



**United Nations  
Environment Programme**

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

Distr.: General  
9 March 2008

English only

---

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

Fourth meeting

Geneva, 10–13 March 2008

Item 5 (b) (ii) of the provisional agenda\*

**Inclusion of chemicals in Annex III of the Rotterdam  
Convention: review of notifications of final regulatory  
action to ban or severely restricted a chemical: aldicarb**

## **Aldicarb: Additional supporting documentation provided by Jamaica**

### **Note by the Secretariat**

The Secretariat has the honour to provide, in the annex to the present note, additional supporting documentation provided by Jamaica in support of its notification of final regulatory action on aldicarb. The material is an excerpt from a survey on the effect of public awareness and use of protective clothing conducted in Jamaica.

---

\* UNEP/FAO/RC/CRC.4/1.

11. PREPARATION AND MIXING OF PESTICIDES

TABLE 11.1

HOW PESTICIDES PREPARED FOR USE

	ALWAYS	USUALLY	SOMETIMES
Following the label	22.4%	31.9%	13.1%
Reading the label & modifying	2.5%	11.1%	19.2%
Asking other farmers	0.3%	4.8%	10.9%
Using memory & experience	1.7%	14.7%	19.3%
Guess	0.9%	3.1%	5.0%
Following inst. from supervisor	1.9%	1.2%	2.2%
Following instr. from store	1.9%	2.2%	1.5%

Most farmers (67.4%) follow the instructions on the label, in various frequencies, in preparation for spraying their crops.

A larger percentage (77.5%) are likely to read the label and mix with modifications/use memory or experience and guess in various frequencies.

32.8% of farmers use modification in mixing pesticides. This came out of the general complaint among farmers that the large chemical companies are deliberately manufacturing weaker concoctions than in previous years in order to force increased sales. The modification therefore is always towards using a greater proportion of powder or liquid.

Other farmers speak of pests becoming immune to labelled instruction mix and stress the necessity of increasing the strength of the mix enough to kill the pest but just short of damaging the crop.

72% of farmers report that most times, they are usually attired in ordinary farm clothes.

In the percentages given above, mask may be any makeshift protection placed across the nose and mouth and may also be a cloth over the nose.

44.8% of farmers state that they dress the way they do for protective reasons. These are those following the instructions on the label as it relates to attire, those wearing gloves, masks and cloth over the nose.

84.8% of farmers tell us that they never or very rarely wear any form of protective gears. Their reasons given are as set out in table 11.6.

TABLE 11.6

REASONS GIVEN BY FARMERS FOR NOT WEARING PROTECTIVE GEARS DURING MIXING

No special reason	- 36.3%
I've always worn this	- 1.1%
I'm in no danger	- 3.7%
Can't afford protective gears	- 5.6%
Its what's available to me	- 2.4%
Most farmers wear the same	- 0.1%
The sprayman mixes	- 4.1%
No reason determined	- 1.5%
	-----
	54.8%

Without adding a weighting factor to the frequencies: Always, usually, sometimes, it can still be seen that the most popular mode of attire during application of pesticides is long pants, short sleeved shirt and water boots or shoes.

When we compare the overall and unweighted percentages of attire worn during application to attire worn during mixing insofar as they relate to main protective gear, we observe the following as set out in table 12.5.

TABLE 12.5  
 -----  
 COMPARISON OF ATTIRE WORN DURING  
 MIXING AND APPLICATION  
 -----

ATTIRE	MIXING	APPLICATION
According to instr.	17.2%	12.8%
Gloves	19.0%	18.4%
Eye protection	7.2%	7.7%
Mouth & nose protection	41.9%	31.1%

34% more farmers protect themselves during mixing when compared to during application as it relates to 'according to the instructions on the label'. This is linked to affordability as it is costlier to purchase protective gears for application than it is for mixing. The differences for gloves and eye protection are not at this stage statistically significant.

35% more farmers use mouth and nose protection during mixing when compared to during application. Farmers believe that the closeness to the raw pesticide during mixing warrants more protection from vapours than during application.

40.1% of farmers state that they are attired the way they are during application of pesticides for protective reasons. These are those following the instructions on the label as it relates to attire, those wearing either gloves, masks, cloth over nose, eye protection and a very small percentage (3%) wearing long sleeved shirts and water boots.

59.9% of our respondents state that outside of water boots, they never wear or very rarely wear any form of protective gears during application. The reasons are shown in table 12.6.

TABLE 12.6

REASONS GIVEN FOR NOT WEARING  
PROTECTIVE GEAR DURING APPLICATION

No special reason	-	28.6%
Can't afford gears	-	14.1%
I'm in no danger	-	2.2%
I've always worn this	-	1.9%
It's what's available	-	9.5%
Someone sprays for me	-	3.6%
		<u>59.9%</u>

TABLE 12.7

PERSONS NEARBY WHEN PESTICIDES  
ARE BEING SPRAYED

Farm assistants	-	26.0%
Family member	-	3.3%
Other farmers	-	8.8%
Me (when applied by sprayman)	-	2.2%
Don't know	-	0.2%
No one exposed	-	59.5%
		<u>100%</u>

An extremely high 40.5% of individuals are exposed to pesticides during application. When this is added to the improperly protected farmers actually applying the spray mixture, the numbers are staggering.

This is not a problem on the larger farms as generally, whenever wholesale pesticide application is taking place, the field is cleared of all other personnel. If one part of the field is being sprayed then personnel not involved are situated at the other section.