



Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade

Distr.: General
3 April 2024
English only

Chemical Review Committee

Twentieth meeting

Rome, 17–20 September 2024

Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda**

**Technical work: report of the Bureau on the preliminary review
of notifications of final regulatory action and proposals for
severely hazardous pesticide formulations**

Report of the Bureau on the preliminary review of notifications of final regulatory action and proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations

Note by the Secretariat

I. Introduction

1. By decision RC-2/2, the Conference of the Parties to the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade adopted a process for the preparation of draft decision guidance documents, which was subsequently amended by decisions RC-6/3 and RC-7/3. In accordance with the process, task groups are to be established for notifications of chemicals and severely hazardous pesticide formulations scheduled for consideration by the Chemical Review Committee. For ease of reference, the procedure is set out in the handbook of working procedures and policy guidance for the Committee.¹

2. In accordance with the procedure, the Bureau of the Committee conducted a preliminary review of the notifications of final regulatory action to be reviewed by the Committee at its twentieth meeting. The report of the Bureau on its preliminary review, including recommendations on the establishment of task groups, is set out in the annex to the present note.

II. Proposed action

3. The Committee may wish to take note of the report of the Bureau on its preliminary review.

* Reissued for technical reasons on 29 April 2024.

** UNEP/FAO/RC/CRC.20/1.

¹ Available at www.pic.int/tabid/1060/.

Annex

Preliminary review of notifications of final regulatory action

I. Approach taken by the Bureau for the intersessional work on the notifications of final regulatory action and proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations to be reviewed by the Chemical Review Committee at its twentieth meeting

1. The Bureau of the Chemical Review Committee conducted a preliminary review of notifications of final regulatory action pending review by the Committee. Given the high workload, with a large number of notifications and proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations before the Committee, and in light of the time available, the Bureau selected 33 new notifications of final regulatory action for 14 chemicals and 4 proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations to be prioritized for review by the Committee at its twentieth meeting. The selected chemicals are benzinone and its salts, chlorpyrifos, chlorpyrifos-methyl, cyhexatin, dichlorvos, dicofol, hexachlorobenzene, paraquat and paraquat dichloride, pentachlorobenzene, phenthoate, profenofos, prothiofos, quinalphos and zineb. The four proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations relate to cypermethrin emulsifiable concentrate 10%, cypermethrin emulsifiable concentrate 35%, emamectin benzoate water-soluble granules 5% and methomyl soluble powder 40%. In addition, the agenda of the twentieth meeting of the Committee lists five chemicals that were introduced and reviewed at previous meetings of the Committee, but for which the Committee has not reached a conclusion: carbaryl, chlorfenvinphos, ethion, methidathion and thiodicarb. The review of 32 other notifications for 10 chemicals¹ would take place at a future meeting of the Committee.
2. Section 1.6 of the handbook of working procedures and policy guidance for the Committee sets out a procedure for dealing with notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical. The procedure was brought to the attention of the Conference of the Parties at its third meeting, which took note of it.² The procedure suggests that for those notifications that appear to meet the requirements of the Convention, intersessional task groups would be created prior to the meetings of the Committee, in line with the agreed process for drafting decision guidance documents. Intersessional task groups would not be formed for notifications that appear not to meet the requirements of the Convention.
3. The Bureau accordingly decided to prioritize the consideration of new notifications of final regulatory action for intersessional work leading up to the Committee's twentieth meeting and to forego setting up task groups for notifications which, following the preliminary review conducted by the Secretariat and the Bureau, seemed highly unlikely to meet the criteria of Annex II to the Convention. In particular, the Bureau assessed the responses to question 2.4 of the notification form:³ "Was the final regulatory action based on a risk or hazard evaluation?" Where the answer to the question was "Yes", intersessional task groups were established to conduct an initial review and prepare an analysis of whether and how the notifications and supporting documentation meet the criteria of the Convention. Where the answer was "No", it was generally recommended that the related notifications should not undergo intersessional work and should be considered directly by the Committee at its twentieth meeting. However, the Bureau selected one notification with "No" as the answer to question 2.4 of the notification form to undergo intersessional work, namely the notification from Malaysia on profenofos, in order to look in more detail into the notification. The Bureau agreed to decide whether intersessional work would be conducted on a notification-by-notification basis, meaning that for some chemicals certain notifications would undergo intersessional work while others would not.
4. The Committee would still need to take a decision on each of the notifications to be considered without intersessional work, deciding which criteria of Annex II to the Convention were fulfilled and which were not. In order to facilitate the review by the Committee, and without prejudice to any

¹ These are atrazine, azinphos-ethyl, diazinon, endrin, fenamiphos, fipronil, mephosfolan, methiocarb, methomyl and prothoate.

