as a drafting group and the drafter introduced a revised version of the draft risk profile prepared by the drafting group.

57. Further discussion ensued in which many members said that the revised draft risk profile provided sufficient evidence that short-chained chlorinated paraffins met the requirements of Annex E and warranted moving to the next phase, with one member saying that new analytical methods had made it easier to obtain critical monitoring data and data on human exposure and that health data had also improved in recent years.

58. One member, however, endorsed the views expressed by several observers that the evidence of adverse effects due to long-range environmental transport remained insufficient; that some of the monitoring data showed increased concentrations of the chemicals in remote areas while others showed decreased concentrations; that further discussion was needed to specify the chemical identities and chain lengths of the target chemicals; that the data included were not sufficient to demonstrate persistence of the chemicals; and that the additional information included in the revised draft risk profile was insufficient to conclude that the chemicals were likely, as a result of long range environmental transport, to lead to significant adverse environmental and human health effects such that global action was warranted. The same member also reiterated his position that problems with the comparability of monitoring data should be corrected through the establishment of standardized monitoring methods.

59. Responding on the question of the identity and chain length of the target chemicals, the drafter said that target chemicals had been clearly identified in the contact group as short-chained, with chain lengths between 10 and 13. As to the purported lack of sufficient new information added to the revised draft risk profile, he reiterated that there was a great deal of additional data included in the revision of the 2012 draft in addition to that submitted at the current meeting; a comparison of the current draft with the 2012 draft would readily demonstrate that fact. Regarding the lack of data on persistence in water and soil, one member, supported by another, said that the focus in the draft risk profile was on persistence in sediments, evidence of which had been included since the initial screening of the chemical against the Annex D criteria. Another member said that anyone suggesting that the data was flawed should provide evidence to prove their contentions.

60. At a subsequent session, the Chair reported that she had been engaged in informal consultations, on the basis of which she proposed the establishment of a friends of the chair group to further discuss the draft risk profile. The Committee accordingly established a friends of the chair group composed of interested members of the Committee and selected observers to further discuss the draft risk profile.

61. Following the discussions in the friends of the chair group, the Chair said that the group had resolved a number of issues relating to the scientific information in the draft risk profile. The group had agreed that a comparison of exposure and effect levels for biota and human exposure was not needed for decision-making, as the Committee had decided at its ninth meeting that its evaluation should not include a quotient-based risk assessment; the comparison could remain in the document but would not be taken into consideration in decision-making. The group had also decided that certain unpublished scientific data should be removed from the draft risk profile; the members of the group had agreed, however, that that decision should not be taken as a precedent; the Committee had in the past considered the views of invited experts whose expertise had contributed to decision-making, and the Committee should in the future determine its approach to scientific information on a case-by-case basis. Finally, the group had agreed that certain additions to table 3.5 made by the drafting group should be removed as they had not been discussed in the contact group.

62. At the invitation of the Chair, the drafter of the intersessional working group then introduced the changes made to the document on the basis of the discussion in the friends of the chair group.

63. Two members spoke in support of adopting the risk profile and moving to the Annex F stage. Responding to a comment by an observer, one member said that there did not seem to be any reason to doubt the data used to establish persistence, and another said that valid data could be derived from both direct and indirect measurements. One member said that alternatives to short-chained chlorinated paraffins should not themselves be persistent organic pollutants.

64. The Committee then adopted decision POPRC-11/3, by which it adopted the risk profile for short-chained chlorinated paraffins and decided to establish an intersessional working group to prepare a draft risk management evaluation for the chemicals. The decision is set out in annex I to the present report and the risk profile is set out in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/10/Add.2.

C. Consideration of a proposal for the inclusion of pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Convention

65. In considering the sub-item, the Committee had before it a note by the Secretariat setting out a proposal by the European Union to list pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Convention (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/5), along with the Secretariat's verification that the proposal contained the information specified in Annex D to the Convention (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/9).

66. Ms. Katinka van der Jagt, a representative of the European Union, introduced the proposal.

67. In the ensuing discussion, all members who spoke said that PFOA, its salts and PFOA-related compounds clearly met the criteria of Annex D to the Convention and should be passed to the next stage of the review process. One member, however, said that some countries, and in particular developing countries and countries with economies in transition, did not have the materials and equipment required to perform chemical analysis, develop inventories and implement controls in the event that the substances were listed under the Convention. She called on the Secretariat and countries to distribute information to guide those countries in need of support, potentially via the Stockholm Convention website. Two members voiced support for her appeal, with one suggesting that efforts in that regard could build on work done with regard to PFOS, its salts and PFOSF and the other noting that a mechanism had recently been established under the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management to improve the exchange of information on the contents of products in the supply chain.

68. One member said that he wished to discuss the proposal in a contact group, saying that he wanted clarification of how branched PFOA fulfilled the Annex D criteria. Many members said that further discussion was required to identify clearly the chemicals that were proposed for listing under the Convention, with one saying that the scope of PFOA-related compounds should be clarified.

69. Several members said that additional information regarding the chemicals was needed, including information relating to several lawsuits filed in the United States for harm caused by exposure to PFOA and information resulting from an ecological screening assessment performed by Canada.

70. Following the discussion, the Chair observed that there appeared to be consensus that the proposal to list pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No. 335-67-1 PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Convention met the criteria of Annex D to the Convention. The Committee accordingly agreed to establish a contact group, chaired by Ms. Kivi, to prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Committee, taking into account the comments in plenary, based on an initial text to be prepared by the Secretariat.

71. Subsequently, Ms. Kivi introduced a draft decision on pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds which, among other things, invited parties and observers to submit to the Secretariat the information specified in Annex E to the Convention on the relevant chemicals before 11 December 2015 and requested the Secretariat to make available to them a non-exhaustive list of Chemical Abstract Service numbers for those substances.

72. Further discussion ensued in which one member said that a list of Chemical Abstract Service numbers and IUPAC names would be necessary to assist developing countries in responding to the request to provide the requested information by the stated deadline and another member said that that task would be further complicated by the vast number of compounds available under different brand

names. One member, however, said that the data required at the current screening stage did not have to be detailed, but rather at the next stage, and another suggested that it might be necessary to clarify that point in the draft decision. In response to a question on the subject, the representative of the Secretariat said that the Secretariat could provide a non-exhaustive list of Chemical Abstract Service numbers within one week of the end of the current meeting.

73. In addition, one member said that the chemicals failed to meet the screening criterion on bioaccumulation because the evaluation stated that it was not possible to determine their log Kow value. Another member, however, pointed out that the log Kow value was just one of several ways to determine whether a chemical met the criterion, and the representative of the Secretariat confirmed that a chemical was considered to have met the criterion when sufficient information had been provided in accordance with any of the three subparagraphs in paragraph 1 (c) of Annex D.

74. The Committee decided to reconvene the contact group to continue its consideration of the draft decision before converting to a drafting group to finalize the text.

75. At a later session, the chair of the contact group reported that the group had established itself as a drafting group. She presented a revised draft decision prepared by the drafting group, which provided that PFOA fulfilled the Annex D screening criteria and that issues related to the inclusion of PFOA-related compounds that potentially degrade to PFOA and the inclusion of PFOA salts would be considered in the development of a draft risk profile; it also provided that no data need be submitted on PFOS, its salts, PFOSF and their related chemicals, as they were already listed in Annex B to the Convention.

76. In the ensuing discussion, several members suggested that there was no need to refer to data from parties and observers on PFOS, its salts, PFOSF and related chemicals in a decision about PFOA and that to do so might be confusing.

77. The Committee then adopted decision POPRC-11/4, as orally amended, by which it confirmed that pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid) met the criteria of Annex D to the Convention and agreed to prepare a draft risk profile pertaining to that chemical, including with regard to issues related to the inclusion of PFOA-related compounds that potentially degrade to PFOA and the inclusion of PFOA salts. The decision is set out in annex I to the present report.

