



United Nations  
Environment Programme



UNEP



Food and Agriculture Organization  
of the United Nations

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/11  
23 March 2001

ENGLISH ONLY

INTERIM CHEMICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
Second session  
Rome, 19–23 March 2001

REPORT OF THE INTERIM CHEMICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
ON THE WORK OF ITS SECOND SESSION

Introduction

1. The Interim Chemical Review Committee, hereinafter referred to as the Committee, was established pursuant to decision INC-6/2 of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for an International Legally Binding Instrument for the Application of the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, adopted at its sixth session in July 1999, with a membership of 29 government-designated experts appointed on the basis of the interim prior informed consent (PIC) regions.
2. In accordance with paragraph 7 of that decision and pursuant to the provisions of articles 5, 6 and 7 of the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the functions and responsibilities of the Committee were to make recommendations on the inclusion of banned and severely restricted chemicals, make recommendations for the inclusion of severely hazardous pesticide formulations and prepare, as appropriate, relevant draft decision guidance documents.
3. The first session of the Committee was held at the Palais des Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, from 21 to 25 February 2000.

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING

4. The second session of the Committee was held at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Rome, Italy, from 19 to 23 March 2001. The session was opened at 10.05 a.m. on Monday, 19 March 2001, by Mr. Reiner Arndt, Chair of the Committee.
5. Opening statements were made by Ms. Louise Fresco, Assistant Director General, Agriculture, FAO, and Mr. James Willis, Executive Secretary of the Interim Secretariat to the Rotterdam Convention, Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Chemicals.

6. Ms. Fresco, speaking on behalf of Mr Jacques Diouf, Director-General of FAO, said that the core role of the Committee was to decide on the inclusion of chemicals in the interim PIC procedure and to elaborate decision guidance documents for such chemicals. She said that the role was a vital contribution to the protection of human health and the environment, and was of special importance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition, where, owing to weak infrastructure and expertise, farmers and the general public were often unable to protect themselves against the risks associated with chemicals and pesticides. She noted the importance of the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of the Committee and in the interim PIC procedure in general. In its work for the current session, the Committee would have to make substantive decisions on notifications pertaining to two chemicals and to approve an incident reporting form. She noted that at a time when the agricultural sector was under increased pressure to guarantee food safety, the establishment of an operational procedure to review chemicals and severely hazardous pesticide formulations identified for inclusion in the interim PIC procedure constituted a vital contribution to the reduction of health and environmental risks. She observed with concern the lack of proposals on severely hazardous pesticide formulations and the limited number of notifications in general. She also expressed concern that the Rotterdam Convention had been ratified by only 14 countries to date. Declaring that the success of the Convention was a priority, she voiced hope that ratification would reach the required number for the Convention to enter into force by the time of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, to be held in June 2002 in Johannesburg, South Africa, in order to signal the importance of the Convention to Governments.

7. Mr. Willis, speaking on behalf of Mr Klaus Töpfer, Executive Director of UNEP, welcomed the participants to the meeting and thanked FAO for its extensive preparation and organization of the meeting. He outlined the elements of decision 21/3 taken by the UNEP Governing Council at its twenty-first session in February 2001. In that decision, the UNEP Governing Council noted its appreciation for the work done to date by the Committee and the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, but also stated its concern regarding the rate of ratification of the Rotterdam Convention. He expressed his hope that the Convention would come into force by 2002 and further noted the call by the UNEP Governing Council for additional funds to implement interim procedures under the Convention. Regarding the work for the week ahead, he identified the need to act on several notifications, continue the work of the task groups set up at the first session of the Committee and act on the recommendations of the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee.

## II. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

### A. Officers

8. The following officers continued to serve in their respective capacities on the Bureau of the Committee:

<u>Chair:</u>	Mr. Reiner Arndt	(Germany)
<u>Vice-Chairs:</u>	Ms. Flor de María Perla de Alfaro	(El Salvador)
	Mr. Tamás Kömives	(Hungary)
	Mr. Masayuki Ikeda	(Japan)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. Dudley Achu Sama	(Cameroon)

### B. Attendance

9. During the first session of the Committee, the government-designated experts served as members of the Committee on an interim basis, pending formal confirmation of their appointment by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee at its seventh session. Subsequently, and prior to the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, designations of three experts were changed by the

respective nominating governments (Canada, Ethiopia and Turkey). At its seventh session, the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, in decision INC-7/1, formally confirmed the designation of the 29 experts to serve on the Committee and reaffirmed the provisions of decision INC-6/2 with regard to the duration and terms of reference of the experts. The Committee also welcomed a new government-designated expert from Australia.