² By decision RC-7/3, the Conference of the Parties welcomed the handbook. At its ninth meeting, the Conference of the Parties, by decision RC-9/2, requested the Secretariat to translate the handbook.

³ Corresponds to section 2.3 of the previous version of the notification form.

decision that the Committee may decide to adopt, section III below sets out a short summary of the results of the Bureau's preliminary review of these notifications.

5. The Bureau furthermore decided that for notifications that did not undergo intersessional work and were considered directly by the Committee, but about which concerns arose during the Committee meeting that prompted a need for further information, the Committee could agree to a subsequent round of intersessional work.

6. Lastly, the Bureau decided that intersessional task groups would be set up for the four proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations, while no task groups would be set up for the five notifications that had been considered by the Committee at previous meetings and for which intersessional task groups had been previously established.

II. Intersessional task groups for notifications of final regulatory action and proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations to be reviewed by the Chemical Review Committee at its twentieth meeting

7. In accordance with the approach explained in section I above, task groups have been established to conduct an initial review and prepare an analysis as to whether and how certain notifications meet the criteria of Annex II to the Rotterdam Convention.

8. Each task group was responsible for conducting a preliminary assessment of the assigned notifications of final regulatory action and proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations. On the basis of the criteria set forth in Annex II and part 3 of Annex IV each task group prepared a draft report for the notifications and proposals assigned to it, including available supporting documentation and information collected by the Secretariat. The draft reports will be posted on the Convention website for comments by Committee members and observers between 5 and 29 July 2024. During the plenary sessions of the twentieth meeting of the Committee, the chairs and drafters of the task groups will present the results of the groups' preliminary assessments to the Committee for its consideration.

9. On the basis of the Bureau's preliminary review and the prioritization approach, as described in section I of the present annex, table 1 sets out the composition of the intersessional task groups. While each Committee member was assigned to one task group, members can freely join additional groups by signalling their wish to do so to the Secretariat.

Table 1

Composition of the intersessional task groups

<i>Chemical name</i>	<i>Notifying Party</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Task group</i>
Hexachlorobenzene	Australia	Industrial	Chair
Pentachlorobenzene	Australia	Industrial	Victorine Pinas (Suriname)
			Drafter
			Adam Barlow (Australia)
			Members
			Stephen Sangster (Belize)
			Oarabile Serumola (Botswana)
			Cangmin Li (China)
			Joseph Edmund (Ghana)
			Carlos Acevedo González (Guatemala)
			Yenny Meliana (Indonesia)
			Giuseppe Granato (Italy)
			Palarp Sinhaseni (Thailand)
Cypermethrin emulsifiable concentrate 10%	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Severely hazardous pesticide formulation	Chair
			Suzana Andrejevic Stefanovic (Serbia)
			Drafter
			Irene Beate Sørvik Malme (Norway)
			Members
			Juergen Helbig (Austria)
			June Aluoch (Kenya)

<i>Chemical name</i>	<i>Notifying Party</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Task group</i>
Emamectin benzoate water-soluble granules 5%	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Severely hazardous pesticide formulation	Judite Dipane (Latvia) Sidi Ould Aloueimine (Mauritania) Zaigham Abbas (Pakistan) Christian Sekomo Birame (Rwanda)
Methomyl soluble powder 40%	Lao People's Democratic Republic	Severely hazardous pesticide formulation	Jeevani Marasinghe (Sri Lanka) Hasmath Ali (Trinidad and Tobago)
Chlorpyrifos-methyl	European Union	Pesticide	Chair
Dichlorvos	European Union	Pesticide	Saida Ech-Chayeb (Morocco)
Paraquat and paraquat dichloride	Burkina Faso	Pesticide	Drafters
	Cabo Verde	Pesticide	Christian Bart (Canada)
	Chad	Pesticide	Carles Escriva (Germany)
	Mali	Pesticide	Members
	Mauritania	Pesticide	Suresh Lochan Amichand (Guyana)
	Niger	Pesticide	Dinesh Runiwal (India)
	Senegal	Pesticide	Ahmad Heidari (Iran)
	Togo	Pesticide	Shankar Paudel (Nepal)
Profenofos	Malaysia	Pesticide	Charles Bodar (Netherlands (Kingdom of the)) Nolozuko Gwayi (South Africa) Daniel Ndiyo (United Republic of Tanzania)

III. Results of the preliminary review by the Bureau for notifications of final regulatory action for which intersessional work was not prioritized

10. The notifications of final regulatory action that have not been prioritized for intersessional work by the Bureau, as explained in section I above, are set out in table 2 below.