D. Consideration of information on unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene

78. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the Secretariat recalled that at its seventh meeting the Conference of the Parties had adopted decision SC-7/11, in which it had, among other things, taken note of new information provided at that meeting with regard to unintentional production of hexachlorobutadiene and requested the Committee to further evaluate hexaclorobutadiene on the basis of the newly available information in relation to its listing in Annex C and to make a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties on listing hexachlorobutadiene in Annex C for further consideration at its eighth meeting. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties had also invited parties and observers to submit any additional information to the Secretariat that would assist the Committee's further evaluation of unintentional production of hexachlorobutadiene; the information received to date was contained in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/10.

79. At the invitation of the Chair, Mr. Jianxin Hu (China), then made a brief presentation on the new information on hexachlorobutadiene that he had presented at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

80. In response to a question from a member, the representative of the Secretariat clarified that decision SC-7/11 did not specify the type of information to be collected by the Secretariat for the further evaluation of the unintentional production of hexachlorobuatidene. The Secretariat was relying on the Committee to provide guidance on the information to be requested from the parties.

81. The discussion that followed revolved around the information to be requested from the parties. Members suggested that information be sought on sources of emissions; measures put in place to reduce or eliminate sources of emissions; costs related to such measures; standard operating procedures for monitoring air, water and soil; and chemical processes that produced hexachlorobutadiene, to help identify manufacturing sources that might be causing unintentional releases, among other things.

82. Several members cautioned against reopening consideration of the risk management evaluation, and a number said that it was necessary to request only the very precise information

needed to fulfil the mandate of decision SC-7/11. The representative of the Secretariat provided a clarification in that regard, underscoring that the Committee had already made a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties to list hexachlorobutadiene in Annex C and that the current mandate was limited to a review of newly available information regarding its unintentional production.

83. A number of members said that developing countries lacked the resources to monitor pollutants like hexachlorobutadiene, with one attributing that to a lack of capacity and standard operating procedures and another saying that the relevant chemicals were all imported and would need to be traced back to their points of origin. One member said that developing countries and countries with economies in transition needed a standard monitoring method to enable them to deal with persistent organic pollutants and that financial and technical resources should be provided to that end. The Chair, suggesting that the matter was beyond the mandate of the Committee, said that his comment would be reflected in the present report.

84. One member said that any party proposing the listing of a chemical in the annexes to the Convention should provide all information necessary to the proper consideration of whether and how the chemical should be recommended for listing.

85. The Committee agreed to establish a friends of the chair group, chaired by Ms. Kukharchyk, to revise the draft decision set out in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/6.

86. Subsequently, the chair of the friends of the chair group presented a revised draft decision on hexachlorobutadiene.

87. In the ensuing discussion, one member said that developing countries and countries with economies in transition lacked the resources to participate effectively in a large number of intersessional working groups. In response to that member's request for information, the representative of the Secretariat said that four intersessional working groups had operated during the period between the Committee's tenth and eleventh meetings, while in earlier years, when more chemicals had been under consideration by the Committee, up to nine groups had operated simultaneously.

88. The same member, supported by another, reiterated a point made earlier in the meeting that there was a need for standard operating procedures for the production of the data considered by the Committee in its work.

89. The Committee adopted the decision, as orally amended, by which it decided to establish an intersessional working group to undertake the activities requested in decision SC-7/11, agreed to the work plan set out in the annex and requested the Secretariat to collect additional information from parties and observers on unintentional production of hexachlorobutadiene. Decision POPRC-11/5 is set out in annex I to the present report.

E. Guidance on alternatives to perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts, perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and their related chemicals

90. In considering the sub-item, the Committee had before it a note by the Secretariat on the development of revised guidance on alternatives to PFOS, its salts, PFOSF and their related chemicals (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/7), a proposal for revising the guidance (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/11) and a compilation of comments and responses related to the proposal (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/12).

91. Mr. Janssen, co-chair of the intersessional working group, gave a presentation in which he outlined the mandate for the preparation of the guidance, emanating from decision SC-6/7, and the proposed process for carrying out the revision.

92. In the ensuing discussion, one member requested clarification as to which uses of PFOS, its salts, PFOSF and their related chemicals were still acceptable and which could be eliminated. The representative of the Secretariat recalled that at its seventh meeting the Conference of the Parties, after reviewing the acceptable purposes and specific exemptions pertaining to those chemicals in accordance with paragraphs 5 and 6 of part III of Annex B, had concluded that parties might have a continued need for all of the acceptable purposes listed in Annex B to the Convention; had noted that as there were no parties currently registered for specific exemptions pertaining to the production and use of PFOS, its salts and PFOSF in carpets, leather and apparel, textiles and upholstery, paper and packaging, coatings and coating additives and rubber and plastics, no new registrations could be made for such exemptions; and had decided that it would undertake its next evaluation of PFOS, its salts and PFOSF at its ninth meeting, in 2019.

93. In response to a question from a member, the representative of the Secretariat reported that, as detailed in the report of the Committee's tenth meeting, 14 parties had participated in the

intersessional working group on the revised guidance on PFOS, its salts, PFOSF and their related chemicals.

94. The Committee established a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Janssen and Mr. Haryono, to prepare a draft decision for consideration by the Committee in plenary.

95. The co-chair of the contact group subsequently presented a conference room paper containing a revised proposal for revising the guidance on alternatives to PFOS, its salts, PFOSF and their related chemicals. One member requested that the appropriate Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) Registry numbers and International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC) names be added to the document. The Chair replied that that would be done.

96. The representative of the Secretariat then presented the draft decision by which the Committee would establish an intersessional working group to prepare revised guidance on alternatives to PFOS, its salts, PFOSF and their related chemicals in accordance with the work plan set out in the annex to the decision. The Committee adopted decision POPRC-11/6, which is set out in annex I to the present report.

VI. Report on activities for effective participation in the work of the Committee

97. Introducing the item, the representative of the Secretariat outlined the relevant documents, including the Secretariat's report on the matter (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/8), containing a draft decision, and a note by the Secretariat listing the capacity-building and training activities carried out and planned between the tenth and eleventh meetings of the Committee (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/13). The activities, some of which contributed to enhancing cooperation and coordination between the Committee and the scientific bodies of the Rotterdam and Basel conventions, included face-to-face training, online training and webinars.

98. Members of the Committee expressed appreciation for the work of the Secretariat and offered suggestions on how it could be made more effective. Concern was expressed regarding the use of webinars. Several members said that government officials and other stakeholders in developing countries often encountered significant difficulties that reduced the effectiveness of webinars. Such difficulties included insufficient or unreliable internet connections, a lack of attention in many webinars to regionally specific issues, insufficient publicity regarding the webinars and inability to participate in the webinars at their scheduled times owing to other responsibilities. A low level of participation in many webinars was evidence of those difficulties. Several members requested that the Secretariat examine patterns of participation in the webinars, including the geographic distribution of participants, their effectiveness, the appropriateness of their use for particular types of training and information, and opportunities for improvement. One member called on donor countries to address the technological hurdles in developing countries that prevented more effective use of the webinars and on-line training activities.

99. Several members said that it was important to increase the number of in-person and regionally focused training and information sessions. A number of members suggested that such training should be delivered through Stockholm Convention regional centres, which should be strengthened to that end. One member said that UNEP regional offices and other organizations should contribute more actively to training efforts.

100. One member suggested that the financial mechanism should fund such projects so that more information regarding the presence and impact of toxic chemicals, including those under consideration by the Committee, could be produced in a timely fashion. Another requested more information regarding plans for particular types of pilot projects. One member suggested that hard copy materials be sent to focal points and regional centres in developing countries to enable them to build libraries rather than rely on internet distribution or conference attendees bringing materials home. One member, supporting the proposal of an observer, said that representatives of commercial enterprises that had proactively phased out chemicals under review and experts in successful agricultural or industrial practices that did not require the use of chemicals should be encouraged to participate in meetings of the Committee and in regional training sessions and other activities. One member sought clarification regarding the pilot projects referred to in paragraph 5 (a) of the draft decision in the note by the Secretariat.