10. The session was attended by the following 28 experts: Mr. André Mayne (Australia), Ms. Beverley Wood (Barbados), Ms. Sandra de Souza Hacon (Brazil), Mr. Dudley Achu Sama (Cameroon), Ms. Janet K. Taylor (Canada), Mr. Julio Monreal Urrutia (Chile), Ms. Yong-Zhen Yang (China), Ms. Mercedes Bolaños Granda (Ecuador), Mr. Mohammed El Zharka (Egypt), Ms. Flor de María Perla de Alfaro (El Salvador), Mr. Ammanuel N. Malifu (Ethiopia), Mr. Marc Debois (Finland), Ms. Fatoumata Jallow Ndoeye (Gambia), Mr. Reiner Arndt (Germany), Mr. Tamás Kömives (Hungary), Mr. Kasumbogo Untung (Indonesia), Mr. Masayuki Ikeda (Japan), Mr. Ravinandan Sibartie (Mauritius), Mr. Mohamed Ammati (Morocco), Mr. Bhakta Raj Palikhe (Nepal), Mr. Karel A. Gijsbertsen (Netherlands), Mr. Hassan A. Al Obaidly (Qatar), Mr. Boris Kurlyandski (Russian Federation), Mr. William J. Cable (Samoa), Mr. Jan Ferdinand Goede (South Africa), Mr. Azhari Omer Abdelbagi (Sudan), Mr. Pietro Fontana (Switzerland) and Ms. Cathleen Barnes (United States of America).

11. Observers from the following parties were also present: Angola, Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Germany, Greece, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, United States of America and Zimbabwe.

12. Representatives of the following United Nations specialized agencies and intergovernmental organizations were also present: League of Arab States, World Health Organization and the European Commission.

13. The following non-governmental organizations were also represented: Global Crop Protection Federation, Lions Club International, Pesticide Action Network (United Kingdom) and Soroptimist International.

### C. Adoption of the agenda

14. At its opening meeting, the Committee adopted the following agenda on the basis of the revised provisional agenda (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/1/Rev.1).

1. Opening of the session.
2. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
  - (b) Organization of work.
3. Review of the outcome of the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee - action items/decisions relevant to the work of the Interim Chemical Review Committee.
4. Status of implementation of the interim prior informed consent procedure as it relates to the work of the Interim Chemical Review Committee.
5. Consideration of the draft decision guidance document on maleic hydrazide referred to the Interim Chemical Review Committee by the sixth session of the Intergovernmental

Negotiating Committee, in the light of guidance provided by the seventh session of that Committee.

6. Operational procedures for the Interim Chemical Review Committee:
  - (a) Status of the work of the individual task groups established at the first session of the Committee:
    - (i) Task group 1: Format and guidance on submission of notifications of final regulatory action;
    - (ii) Task group 2: Incident report form, format and guidance on submission of proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations;
    - (iii) Task groups 3A and B: Formats for decision guidance documents on banned and severely restricted chemicals and severely hazardous pesticide formulations;
    - (iv) Task group 4: Cooperation and coordination in the submission of notifications of final regulatory action.
  - (b) Issues associated with implementation of the operational procedures:
    - (i) Verified notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical;
    - (ii) Use of Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) numbers and precise chemical descriptions to identify chemicals subject to the interim PIC procedure.
7. Inclusion of chemicals in the interim prior informed consent procedure.
  - (a) Review of notifications forwarded to the Interim Chemical Review Committee – monocrotophos.
8. Other matters.
9. Adoption of the report.
10. Closure of the meeting.

15. The representative of the Global Crop Protection Federation noted that the late distribution of the revised agenda prevented any preparation on monocrotophos by pertinent manufacturers prior to and during the meeting. He requested the secretariat to provide an earlier indication of chemicals to be discussed in future meetings.

#### D. Organization of work

16. At its opening meeting, the Committee decided to conduct its work in plenary and to establish working groups as the need arose.