Table 2

Notifications of final regulatory action not prioritized for intersessional work

<i>Chemical name</i>	<i>Notifying Party</i>	<i>Category</i>
Benzidine and its salts	Türkiye	Industrial
Chlorpyrifos	Chile	Pesticide
Chlorpyrifos-methyl	Chile	Pesticide
Cyhexatin	Türkiye	Pesticide
Dichlorvos	Malawi	Pesticide
	Serbia	Pesticide
Dicofol	Chile	Pesticide
	Peru	Pesticide
	Türkiye	Pesticide
Paraquat and paraquat dichloride	Chile	Pesticide
	Türkiye	Pesticide
Phenthoate	Malaysia	Pesticide
	Türkiye	Pesticide
Profenofos	Türkiye	Pesticide
Prothiofos	Malaysia	Pesticide
	Türkiye	Pesticide
Quinalphos	Malaysia	Pesticide
	Türkiye	Pesticide
Zineb	Ecuador	Pesticide
	Türkiye	Pesticide

11. The analysis of the Bureau according to its preliminary review is as follows:

A. Benzidine and its salts

12. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.

B. Chlorpyrifos

13. The notification from Chile was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). The notifying Party indicated that, although it had conducted a comprehensive review of the new scientific information on the risks to human health and the environment of the pesticide, no risk evaluation involving prevailing conditions had been carried out, in particular in relation to information on actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Chile.

C. Chlorpyrifos-methyl

14. The notification from Chile was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). The notifying Party indicated that, although it had conducted a comprehensive review of the new scientific information on the risks to human health and the environment of the pesticide, no risk evaluation involving prevailing conditions had been carried out, in particular in relation to information on actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Chile.

D. Cyhexatin

15. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.

E. Dichlorvos

16. The notification from Malawi was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. The notifying Party stated that the available information was insufficient to perform a risk assessment regarding the exposure of operators, workers and bystanders. Consequently, it was decided that the risks to these groups were not acceptable.

17. The notification from Serbia was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. The reason given by the notifying Party for taking the regulatory action was to harmonize Serbian legislation with that of the European Union and to ensure a high level of protection for human health, animal health and the environment.

F. Dicofol

18. The notification from Chile was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). The notifying Party indicated that, although it had conducted a comprehensive review of the new scientific information on the risks to human health and the environment of the pesticide, no risk evaluation involving prevailing conditions had been carried out, in particular in relation to information on actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Chile.

19. The notification from Peru was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving prevailing conditions within the Party taking the

action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Peru was provided.

20. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.

G. Paraquat and paraquat dichloride

21. The notification from Chile was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). The notifying Party indicated that, although it had conducted a comprehensive review of the new scientific information on the risks to human health and the environment of the pesticide, no risk evaluation involving prevailing conditions had been carried out, in particular in relation to information on actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Chile.

22. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.

H. Phenthoate

23. The notification from Malaysia was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. The final regulatory action was taken owing to violation of maximum residue limits, frequent detection of off-label use and the availability of safer and effective alternatives. This notification is similar to the one on profenofos from Malaysia, for which an intersessional task group report will be prepared. Further insights on reviewing this notification will be gained from the review of the notification on profenofos.

24. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.

I. Profenofos

25. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.

J. Prothiofos

26. The notification from Malaysia was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving prevailing conditions within the Party taking the action had been carried out. The final regulatory action was taken owing to violation of maximum residue limits, frequent detection of off-label use and the availability of safer and effective alternatives. This notification is similar to the one on profenofos from Malaysia, for which an intersessional task group report will be prepared. Further insights on reviewing this notification will be gained from the review of the notification on profenofos.

27. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving prevailing conditions within the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.

K. Quinalphos

28. The notification from Malaysia was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. The final regulatory action was taken owing to violation of maximum residue limits, frequent detection of off-label use and the availability of safer and effective alternatives. This notification is similar to the one on profenofos from Malaysia, for which an intersessional task group report will be prepared. Further insights on reviewing this notification will be gained from the review of the notification on profenofos.

29. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.

L. Zineb

30. The notification from Ecuador was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except criterion (b), as no additional information has been provided by the notifying Party to support the regulatory decision and the risk and hazard evaluation performed. The regulatory measure had the intended effect of eliminating potential carcinogenic effects on the operators.

31. The notification from Türkiye was found by the Bureau to appear to meet the criteria of Annex II, except subcriterion (b) (iii). According to the information available to the Bureau, and as indicated by the notifying Party itself, no risk evaluation involving conditions prevailing in the Party taking the action had been carried out. Furthermore, no information on use or actual, expected or anticipated exposure under prevailing conditions in Türkiye was provided.