101. The representative of the Secretariat welcomed the suggestions offered, saying that the Secretariat would carefully consider them along with any others that members and observers might wish to submit in writing. Regarding current practices, she noted that each webinar was offered at two different times to accommodate participants in different time zones; they were also recorded and could

be viewed online at any time. She outlined the efforts of the Secretariat to evaluate the content and provision of webinars, noting that webinars were one of the means of delivering information and training; the Secretariat also offered face-to-face activities subject to the availability of resources. Access to scientific information, including through the clearing-house mechanism, would continue to be improved as called for in decision SC-7/29. The reference to pilot projects in paragraph 5 (c) of the draft decision referred to, for example, efforts to create or strengthen relevant institutional arrangements to facilitate the active involvement of various stakeholders in gathering information required by the Committee.

102. One member suggested that the draft decision set out in the note by the Secretariat required more details regarding the need for increased capacity-building and technical assistance activities relevant to effective participation in the work of the Committee; he proposed that the Committee consider forming a contract group or intersessional working group to examine the issue.

103. The Committee established a contact group, chaired by Mr. Abdullah, to consider the issue further and to revise the draft decision set out in the note by the Secretariat, taking into account the discussion in plenary.

104. The chair of the contact group later presented a revised draft decision on effective participation in the work of the Committee. The Committee adopted decision POPRC-11/7, by which it invited the Secretariat to continue its activities related to supporting effective participation, regional centres to play an active role in facilitating effective participation, and parties and observers in a position to do so to contribute to the work of the Committee and to provide financial support to facilitate the effective participation by parties in that work. The decision is set out in annex I to the present report.

105. During the discussion of the draft decision, one member suggested that the Secretariat consider featuring information on parties' successful efforts to eliminate substances listed under the Convention in its technical assistance programme, including webinars.

VII. Workplan for the intersessional period between the eleventh and twelfth meetings of the Committee

106. In its consideration of the item the Committee had before it a note by the Secretariat on a draft workplan for the intersessional period between the eleventh and twelfth meetings of the Committee (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/9). The representative of the Secretariat introduced the item, outlining the information contained in the note, following which the Committee adopted the workplan without amendment.

107. The Committee adopted the draft workplan and, in accordance with paragraph 6 of Article 8 of the Convention and paragraph 29 of the annex to decision SC-1/7, established a number of intersessional working groups to carry forward the work necessary to implement its decisions.

108. The composition of the intersessional working groups is set out in annex II to the present report and the workplan is set out in annex III to the present report.

109. The Committee also agreed that the Secretariat, together with the drafter and chair of the intersessional working group on decabromodiphenyl ether, would prepare a workplan for the work on that chemical based on the decision on that substance adopted by the Committee.

VIII. Venue and date of the twelfth meeting of the Committee

110. The Committee decided that its twelfth meeting would be held from 19 to 23 September 2016, back to back with the twelfth meeting of the Rotterdam Convention's Chemical Review Committee, at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in Rome. It was understood that the Chair, in consultation with the Vice-Chair, might adjust the length of the meeting to accord with the volume of work to be accomplished. Two members requested that consideration be given to holding subsequent meetings of the Committee in Geneva.

IX. Other matters

111. Under other matters one member reiterated a point he had made during the adoption of the agenda, saying that all documents pertaining to matters on the agendas of meetings of the Committee, including information documents, should be circulated at least six weeks before the meetings for which they were produced.

112. The representative of the Secretariat then read a statement from the Executive Secretary clarifying the matter. In that statement, the Executive Secretary said that according to the longstanding practice of all past meetings of the Committee and the Conference of Parties the reference to "supporting documents" in rule 11 of the rules of procedures had been understood to apply only to "working documents". Working documents, which were identifiable by the way they were numbered, namely, UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/XX for Committee documents, were always circulated in the six official languages of the United Nations and were subject to the six-week deadline set out in rule 11 of the rules of procedure. In accordance with this practice, information documents were not subject to rule 11 and the distribution deadlines set out therein. Both working and information documents, however, were distributed as early as possible. To avoid potential misunderstandings in the future, the Secretariat would no longer refer to information documents as containing "supporting" information.

113. In response, the objecting member said that the practices of the Secretariat could not contravene the rules of procedure.

X. Adoption of the report

114. The Committee adopted the present report on the basis of the draft report contained in documents UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/L.1 and Add.1, as orally amended, on the understanding that the Vice-Chair, serving as rapporteur and working in consultation with the Secretariat, would be entrusted with its finalization.

XI. Closure of the meeting

115. Following the customary exchange of courtesies the meeting was declared closed at 9 p.m. on Friday, 23 October 2015.

Annex I

Decisions adopted by the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee at its eleventh meeting

POPRC-11/1: Decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE)

POPRC-11/2: Dicofol

POPRC-11/3: Short-chained chlorinated paraffins

POPRC-11/4: Pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds

POPRC-11/5: Unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene

POPRC-11/6: Guidance on alternatives to perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts, perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and their related chemicals

POPRC-11/7: Effective participation in the work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

POPRC-11/1: Decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE)

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee,

Having concluded in its decision POPRC-9/4 that decabromodiphenyl (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE) ether fulfils the criteria set out in Annex D to the Stockholm Convention,

Having evaluated the risk profile for decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE) adopted by the Committee at its tenth meeting[1] in accordance with paragraph 6 of Article 8 of the Convention,

Having concluded in its decision POPRC-10/2 that the decabromodiphenyl ether component (BDE-209) of c-decaBDE is likely, as a result of its long-range environmental transport, to lead to significant adverse human health and environmental effects such that global action is warranted,

Having completed the risk management evaluation for decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE) in accordance with paragraph 7 (a) of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention,

Noting that non-persistent organic pollutant alternatives to decabromodiphenyl ether are available,

1. *Adopts* the risk management evaluation for decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE);[2]

2. *Decides*, in accordance with paragraph 9 of Article 8 of the Convention, to recommend to the Conference of the Parties that it consider listing decabromodiphenyl ether (BDE-209) of c-decaBDE in Annex A to the Convention with specific exemptions for some critical spare parts, to be defined, for the automotive and aerospace industries;

3. *Invites* parties and observers, including from the automotive and aerospace industries, to provide information that would assist the further defining by the Committee of such critical spare parts and invites parties and observers from small and medium-sized enterprises of the textile industry in developing countries to provide information on the use of decabromodiphenyl ether in the textile industry before 31 January 2016;

4. *Requests* the Secretariat to compile the information provided in accordance with paragraph 3 above and make it available to the Committee;

5. *Decides* to establish an intersessional working group to assess the information provided in accordance with paragraph 3 above with the intention of strengthening the recommendation on the listing of the chemical for consideration at its twelfth meeting.

POPRC-11/2: Dicofol

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee,

Having considered the draft risk profile for dicofol in accordance with paragraph 6 of Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention,

1. *Decides* to defer its decision on the draft risk profile for dicofol set out in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/17 to the twelfth meeting of the Committee;

2. *Agrees* that members who consider that additional information may be available shall submit to the Committee such additional information as specified in Annex E to the Convention by 11 December 2015;

3. *Decides*, in accordance with paragraph 6 of Article 8 of the Convention and paragraph 29 of decision SC-1/7 of the Conference of the Parties, to establish an intersessional working group to review and update the draft risk profile in accordance with Annex E of the Convention, taking into account the additional information provided by members in accordance with paragraph 2 above;

4. *Agrees* that the draft risk profile shall be presented for consideration and adoption at its twelfth meeting.

[1] UNEP/POPS/POPRC.10/10/Add.2.

[2] UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/10/Add.1.