### III. REVIEW OF THE OUTCOME OF THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE – ACTION ITEMS/DECISIONS RELEVANT TO THE WORK OF THE INTERIM CHEMICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

17. The secretariat introduced its note as contained in UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/2 on the outcome of the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee. Based on the recommendations of the Committee, the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee had adopted a policy on contaminants and, with regard to maleic hydrazide, had requested the Committee to apply two approaches to its consideration of that chemical and report back to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee at its eighth session. Concerning the status of implementation of the interim PIC procedure, the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee had requested the secretariat to prepare an analysis of the problems frequently encountered by Parties in preparing notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical. That analysis was to be considered by the Committee at its second session and the outcome reported back to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee at its eighth session.

18. Furthermore, the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, in confirming the experts designated for the Committee, had noted the need for the Committee to be protected through the use of conflict-of-interest procedures. It had also decided that countries should set priorities when preparing notifications of final regulatory actions. Decision guidance documents had been adopted for two chemicals (ethylene dichloride and ethylene oxide) with the effect that those chemicals became subject to the interim PIC procedure. The decision guidance documents for those two chemicals were circulated on 1 February 2001. In accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, bromacil had not been made subject to the interim PIC procedure. The Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee had encouraged the Committee to develop further an incident report form, had agreed with the Committee's recommendation regarding assistance to countries in identifying severely hazardous pesticide formulations and had adopted the Committee's proposed process for drafting decision guidance documents.

### IV. STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERIM PIC PROCEDURE AS IT RELATES TO THE WORK OF THE INTERIM CHEMICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

19. The secretariat introduced its note as contained in UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/3 on the status of implementation of the interim prior informed consent procedure. That note reflected the information contained in the PIC Circular, which was distributed semi-annually to all designated national authorities and included information that the secretariat was required to provide to Parties under the Convention. The information of special relevance to the Committee was that relating to submission of notifications of final regulatory actions under article 5 and proposals regarding severely hazardous pesticide formulations under article 6. The PIC Circular was thus also distributed to the Committee members for information. With regard to the submitted notifications of final regulatory action, the Committee noted the trend of an increasing number of submitted and verified notifications that were found to contain all the information required in annex I of the Convention.

### V. CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT DECISION GUIDANCE DOCUMENT ON MALEIC HYDRAZIDE REFERRED TO THE INTERIM CHEMICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE BY THE SIXTH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE, IN THE LIGHT OF GUIDANCE PROVIDED BY THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THAT COMMITTEE

20. Under this agenda item, the Chair introduced the note by the secretariat on consideration of the draft decision guidance document on maleic hydrazide (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/4), a compilation of notifications of control actions on maleic hydrazide (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.7) and a compilation of background documents and comments on the draft decision guidance document on maleic hydrazide

(UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.7/Add.1). He recalled that, at its first session, the Committee had decided not to address the draft decision guidance document until after a discussion on the issue of that chemical, the use of which had been reported as banned or severely restricted on the basis of specific levels of contaminants, had taken place at the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee. By decision INC-7/5, the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee had adopted a general policy on contaminants and requested that the Committee, on a pilot basis, and without prejudice to any future policy on contaminants, apply two approaches to its consideration of maleic hydrazide and its impurity hydrazine and report on the outcome to the eighth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee. Those two approaches were described in document UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/4.

21. The Committee noted that there were five derivatives of maleic hydrazide, of which only one, maleic hydrazide potassium salt, remained in international trade. With this in mind, the Committee also noted the importance of identifying the specific derivative for which a notification was being submitted. It was confirmed by an industry representative that the hydrazine content in currently marketed maleic hydrazide potassium salt was less than or equal to 1 ppm owing to a more rigorous quality control procedure and verification by batch sampling. In addition, it was noted with appreciation that an application for an FAO specification for that derivative had already been made by a single manufacturer. The Committee urged the remaining manufacturers to request and apply the same specification. The secretariat would provide guidance to designated national authorities on the procedures that maleic hydrazide manufacturers should follow regarding FAO specifications. In response to several questions regarding the manufacture and international trade of maleic hydrazide and its derivatives, an industry representative provided detailed information that is attached as annex II to the present report. It was stated that, with regard to the question on the stability of maleic hydrazide during storage, only the diethanolamine salt formulation of maleic hydrazide degraded on storage, and that that formulation was no longer in international trade. A small breakout group was established to address the general issue of storage stability of pesticides. The conclusions of that group are attached as annex III to the present report.