POPRC-11/3: Short-chained chlorinated paraffins

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee,

Having completed an evaluation of the proposal by the European Union to list short-chained chlorinated paraffins in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Stockholm Convention and having decided at its second meeting, in its decision POPRC-2/8, that the proposal meets the criteria set out in Annex D to the Convention,

Having also completed the risk profile for short-chained chlorinated paraffins in accordance with paragraph 6 of Article 8 of the Convention,

1. *Adopts* the risk profile for short-chained chlorinated paraffins;[3]

2. *Decides*, in accordance with paragraph 7 (a) of Article 8 of the Convention, that short-chained chlorinated paraffins are likely as a result of long-range environmental transport to lead to significant adverse human health and environmental effects such that global action is warranted;

3. *Also decides*, in accordance with paragraph 7 (a) of Article 8 of the Convention and paragraph 29 of the annex to decision SC-1/7 of the Conference of the Parties, to establish an intersessional working group to prepare a risk management evaluation that includes an analysis of possible control measures for short-chained chlorinated paraffins in accordance with Annex F to the Convention;

4. *Invites*, in accordance with paragraph 7 (a) of Article 8 of the Convention, parties and observers to submit to the Secretariat the information specified in Annex F before 11 December 2015.

POPRC-11/4: Pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee,

Having examined the proposal by the European Union to list pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No.: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds in Annexes A, B and/or C to the Convention and having applied the screening criteria specified in Annex D to the Convention,

1. *Decides*, in accordance with paragraph 4 (a) of Article 8 of the Convention, that it is satisfied that the screening criteria have been fulfilled for pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), as set out in the evaluation contained in the annex to the present decision;

2. *Also decides*, in accordance with paragraph 6 of Article 8 of the Convention and paragraph 29 of decision SC-1/7, to establish an ad hoc working group to review the proposal further and to prepare a draft risk profile in accordance with Annex E to the Convention;

3. *Decides* further that issues related to the inclusion of PFOA-related compounds that potentially degrade to PFOA and the inclusion of PFOA salts should be dealt with in developing the draft risk profile;

4. *Invites*, in accordance with paragraph 4 (a) of Article 8 of the Convention, parties and observers to submit to the Secretariat the information specified in Annex E, by 11 December 2015, for the following substances:

(a) Pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid);

(b) Any substance that has a perfluoroalkyl group with the formula C_8F_{17}- or C_7F_{15}-C as one of its structural elements and that potentially degrades to PFOA, excluding perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts and perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride, which are listed in Annex B to the Convention;

5. *Requests* the Secretariat, for the purpose of facilitating information collection, to make available to parties and observers a non-exhaustive list of CAS numbers for PFOA, its salts and PFOA-related compounds when the Secretariat invites them to submit information specified in Annex E.

[3] UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/10/Add.2.

Annex to decision POPRC-11/4

Evaluation of pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds against the criteria of Annex D

A. Background

1. The primary source of information for the preparation of the present evaluation was the proposal submitted by the European Union (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/5).

2. Additional sources of scientific information included critical reviews prepared by recognized authorities.

B. Evaluation

3. The proposal was evaluated in the light of the requirements of Annex D regarding the identification of the chemical (paragraph 1 (a)) and the screening criteria (paragraphs 1 (b)–(e)):

(a) Chemical identity:

(i) Adequate information was provided in the proposal, which relates to PFOA, its salts and PFOA-related compounds;

(ii) The chemical structures were provided;

The chemical identity of PFOA, its salts and PFOA-related compounds is adequately established. The proposal includes PFOA-related compounds that may degrade to PFOA.

(b) Persistence:

(i) Due to its high persistence, no environmental half-lives for PFOA are available;

(ii) The results of various degradation tests and field monitoring data support the conclusion that no biodegradation of PFOA occurs. PFOA is very persistent and does not undergo any abiotic or biotic degradation under relevant environmental conditions (Meesters and Schroeder, 2004; Schröder 2003; Hanson et al., 2005; Liou et al., 2010; Siegemund et al., 2000);

(iii) PFOA and a number of PFOA-related substances are found in humans and the environment although there are no natural sources (Moody et al., 1999 and 2003), including in remote areas like the Arctic, which indicates their potential for long-range transport (NILU, 2013).

There is sufficient evidence that PFOA meets the criterion on persistence.

(c) Bioaccumulation:

(i) Due to the formation of an emulsified layer between the octanol-water surface interface, the determination of log Kow is impossible (U.S. EPA, 2014). PFOA is a surface active substance and, as a result, log Kow values are not relevant (Ahrens, 2009; ECHA, 2013a);

(ii) Due to high water solubility, the bioconcentration factor (3M Co., 1995; Martin et al., 2003) and bioaccumulation factor for PFOA and its salts are below 5000 (e.g. Martine et al., 2003). Bioconcentration factor values are not good predictors of bioaccumulation for this substance, as its bioaccumulation is not related to lipophilicity and accumulation does not primarily occur in lipid tissues (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.3/20, annex VI);

(iii) There is evidence that PFOA biomagnifies in air-breathing animals, as field biomagnification factors for PFOA including various locations and several food webs are higher than 1 (Houde et al., 2006; Butt et al., 2008, Müller et al., 2011); Trophic magnification factors were found to be higher than 1 for selected food chains (Houde et al., 2006 and Kelly et al., 2009, Müller et al., 2011), indicating that PFOA can biomagnify in food chains and webs;

(iv) Levels of PFOA analysed in polar bear tissue and blood indicate uptake and accumulation from the surrounding environment and food (Butt et al., 2008). These data clearly show the presence of PFOA in various species in remote regions. PFOA is found in human blood in the general population (e.g., Fromme et al., 2007, 2009) and at elevated concentrations in more exposed populations. Mothers excrete PFOA via breast milk and transfer PFOA to infants. After birth and at the end of breast feeding PFOA re-accumulates in maternal blood (ECHA, 2013a); human plasma half-lives of PFOA were reported as 2.3 to 3.5 years (geometric mean, range: 1.0 – 14.7 years). PFOA levels increase with age due to the chemical's long half-life (Haug et al., 2010, 2011). Taken together, the long plasma half-life and the persistence of PFOA provide enough evidence to conclude that PFOA bioaccumulates in humans.

There is sufficient evidence that PFOA meets the criterion on bioaccumulation.

(d) Potential for long-range environmental transport:

(i) PFOA measured at sites remote from known point sources indicates that it has the potential for long-range environmental transport, e.g., via ocean currents and/or via atmospheric transport of volatile precursors of PFOA (NILU, 2013); (Environment Canada and Health Canada, 2012);

(ii) The atmospheric lifetime of PFOA has been predicted to be 130 days (Hurley et al., 2004). *In silico* methods predict that PFOA is globally distributed. This screening tool gave the following result for PFOA: Pov = 1,038 days; critical travel distance (CTD) 1,745 km (Gomis et al., 2015);

(iii) PFOA has been detected in concentrations from the low- to mid- picograms per litre (pg/L) in remote regions of the Arctic cap (US. EPA, 2014). In the Norwegian Arctic, PFOA was detected in sediment, water and pooled soil samples and various biota samples (NILU, 2013; US. EPA, 2014; Müller et al., 2011).

There is sufficient evidence that PFOA meets the criterion for long-range environmental transport.

(e) Adverse effects:

(i) There is epidemiological evidence for kidney and testicular cancer, disruption of thyroid function and endocrine disruption in women (Steenland et al., 2012; Knox et al., 2011a, b; Melzer et al., 2010; ECHA 2014);

(ii) There exists experimental evidence from animal studies (Sibinski et al., 1987 and Biegel et al, 2001, cited in ECHA, 2011) that PFOA induces tumours (e.g., in the liver). Developmental effects have been observed in mice (e.g. Lau et al., 2006). Postnatal administration of ammonium salts of PFOA (APFO) in mice indicated adverse effects on mammary gland development (delayed/stunted) in offspring. Repeated oral exposure of several species to PFOA showed adverse effects such as mortality, reduced body weight gain, cyanosis and liver cell degeneration and necrosis (ECHA, 2011). Mothers excrete PFOA via breast milk, which causes concern for the health of breastfed infants (ECHA, 2011).