22. The Committee applied the two approaches mentioned in paragraph 20 above to the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide. The Committee concluded that in the context of the first approach, there was no international trade in the maleic hydrazide potassium salt with a level of the impurity hydrazine greater than 1 ppm. Using the second approach, it found that there was no decrease in the quantity of the chemical used or in the number of uses. The text of the decision taken by the Committee relative to maleic hydrazide is attached as annex IV to the present report.

## VI. OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES FOR THE INTERIM CHEMICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

### A. Status of the work of the individual task groups established at the first session of the committee

#### (i) Report on the work of task group 1 on format and guidance on submission of notification of final regulatory action

23. The secretariat introduced the documentation on the sub-item, namely, the secretariat's note annexing a report on the intersessional work of task group 1 on format and guidance on submission of notification of final regulatory action (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/5), a note by the secretariat providing a preliminary analysis of problems frequently encountered by parties in preparing notifications of final regulatory action (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/9), and a compilation of examples of notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.1). The Chair briefly described the process for drafting decision guidance documents utilizing the flow chart developed by the Committee at its previous session and adopted by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee at its seventh session (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.5). The Committee established an open-ended breakout group on the matter to be co-chaired by Mr. Debois and Mr. Monreal Urrutia.

24. One of the co-chairs subsequently gave a presentation on the work of the breakout group to the Committee. He reported that the group had undertaken a review of annex I of the Convention and tried to reach, insofar as possible, a common understanding of the intent of each element in that annex. The group identified the information required by annex I that it considered to be essential in order for the Committee to be able to apply the criteria in annex II of the Convention and reach a decision as to whether it should recommend including a chemical in the interim PIC procedure.

25. The group also identified certain instances in which the information elements of annex I would be of particular relevance to the Committee in its preparation of a draft decision guidance document. It agreed on such links between the information elements of annex I and the criteria in annex II. Those links should be highlighted for designated national authorities in future guidance, in order to encourage submission of the essential information.

26. As an aid in its deliberations on what constituted the essential elements of annex I and as a basis for further refinement of the information relevant for the submission of notifications of final regulatory action, the decision whether to include a chemical in the interim PIC procedure and the preparation of draft decision guidance documents, the group drafted an internal guidance document based on annex I, setting out under each item of information required by that annex its agreement on what information was essential and its understanding of how that requirement could best be satisfied by a designated national authority submitting a notification of final regulatory action.

27. The Committee emphasized the need for a designated national authority submitting a notification of final regulatory action to provide information as fully as possible and, where information was unavailable, to so indicate rather than merely to leave blank the relevant spaces on the notification form. The Committee reviewed the internal guidance document based on Annex I developed by the group and agreed that the guidance therein would be of use in the development of any modified notification format and instructions to the designated national authorities to assist in completion of notification forms.

28. The Committee agreed:

(a) That in carrying out its responsibility to verify the completeness of notifications of final regulatory action, the secretariat should take into account the elements of annex I of the Convention identified by the group as essential to the Committee;

(b) That before the secretariat forwards verified notifications to the Committee for review, the designated national authority, in response to a request by the secretariat for the documentation referenced in the notification of final regulatory action, should, if possible, submit a focused summary of the information used in support of the regulatory action and referenced in the notification of final regulatory action for use by the Committee in its consideration of the criteria of annex II of the Convention and should, when citing data from literature, provide references;

(c) That a compilation of model notifications of final regulatory action verified to be complete by the secretariat should be circulated to designated national authorities;

(d) That, in the future, examples of focused summaries should be circulated to designated national authorities;

(e) That, when forwarding notifications to the Committee for review, the secretariat should initiate collection of information on international trade in the chemical that is the subject of the notifications of final regulatory action, as such information was considered essential to the Committee's consideration of the notification and to its prioritization of work;

(f) That a description of a chemical in a notification of final regulatory action could refer to its common name, if that name was specific to that chemical, but the decision guidance document pertaining to

the chemical would be required to state details including the precise chemical name and CAS number of the chemical that was subject to the final regulatory action.

29. Finally, with regard to the preliminary analysis of problems experienced by Governments in their preparation of notifications of final regulatory action, the Committee asked that the secretariat take into consideration the guidance provided in the internal guidance document based on annotated annex I that might facilitate submission of complete notifications, when preparing the final analysis to be forwarded to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee. The Committee also agreed to further consider the issue at its next meeting, should the secretariat identify any remaining problems that should be addressed.

- (ii) Report on the work of task group 2 on incident report form, format and guidance on submission of proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations

30. The secretariat introduced the documentation on the sub-item, namely, the secretariat's note annexing a report on the intersessional work of task group 2 on an incident report form, format and guidance on submissions of proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations, including a draft format for submission of a proposal for inclusion of a severely hazardous pesticide formulation in line with article 6 of the Convention (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/6). Upon request, the representative of the World Health Organization briefly described the work of the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS) with relation to poisons control and a project on the epidemiology of pesticide poisonings. She noted the good cooperation and communication between IPCS and the secretariat. The Committee decided to establish an open-ended breakout group on the sub-item to be co-chaired by Mr. Ammati and a representative of the secretariat.

31. Following the report of the breakout group, a general discussion took place. The severely hazardous pesticide formulation form itself was considered to be largely self-explanatory. Some simple guidance addressing the questions of "who", "what", "when", "where", and "why" was nevertheless elaborated to accompany the form. Additionally, a list of questions was developed as the basis for seeking technical input on the pilot field-testing of the provisional version of the severely hazardous pesticide formulation form. While the intent of the incident report form was to facilitate the submission of information relevant to article 6 of the Convention, it did not preclude countries from developing their own forms for collecting such information or from submitting those forms along with the DNA Transmittal Form (Part A), as long as the information requirements of parts 1 and 3 of annex IV of the Convention were met. In a number of instances where potential concerns were raised in reviewing the draft form it was recognized that they would be better addressed in the course of the pilot field-testing.

32. The Committee agreed:

- (a) That the secretariat, in cooperation with interested Committee members and observers, would lead a task group for the pilot testing phase and develop a further version of the severely hazardous pesticide formulation report form and guidance for submission to the next session of the Committee;

- (b) That a task group would be established to work on the preparation of an outline for a decision guidance document for severely hazardous pesticide formulations, the goal being to facilitate the process for developing a decision guidance document based on the information expected to be available to the Committee;

- (c) That a task group would be established to work on a draft of an environmental incident report form. It was noted that the form could be developed based on the existing model for health-related incidents.

The composition of the three above-mentioned task groups is provided in annex V to the present report.



- (iii) Report on the work of task groups 3A and 3B on formats for decision guidance documents on banned and severely restricted chemicals and severely hazardous pesticide formulations

33. The secretariat introduced the documentation on the sub-item, namely, the secretariat's note annexing a report on the intersessional work of task groups 3A and 3B on formats for decision guidance documents on banned and severely restricted chemicals and severely hazardous pesticide formulations (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/7). The Committee decided to establish an open-ended breakout group on the matter to be co-chaired by Ms. Jallow Ndoye and Ms. Yang.

34. The Committee confirmed that while the decision guidance document served multiple purposes, the main intent of that document was to provide information that would allow a country to make an import decision on the chemical concerned and that might subsequently be used to support a national regulatory action pursuant to paragraph 9 of article 10. The decision guidance document might also serve as a valuable source of information for a number of other national programmes on chemicals management.

35. The Committee took note that the following information was available for the development of a decision guidance document: notifications received from countries, information available at the international level and information from countries that had taken regulatory action. The Committee took note of the format presented by the breakout group and identified possible sources of additional information for completing a draft decision guidance document. Those included Governments, the secretariat, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations, all of whom would, in the process of circulating the draft decision guidance document, provide information on individual items and sub-items of that document. The Committee agreed that information on toxicological endpoints and on exposure values would have to be limited to nationally and internationally recognized information sources. On the understanding that the format presented was an indicative document that should be used as a basis on which a decision guidance document should be drafted, the Committee agreed:

- (a) On the format contained in UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/7, as amended by the breakout group and by the Committee, with the understanding that the secretariat would assist the drafting group on monocrotophos in further developing an internal proposal;
- (b) That members of the drafting group on monocrotophos would report back to the next session of the Committee on lessons learned and proposals for developing guidance to be used by other drafting groups on drafting decision guidance documents for candidate chemicals;
- (c) On the need for guidance to accompany the initial proposal for a draft decision guidance document when circulated for comments, in order to facilitate collection and compilation of the comments, and when presented to the intersessional task group for review in modifying the internal proposal (step 5 of the process for developing decision guidance documents).