There is sufficient evidence that PFOA meets the criterion on adverse effects.

C. Conclusion

4. The Committee concludes that PFOA meets the screening criteria specified in Annex D.

References

1. Ahrens, L., Siebert, U., Ebinghaus, R., 2009. Temporal trends of polyfluoroalkyl compounds in harbor seals (Phoca vitulina) from the German Bight, 1999-2008. Chemosphere 76, 151–158.
2. 3M Co., 1995. Assessment of bioaccumulative properties of ammonium perfluorooctanoic acid: Static fish. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrative Record 226–0496.
3. Butt, C.M., Mabury, S.A., Kwan, M., Wang, X., Muir, D.C., 2008. Spatial trends of perfluoroalkyl compounds in ringed seals (Phoca hispida) from the Canadian Arctic. Environ.Toxicol.Chem. 27, 542–553.
4. ECHA 2011. Opinion proposing harmonized classification and labelling at community level of PFOA, adopted Dec. 2011.
5. ECHA, 2013a. Support document for identification of pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) as a substance of very high concern because of its CMR and PBT properties, http://echa.europa.eu/ candidate-list-table/-/substance/305/search/+/term.
6. Environment Canada and Health Canada, 2012. Screening assessment report, perfluorooctanoic acid, its salts, and its precursors.
7. Fromme, H., Schlummer, M., Möller, A., Gruber, L., Wolz, G., Ungewiss, J., et al., 2007. Exposure of an adult population to perfluorinated substances using duplicate diet portions and biomonitoring data. Environ. Sci. Technol. 41, 7928–7933.
8. Fromme, H., Tittlemier, S.A., Volkel, W., Wilhelm, M., Twardella, D., 2009. Perfluorinated compounds - exposure assessment for the general population in western countries. Int J Hyg Environ Health 212 (3), 239–270.
9. Gomis MI, Wang Z, Scheringer M, Cousins IT. 2015. A modeling assessment of the physicochemical properties and environmental fate of emerging and novel per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances. Sci Total Environ.;505:981–991.
10. Hanson M, Small J, Sibley P, Boudreau T, Brain R, Mabury S, Solomon K. 2005 Oct. Microcosm Evaluation of the Fate, Toxicity, and Risk to Aquatic Macrophytes from Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA). Archives of environmental contamination and toxicology 49(3):307–316.
11. Haug, L.S., Huber, S., Becher, G., Thomsen, C., 2011. Characterisation of human exposure pathways to perfluorinated compounds--comparing exposure estimates with biomarkers of exposure. Environ Int 37, 687–693.
12. Haug, L.S., Thomsen, C., Brantsaeter, A.L., Kvalem, H.E., Haugen, M., Becher, G., Alexander, J., Meltzer, H.M., Knutsen, H.K., 2010. Diet and particularly seafood are major sources of perfluorinated compounds in humans. Environ Int. 2010 Oct; 36(7): 772–778.
13. Houde, M., Bujas, T.A., Small, J., Wells, R.S., Fair, P.A., Bossart,G.D., Solomon, K.R., Muir, D.C., 2006. Biomagnification of perfluoroalkyl compounds in the bottlenose dolphin (Tursiops truncatus) food web. Environ Sci Technol 40(13):4138–4144.
14. Hurley, M.D., Andersen, M.P.S., Wallington, T.J., Ellis, D.A., Martin, J.W., Mabury, S.A., 2004. Atmospheric chemistry of perfluorinated carboxylic acids: reaction with OH radicals and atmospheric lifetimes. J Phys Chem A 108(4): 615–620.
15. Kelly, B.C., Ikonomou, M.G., Blair, J.D., Surridge, B., Hoover, D., Grace, R., Gobas, F.A.P.C., 2009. Perfluoroalkyl contaminants in an Arctic marine food web: trophic magnification and wildlife exposure. Environmental Science & Technology 43, 4037–4043.
16. Knox, S. S., Jackson, T., Javins, B., Frisbee, S. J., Shankar, A., Ducatman, A. M., 2011a. Implications of early menopause in women exposed to perfluorocarbons. J Clin.Endocrinol.Metab. 96, 1747–1753.
17. Knox, S. S., Jackson, T., Frisbee, S. J., Javins, B., Ducatman, A. M., 2011b. Perfluorocarbon exposure, gender and thyroid function in the C8 Health Project. J Toxicol Sci 36, 403–410.
18. Liou, J.S., Szostek, B., Derito, C.M., Madsen, E.L., 2010 Apr. Investigating the biodegradability of perfluorooctanoic acid. Chemosphere 80(2):176–183
19. Martin, J.W., Mabury, S.A., Solomon, K.R., Muir, D.C., 2003 Janb. Dietary accumulation of perfluorinated acids in juvenile rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). Environ Toxicol Chem 22(1):189–195.

20. Meesters, R.J., Schroeder, H.F., 2004. Perfluorooctane sulfonate - a quite mobile anionic anthropogenic, surfactant, ubiquitously found in the environment. Water Sci Technol 50(5):235–242.

21. Moody, C.A., Field, J.A., 1999. Determination of perfluorocarboxylates in groundwater impacted by fire-fighting activity. Environmental Science and Technology 33(16):2800–2806.

22. Moody, C.A., Hebert, G.N., Strauss, S.H., Field, J.A., 2003 Apr. Occurrence and persistence of perfluorooctanesulfonate and other perfluorinated surfactants in groundwater at a fire-training area at Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, USA. J Environ Monit 5(2):341–345.

23. NILU, 2013. Perfluorinated alkylated substances, brominated flame retardants and chlorinated paraffins in the Norwegian environment - Screening 2013.

24. Müller, C.E., De Silva, A.O., Small, J., Williamson, M., Wang, X., Morris, A., Katz, S., Gamberg, M., Muir, D.C., 2011. Biomagnification of perfluorinated compounds in a remote terrestrial food chain: Lichen-Caribou-wolf. Environ Sci Technol 45, 8665–8673.

25. Melzer, D., Rice, N., Depledge, M. H., Henley, W. E., Galloway, T. S., 2010. Association between serum perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and thyroid disease in the U.S. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Environ Health Perspect. 118, 686–692.

26. Schröder, H.F., 2003 Dec. Determination of fluorinated surfactants and their metabolites in sewage sludge samples by liquid chromatography with mass spectrometry and tandem mass spectrometry after pressurised liquid extraction and separation on fluorine-modified reversed-phase sorbents. Journal of Chromatography A 1020(1):131–151.

27. Siegemund, G., Schwertfeger, W., Feiring, A., Smart, B., Behr, F., Vogel, H., McKusick, B., 2000. Fluorine compounds, organic. Ullmann's Encyclopedia of Industrial Chemistry.

28. Steenland, K., Woskie, S., Cohort mortality study of workers exposed to perfluorooctanoic acid, 2012. Am J Epidemiol. Nov 15;176(10):909–917.

29. Wang, N., Szostek, B., Buck, R.C., Folsom, P.W., Sulecki, L.M., Capka, V., Berti, W.R., Gannon, J.T., 2005. Fluorotelomer alcohol biodegradation-direct evidence that perfluorinated carbon chains break down. Environ.Sci Technol. 39, 7516–7528.

30. U.S. EPA 2014. Emerging contaminants – perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA).

POPRC-11/5: Unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee,

Taking note of decision SC-7/11, by which the Conference of the Parties requested the Committee to further evaluate hexachlorobutadiene on the basis of newly available information in relation to its listing in Annex C and to make a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties on listing hexachlorobutadiene in Annex C for further consideration at its eighth meeting,

1. *Decides* to establish an intersessional working group to undertake the activities requested in paragraphs 1 and 3 of decision SC-7/11 and agrees to work in accordance with the workplan set out in the annex to the present decision;

2. *Requests* the Secretariat to collect from parties and observers any additional information that would assist the further evaluation by the Committee of the unintentional production of hexachlorobutadiene, including in particular information regarding:

(a) Sources of unintentional formation, releases and emissions of hexachlorobutadiene identified in the risk management evaluation for the chemical as well as new sources;

(b) Standard methods for sampling, monitoring, analysing and reporting unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene in various media;

(c) Risk management measures implemented by parties and other stakeholders to reduce and eliminate unintentional emissions and releases of hexachlorobutadiene to air, water, sludge and products;

(d) Alternative processes for the production of halogenated chemicals to reduce and eliminate unintentional production of hexachlorobutadiene;

(e) Replacement of chlorinated chemicals identified as a source of unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene;

(f) Monitoring data on unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene;

(g) Cost of measures implemented to reduce and/or eliminate unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene.

Annex to decision POPRC-11/5

Workplan for the consideration of additional information on unintentional releases of hexachlorobutadiene

Scheduled date	*Interval between activities (weeks)*	*Activity*
23 October 2015	–	The Committee establishes an intersessional working group
6 November 2015	2	The Secretariat requests parties and observers to provide any additional information that would assist the further evaluation by the Committee of the unintentional production of hexachlorobutadiene
15 January 2016	10	Parties and observers submit the information to the Secretariat
26 February 2016	6	The working group chair and drafter complete a first draft of a document containing a review of the information provided
25 March 2016	4	The members of the working group submit comments on the first draft to the chair and the drafter; the Secretariat invites comments from the Toolkit and BAT and BEP experts
8 April 2016	2	The working group chair and the drafter finish their review of the comments from the working group and complete the second draft and a compilation of responses to those comments
15 April 2016	1	The Secretariat distributes the second draft to parties and observers
13 May 2016	4	Parties and observers submit their comments to the Secretariat
27 May 2016	2	The working group chair and the drafter review the comments from parties and observers and complete the final draft and a compilation of responses to those comments
3 June 2016	1	The Secretariat sends the final draft to the Division of Conference Services, United Nations Office at Nairobi, for editing and translation
29 July 2016	8	The Division of Conference Services completes the editing and translation of the final draft
5 August 2016	1	The Secretariat distributes the final draft in the six official languages of the United Nations
19–23 September 2016	6	Twelfth meeting of the Committee

POPRC-11/6: Guidance on alternatives to perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts, perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and their related chemicals

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

1. *Decides* to establish an intersessional working group to prepare revised guidance on alternatives to perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts, perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and their related chemicals, based on the proposal set out in the note by the Secretariat,[4] for consideration at its twelfth meeting, and agrees to work in accordance with the workplan set out in the annex to the present decision;

2. *Requests* the Secretariat, subject to the availability of resources, to commission the preparation of the revised guidance for consideration by the Committee at its twelfth meeting;

3. *Invites* parties and observers to submit information to enable the Committee to prepare the revised guidance in accordance with the workplan set out in the annex to the present decision;

4. *Invites* parties and observers in a position to do so to provide financial support for the implementation of the activities referred to in the present decision.

Annex to decision POPRC-11/6

Workplan for the development of revised guidance on alternatives to perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts, perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and their related chemicals

Scheduled date	*Interval between activities (weeks)*	*Activity*
23 October 2015	–	The Committee establishes an intersessional working group
30 October 2015	1	The Secretariat invites parties and observers to submit information to assist in the preparation of the revised guidance
8 January 2016	10	Parties and observers submit the information to the Secretariat
4 March 2016	8	The chair of the working group complete the first draft and submit it to the Secretariat The Secretariat invites the working group to provide comments on the first draft
1 April 2016	4	The working group members submit comments on the first draft to the Secretariat
29 April 2016	4	The chair of the working group review the comments on the first draft and complete the second draft and a compilation of responses to the comments
6 May 2016	1	The Secretariat invites parties and observers to provide comments on the second draft
17 June 2016	6	Parties and observers submit comments to the Secretariat
15 July 2016	4	The chair of the working group review the comments from parties and observers and complete the third (final) draft and a compilation of responses to the comments
8 August 2016	3	The Secretariat distributes the final draft in English
19–23 September 2016	6	Twelfth meeting of the Committee

[4] UNEP/POPS/POPRC.11/INF/11/Rev.1, annex.

POPRC-11/7: Effective participation in the work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

The Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee,

Recognizing the limited participation of parties and others in activities organized by the Secretariat and taking into account the circumstances and particular requirements of developing countries, in particular the least developed among them, and countries with economies in transition,

1. *Invites* the Secretariat to continue its activities related to supporting effective participation in the work of the Committee, subject to the availability of resources, including:

(a) The organization of webinars, training and online meetings at times suitable to participants in the various United Nations regions on topics related to the work of the Committee;

(b) The organization of workshops and other face-to-face activities to build the capacities of parties and of training-of-trainers activities, with the support of Committee members, regional centres, regional networks and the regional offices of the United Nations Environment Programme and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations;

(c) The facilitation, in cooperation with members of the Committee and the regional centres, of the development of pilot projects to stimulate the active involvement in the work of the Committee of various stakeholders such as the academic community, research institutes and universities;

(d) The development of tools to facilitate the sharing of information and resources to support the effective participation of parties and others in the work of the Committee, including the development of training modules and videos, which may present successful experiences;

(e) The evaluation of the programme activities referred to in paragraphs 1 (a)–(d) above, as well as the participation of Parties and others, the results of which are to be reported to the Committee at its twelfth meeting;

2. *Invites* regional centres to play an active role in providing assistance to facilitate effective participation in the work of the Committee, including through the exchange of information and expert knowledge in their areas of expertise;

3. *Invites* parties and observers in a position to do so to contribute to the work of the Committee and to provide financial support to facilitate the effective participation by parties in that work.

Annex II

Composition of intersessional working groups (2015–2016)

Working group on decabromodiphenyl ether (commercial mixture, c-decaBDE)

Committee members

Mr. Jack Holland (Australia) **(Co-Chair)**
Ms. Ingrid Hauzenberger (Austria)
Ms. Tamara Kukharchyk (Belarus)
Ms. Estefania Moreira (Brazil)
Mr. Joswa Aoudou (Cameroon)
Ms. Michelle Kivi (Canada)
Mr. Jorge Álvarez Álvarez (Cuba)
Mr. Pavel Cupr (Czech Republic)
Mr. Sylvain Bintein (France)
Ms. Caroline Wamai (Kenya) **(Co-Chair)**
Ms. Mantoa Sekota (Lesotho)
Mr. Martien Janssen (Netherlands)
Ms. Liselotte Såll (Norway) **(Drafter until May 2016)**
Mr. Zaigham Abbas (Pakistan)
Ms. Kyunghee Choi (Republic of Korea)
Mr. Ousmane Sow (Senegal)
Mr. Azhari Abdelbagi (Sudan)
Ms. Maria Delvin (Sweden) **(Drafter from May 2016)**

Observers

Mr. Jean-François Ferry (Canada)
Ms. Katinka Elvira van der Jagt (European Union)
Mr. Timo Seppälä (Finland)
Ms. Caren Rauert (Germany)
Mr. Darren Byrne (Ireland)
Mr. Takahiro Aoyama (Japan)
Ms. Saki Hikosaka (Japan)
Ms. Kyoko Hirasawa (Japan)
Mr. Nobutada Kimura (Japan)
Mr. Noriyasu Nagai (Japan)
Mr. Makoto Nakai (Japan)
Mr. Yasuyuki Suzuki (Japan)
Mr. Mineo Takatsuki (Japan)
Mr. Shuji Tamura (Japan)
Mr. Peter Dawson (New Zealand)
Ms. Christel Moræus Olsen (Norway)
Ms. Trine Celius (Norway)
Ms. Christina Charlotte Tolfsen (Norway)
Ms. Magdalena Pyjor (Poland)
Mr. Pavel Shirokov (Russian Federation)
Mr. Obed Meringo Baloyi (South Africa)
Ms. Thabile Ndlovu (Swaziland)
Ms. Sarah Maillefer (Switzerland)
Mr. Youssef Zidi (Tunisia)
Ms. Ana Corado (United States of America)
Ms. Katherine Weber (United States of America)
Ms. Pamela Miller (Alaska Community Action on Toxics)
Ms. Venetia Spencer (Bromine Science and Environmental forum (BSEF))
Mr. Tobias Bahr (European Automobile Manufacturers Association (ACEA))
Mr. Timo Unger (European Automobile Manufacturers Association (ACEA))
Ms. Michelle Lopez Orfei (International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA))
Mr. Joseph Digangi (International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Mariann Lloyd-Smith (International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN))