- (iv) Report on the work of task group 4 on cooperation and coordination in the submission of notifications of final regulatory action

36. The secretariat introduced the documentation on the sub-item, namely, the secretariat's note annexing a report on the intersessional work of task group 4 on cooperation and coordination in the submission of notifications of final regulatory action, format and guidance on submission of notification of final regulatory action (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/8). Ms. Pornpimon Chareonsong, an official with the Pollution Control Department of Thailand, made a brief presentation on issues related to the implementation of the Convention in Thailand, in particular on how Thailand's regulatory practices comport with the requirements of the interim PIC procedure. The Committee decided to establish an open-ended breakout group on the matter to be co-chaired by Ms. Barnes and Ms. Wood. The group considered cooperation and coordination among countries in preparing notifications and proposals under articles 5 and 6 of the Convention, as well as the question of how the Committee should deal with "old" notifications of final regulatory action, i.e., those submitted prior to implementation of the interim PIC procedure that did not

satisfy the information requirements of annex I of the Convention. The report of the breakout group was presented to and discussed by the Committee.

37. The Committee concluded:

(a) That the PIC Circular included summaries of notifications of final regulatory actions submitted by designated national authorities meeting the requirements of annex I of the Convention and an indication of the availability of a supporting risk or hazard evaluation, and that interested parties should be encouraged to contact the designated national authorities of notifying countries and to request a copy of the referenced documentation. Such a risk or hazard evaluation could be used to support a domestic regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical. The subsequent notification of such regulatory action under article 5 would be required to include an indication that a risk or hazard evaluation had been undertaken. However, in order to meet the criteria in annex II of the Convention, a risk evaluation, including an evaluation of exposure reflecting the prevailing conditions and uses in the notifying country, would be required. The Committee concluded that evaluations on health effects were more readily transferable or shared among countries than those concerning environmental effects;

(b) That, in its consideration of how to deal with “old” notifications, the Committee should take steps to prioritize its activities pertaining to such notifications and that, in the light of this, it should designate as a lower priority work in connection with the possible re-evaluation of pesticides, inasmuch as detailed information on pesticides was available from a number of ongoing government pesticide re-evaluation programmes, notwithstanding the fact that designated national authorities could update their “old” notifications;

(c) That under the Convention, countries experiencing problems caused by severely hazardous pesticide formulations should report such incidents pursuant to part 1 of annex IV of article 6 of the Convention. The information collected by the secretariat in line with part 2 of annex IV could be used to support a national regulatory action to ban or severely restrict the pesticide and be the basis for a notification under article 5;

(d) That it would establish an intersessional task group with the mandate to further develop the process to prioritize work on “old” notifications pertaining to chemicals. The task group would review the criteria and revise the process as a result of experience gained in its application. A further output would be the identification of an initial list of “priority chemicals” that could be the subject of further work by the Committee. The Committee also concluded that the same task group should draft an issue paper on the compatibility of current regulatory practices with the notification requirements of the interim PIC procedure as a possible basis for practical guidance to countries;

(e) That the secretariat should assist the Committee in its work on reviewing “old” notifications and, where possible, in determining whether there was ongoing trade in those chemicals the Committee identified as “priority chemicals”.

The composition of the above-mentioned task group is provided in annex V to the present report.

38. Under the agenda item, the Committee agreed on several recommendations to be made to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, as set out in annex I to the present report.

B. Issues associated with implementation of the operational procedures

(i) Verified notification of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical

39. The secretariat introduced the documentation on the sub-item, namely, a note by the secretariat on verified notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical and a compilation of examples of notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical

(UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF/1). In outlining the issue, the Chair described the process agreed to by the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee whereby the secretariat, when it received at least one notification from each of two PIC regions containing the information required in annex I of the Convention, was required to request from the designated national authority the documentation referenced in each notification and to forward the notifications and accompanying documentation to the members of the Committee. The Committee would review the information provided and, in accordance with the criteria set out in annex II of the Convention, recommend to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee whether the chemical in question should be made subject to the interim PIC procedure and a decision guidance document should be drafted.

40. The secretariat brought to the attention of the Committee two examples of verified notifications that had been submitted. One, pertaining to DNOC, indicated that the regulatory action had not been based on a hazard or risk evaluation. The other, on asbestos (amphibole forms), indicated that, although the action had been based on a risk or hazard evaluation, no documentation was readily available. For each of the chemicals in question, a second notification had recently been submitted and found to contain all the information required in annex I of the Convention. The Committee was invited to consider how to apply the criteria of annex II of the Convention (especially section (b)) to the two example notifications and how such notifications might form the basis for drafting a decision guidance document.