Ms. Eva Kruemmel (Inuit Circumpolar Council)
Ms. Sophia Danenberg (United States Council for International Business (USCIB))

Working group on dicofol

Committee members

Mr. Jack Holland (Australia)
Ms. Ingrid Hauzenberger (Austria)
Ms. Tamara Kukharchyk (Belarus)
Ms. Estefania Moreira (Brazil)
Ms. Michelle Kivi (Canada)
Mr. Jorge Álvarez Álvarez (Cuba)
Mr. Pavel Cupr (Czech Republic)
Mr. Sylvain Bintein (France) **(Drafter until May 2016)**
Mr. Hubert Binga (Gabon)
Mr. Ram Niwas Jindal (India)
Mr. Seyed Jamaleddin Shahtaheri (Iran (Islamic Republic of))
Ms. Caroline Wamai (Kenya)
Ms. Mantoa Sekota (Lesotho)
Mr. Martien Janssen (Netherlands)
Mr. Zaigham Abbas (Pakistan)
Mr. Marcus Richards (Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) **(Chair)**
Mr. Ousmane Sow (Senegal)
Mr. Jayakody Sumith (Sri Lanka)
Mr. Azhari Abdelbagi (Sudan)
Ms. Maria Delvin (Sweden)

Observers

Ms. Katinka Elvira van der Jagt (European Union) **(Drafter from May 2016)**
Mr. Timo Seppälä (Finland)
Ms. Caren Rauert (Germany)
Mr. Tirthankar Basu (India)
Ms. Helen Jacobs (Jamaica)
Mr. Takahiro Aoyama (Japan)
Ms. Saki Hikosaka (Japan)
Ms. Kyoko Hirasawa (Japan)
Mr. Nobutada Kimura (Japan)
Mr. Noriyasu Nagai (Japan)
Mr. Makoto Nakai (Japan)
Mr. Yasuyuki Suzuki (Japan)
Mr. Mineo Takatsuki (Japan)
Mr. Shuji Tamura (Japan)
Mr. Adama Tolofoudye (Mali)
Mr. Rameshwar Adhikari (Nepal)
Ms. Christel Moræus Olsen (Norway)
Mr. Pavel Shirokov (Russian Federation)
Mr. Obed Meringo Baloyi (South Africa)
Mr. Molaodi Gordon Khauoe (South Africa)
Ms. Thabile Ndlovu (Swaziland)
Ms. Ana Corado (United States of America)
Ms. Katherine Weber (United States of America)
Ms. Pamela Miller (Alaska Community Action on Toxics)
Mr. Philippe Chatton (CropLife International)
Mr. Mark Trewhitt (CropLife International)
Mr. Joseph Digangi (International POPS Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Eva Kruemmel (Inuit Circumpolar Council)
Ms. Meriel Anne Watts (Pesticide Action Network Asia and the Pacific (PAN AP))

Working group on short-chained chlorinated paraffins

Committee members

Mr. Jack Holland (Australia)
Ms. Ingrid Hauzenberger (Austria)
Ms. Tamara Kukharchyk (Belarus)
Ms. Estefania Moreira (Brazil)
Ms. Michelle Kivi (Canada) **(Drafter)**
Mr. Pavel Cupr (Czech Republic)
Mr. Sylvain Bintein (France)
Mr. Ram Niwas Jindal (India)
Mr. Agus Haryono (Indonesia)
Mr. Seyed Jamaleddin Shahtaheri (Iran (Islamic Republic of))
Mr. Sidi Ould Aloueimine (Mauritania)
Mr. Martien Janssen (Netherlands)
Ms. Kyunghee Choi (Republic of Korea)
Mr. Ousmane Sow (Senegal) **(Chair)**
Ms. Maria Delvin (Sweden)

Observers

Mr. Jean-François Ferry (Canada)
Ms. Katinka Elvira van der Jagt (European Union)
Mr. Timo Seppälä (Finland)
Ms. Caren Rauert (Germany)
Mr. Darren Byrne (Ireland)
Mr. Takahiro Aoyama (Japan)
Ms. Saki Hikosaka (Japan)
Ms. Kyoko Hirasawa (Japan)
Mr. Nobutada Kimura (Japan)
Mr. Noriyasu Nagai (Japan)
Mr. Makoto Nakai (Japan)
Mr. Yasuyuki Suzuki (Japan)
Mr. Mineo Takatsuki (Japan)
Mr. Shuji Tamura (Japan)
Mr. Rameshwar Adhikari (Nepal)
Mr. Peter Dawson (New Zealand)
Ms. Christina Charlotte Tolfsen (Norway)
Mr. Pavel Shirokov (Russian Federation)
Mr. Obed Meringo Baloyi (South Africa)
Mr. Youssef Zidi (Tunisia)
Ms. Ana Corado (United States of America)
Ms. Katherine Weber (United States of America)
Ms. Pamela Miller (Alaska Community Action on Toxics)
Mr. Joseph Digangi (International POPS Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Mariann Lloyd-Smith (International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Eva Kruemmel (Inuit Circumpolar Council)
Ms. Sophia Danenberg (United States Council for International Business (USCIB))
Mr. Dolf Van Wijk (World Chlorine Council)

Working group on pentadecafluorooctanoic acid (CAS No: 335-67-1, PFOA, perfluorooctanoic acid), its salts and PFOA-related compounds

Committee members

Mr. Jack Holland (Australia)
Ms. Ingrid Hauzenberger (Austria)
Ms. Tamara Kukharchyk (Belarus)
Ms. Estefania Moreira (Brazil)
Mr. Joswa Aoudou (Cameroon)
Ms. Michelle Kivi (Canada)
Mr. Jorge Álvarez Álvarez (Cuba)

Mr. Pavel Cupr (Czech Republic)
Mr. Sylvain Bintein (France) **(Drafter until May 2016)**
Mr. Hubert Binga (Gabon)
Mr. Agus Haryono (Indonesia)
Mr. Seyed Jamaleddin Shahtaheri (Iran (Islamic Republic of))
Mr. Martien Janssen (Netherlands)
Mr. Zaigham Abbas (Pakistan)
Ms. Kyunghee Choi (Republic of Korea) **(Chair until May 2016)**
Mr. Jayakody Sumith (Sri Lanka)
Mr. Azhari Abdelbagi (Sudan)
Ms. Maria Delvin (Sweden)

Observers

Ms. Maria Uhl (Austria)
Mr. Jean-François Ferry (Canada)
Ms. Katinka Elvira van der Jagt (European Union) **(Drafter from May 2016)**
Mr. Timo Seppälä (Finland)
Ms. Caren Rauert (Germany)
Mr. Darren Byrne (Ireland)
Ms. Helen Jacobs (Jamaica)
Mr. Takahiro Aoyama (Japan)
Ms. Saki Hikosaka (Japan)
Ms. Kyoko Hirasawa (Japan)
Mr. Nobutada Kimura (Japan)
Mr. Noriyasu Nagai (Japan)
Mr. Makoto Nakai (Japan)
Mr. Yasuyuki Suzuki (Japan)
Mr. Mineo Takatsuki (Japan)
Mr. Shuji Tamura (Japan)
Mr. Adama Tolofoudye (Mali)
Mr. Rameshwar Adhikari (Nepal) **(Chair from May 2016)**
Mr. Peter Dawson (New Zealand)
Ms. Trine Celius (Norway)
Ms. Christel Moræus Olsen (Norway)
Ms. Magdalena Pyjor (Poland)
Mr. Pavel Shirokov (Russian Federation)
Mr. Obed Meringo Baloyi (South Africa)
Ms. Ana Corado (United States of America)
Ms. Katherine Weber (United States of America)
Ms. Pamela Miller (Alaska Community Action on Toxics)
Ms. Venetia Spencer (Bromine Science and Environmental forum (BSEF))
Mr. Tobias Bahr (European Automobile Manufacturers Association (ACEA))
Mr. Timo Unger (European Automobile Manufacturers Association (ACEA))
Mr. Richard F. Holt (FluoroCouncil)
Mr. K. Russel LaMotte (Global Silicones Council)
Ms. Michelle Lopez Orfei (International Council of Chemical Association (ICCA))
Mr. Joseph Digangi (International POPS Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Mariann Lloyd-Smith (International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Eva Kruemmel (Inuit Circumpolar Council)
Ms. Sophia Danenberg (United States Council for International Business (USCIB))

Working group on hexachlorobutadiene

Committee members

Mr. Jack Holland (Australia)
Ms. Ingrid Hauzenberger (Austria)
Ms. Tamara Kukharchyk (Belarus)
Ms. Estefania Moreira (Brazil)
Ms. Michelle Kivi (Canada)
Mr. Sylvain Bintein (France) **(Drafter until May 2016)**
Mr. Hubert Binga (Gabon) **(Chair)**

Mr. Sidi Ould Aloueimine (Mauritania)
Mr. Martien Janssen (Netherlands)
Ms. Maria Delvin (Sweden)

Observers

Mr. Jean-François Ferry (Canada)
Mr. Jianxin Hu (China)
Ms. Katinka Elvira van der Jagt (European Union) **(Drafter from May 2016)**
Mr. Timo Seppälä (Finland)
Ms. Caren Rauert (Germany)
Mr. Darren Byrne (Ireland)
Mr. Takahiro Aoyama (Japan)
Ms. Saki Hikosaka (Japan)
Ms. Kyoko Hirasawa (Japan)
Mr. Nobutada Kimura (Japan)
Mr. Noriyasu Nagai (Japan)
Mr. Makoto Nakai (Japan)
Mr. Yasuyuki Suzuki (Japan)
Mr. Mineo Takatsuki (Japan)
Mr. Shuji Tamura (Japan)
Mr. Peter Dawson (New Zealand)
Ms. Christina Charlotte Tolfsen (Norway)
Mr. Pavel Shirokov (Russian Federation)
Mr. Youssef Zidi (Tunisia)
Ms. Ana Corado (United States of America)
Ms. Katherine Weber (United States of America)
Ms. Venetia Spencer (Bromine Science and Environmental forum (BSEF))
Mr. K. Russel LaMotte (Global Silicones Council)
Ms. Michelle Lopez Orfei (International Council of Chemical Association (ICCA))
Mr. Joseph Digangi (International POPS Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Mariann Lloyd-Smith (International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Eva Kruemmel (Inuit Circumpolar Council)

Working group on perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts, perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and their related chemicals

Committee members

Mr. Jack Holland (Australia)
Ms. Ingrid Hauzenberger (Austria)
Ms. Tamara Kukharchyk (Belarus)
Ms. Estefania Moreira (Brazil)
Ms. Michelle Kivi (Canada)
Mr. Pavel Čupr (Czech Republic)
Mr. Sylvain Bintein (France)
Mr. Hubert Binga (Gabon)
Mr. Agus Haryono (Indonesia)
Mr. Martien Janssen (Netherlands) **(Chair)**
Ms. Kyunghee Choi (Republic of Korea)
Ms. Maria Delvin (Sweden)

Observers

Ms. Maria Uhl (Austria)
Mr. Júlio Sérgio de Britto (Brazil)
Mr. Jean-François Ferry (Canada)
Ms. Katinka Elvira van der Jagt (European Union)
Ms. Caren Rauert (Germany)
Mr. Takahiro Aoyama (Japan)
Ms. Saki Hikosaka (Japan)
Ms. Kyoko Hirasawa (Japan)
Mr. Nobutada Kimura (Japan)

Mr. Noriyasu Nagai (Japan)
Mr. Makoto Nakai (Japan)
Mr. Yasuyuki Suzuki (Japan)
Mr. Shuji Tamura (Japan)
Mr. Adama Tolofoudye (Mali)
Mr. Peter Dawson (New Zealand)
Ms. Trine Celius (Norway)
Mr. Pavel Shirokov (Russian Federation)
Mr. Obed Meringo Baloyi (South Africa)
Mr. Molaodi Gordon Khauoe (South Africa)
Ms. Ana Corado (United States of America)
Ms. Katherine Weber (United States of America)
Ms. Pamela Miller (Alaska Community Action on Toxics)
Ms. Venetia Spencer (Bromine Science and Environmental forum (BSEF))
Mr. Mark Trewhitt (CropLife International)
Mr. Richard F. Holt (FluoroCouncil)
Mr. Karluss Thomas (Global Silicones Council)
Mr. K. Russel LaMotte (Global Silicones Council)
Ms. Michelle Lopez Orfei (International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA))
Mr. Joseph Digangi (International POPS Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Mariann Lloyd-Smith (International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN))
Ms. Eva Kruemmel (Inuit Circumpolar Council)
Ms. Juliana Mara Berti (Leaf-Cutting Ant Baits Industries Association (ABRAISCA))
Mr. Edson Dias da Silva (Leaf-Cutting Ant Baits Industries Association (ABRAISCA))
Mr. Luiz Carlos Forti (Leaf-Cutting Ant Baits Industries Association (ABRAISCA))
Ms. Meriel Anne Watts (Pesticide Action Network Asia and the Pacific (PAN AP))
Ms. Sophia Danenberg (United States Council for International Business (USCIB))

Annex III

Workplan for the preparation of a draft risk profile and a draft risk management evaluation during the period between the eleventh and twelfth meetings of the Persistent Organic Pollutant Review Committee

Scheduled date	*Interval between activities (weeks)*	*Activity (for each chemical under review)*
23 October 2015	–	The Committee establishes an intersessional working group
30 October 2015	1	The Secretariat requests parties and observers to provide the information specified in Annex E for risk profiles and Annex F for risk management evaluations
11 December 2015	6	Parties and observers submit the information specified in Annex E for risk profiles and Annex F for risk management evaluations to the Secretariat • The Secretariat sends a reminder to parties and observers regarding the request for information by 13 November 2015
22 January 2016	6	The working group chair and the drafter complete the first draft • The chair sends the first draft to the Secretariat by 21 January 2016 • The Secretariat sends the first draft to the working group by 22 January 2016
5 February 2016	2	The members of the working group submit comments on the first draft to the chair and the drafter
19 February 2016	2	The working group chair and the drafter finish their review of the comments from the working group and complete the second draft and a compilation of responses to those comments • The chair sends the second draft to the Secretariat by 19 February 2016
26 February 2016	1	The Secretariat distributes the second draft to parties and observers for comments
8 April 2016	6	Parties and observers submit their comments to the Secretariat
29 April 2016	3	The working group chair and the drafter review the comments from parties and observers and complete the third draft and a compilation of responses to those comments • The chair sends the third draft to the Secretariat by 29 April 2016 • The Secretariat sends the third draft to the working group by 2 May 2016
13 May 2016	2	The members of the working group submit their final comments on the third draft to the chair and the drafter
27 May 2016	2	The working group chair and the drafter review the final comments and complete the fourth (final) draft and a compilation of responses to those comments • The chair sends the final draft to the Secretariat by 27 May 2016
3 June 2016	1	The Secretariat sends the final draft to the Division of Conference Services, United Nations Office at Nairobi, for editing and translation
29 July 2016	8	The Division of Conference Services completes the editing and translation of the final draft
5 August 2016	1	The Secretariat distributes the final draft in the six official languages of the United Nations
19–23 September 2016	6	Twelfth meeting of the Committee