41. The Committee agreed that the secretariat would request the referenced documentation, and, once available, forward the notifications and accompanying documentation to the Committee in line with step 2 of the established process for preparing draft decision guidance documents (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.5).

42. Regarding the notification on asbestos (amphibole forms), the Committee expert from the notifying country informed the Committee that the designated national authority would endeavour to provide the secretariat with supporting documentation, in the form of a focused summary, within six months. The secretariat would forward it with the notifications to the Committee for review in accordance with the established process.

43. Regarding the notification on DNOC, one of the experts from the region where the notification originated volunteered to contact the designated national authority that submitted the notification in order to provide guidance on the notification process and the requirements of article 5 of the Convention. Another expert reported that he would, as designated national authority, soon be submitting a notification on DNOC, along with the supporting risk evaluation.

(ii) Use of CAS numbers and precise chemical descriptions to identify chemicals subject to the interim PIC procedure

44. The secretariat introduced the documentation on the sub-item, namely, the secretariat's note on the use of CAS numbers and chemical descriptions in annex III of the Convention (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/10) and a letter from Pesticide Action Network – North America on the possible inconsistent use of CAS numbers and chemical descriptions (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.2). The Committee concluded that, in submitting notifications of final regulatory action, countries must describe a chemical accurately by name and CAS number, and that governments should be encouraged to require that chemical importers provide them with such information. The Chair suggested that a presentation on the subject of CAS numbers be made at the third session of the Committee. A short discussion took place on four scenarios for reviewing notifications of regulatory action by the Committee, as described in paragraph 4 of document UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/10, and the Committee agreed to apply those scenarios when considering future inclusion of chemicals in the interim PIC procedure.

## VII. INCLUSION OF CHEMICALS IN THE INTERIM PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURE

### A. Review of notifications forwarded to the Interim Chemical Review Committee – monocrotophos

45. The secretariat introduced the documentation on the sub-item, namely, the secretariat's note on verified notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict the chemical monocrotophos from Australia and Hungary (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF/6) and documentation submitted by Australia and Hungary (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.6/Add.1 and Add.2) in support of their notifications. The Committee heard presentations on the two notifications from Mr. Andrew Wagner, an official with the Health Department of Australia, and Mr. Kömives, the member of the Committee from Hungary. The Committee reviewed the two notifications, including the supporting documentation referenced therein, and, taking into account each of the specific requirements set out in annex II of the Convention, concluded that the requirements of that annex had been met. Accordingly, the Committee agreed to recommend to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee that monocrotophos become subject to the interim PIC procedure, and agreed to establish an intersessional drafting group with the mandate to produce a draft decision guidance document for that chemical. The composition of that group is provided in annex V to the present report. The tentative schedule of the group, in line with the operational procedure adopted by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee at its seventh session (decision INC-7/6) is provided in annex VI to the present report. The Committee's recommendation regarding the inclusion of monocrotophos to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee is set out in annex I to the present report.

## VIII. OTHER MATTERS

46. The secretariat introduced the documentation on the item, namely, a note from the Chair of the Committee on using regional workshops to strengthen links between the needs of designated national authorities and the work of the Committee and the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.3). The Committee agreed that such workshops were of considerable value as a means of providing technical assistance to designated national authorities and reached the following conclusions:

(a) The participation of Committee members in regional workshops would provide an opportunity for them to meet designated national authorities and become more familiar with their needs and problems in implementing the interim PIC procedure;

(b) The reports of sub-regional workshops, including the presentations prepared by country participants, should be reviewed by the Committee experts from the regions hosting the workshops for comments and proposals related to the practical experience of designated national authorities in using the documentation available for the operation of the interim PIC procedure. Those comments and proposals should then be consolidated and presented to the next full meeting of the Committee in order that they might be considered in the work of the Committee.

(c) The agendas of the regional workshops should be amended to include, as appropriate:

- (i) Working sessions focused on the technical documents used in the operation of the interim PIC procedure. Such documents would include the PIC Circular, decision guidance documents, the forms for notification of final regulatory action and import responses, and documentation for the submission of proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations;
- (ii) Opportunities to provide further guidance on information exchange and access, the importance of precise descriptions of chemicals in notifications of final regulatory

action and the transferability of data, particularly hazard assessments, in support of regulatory decisions;

(iii) Provision for the representatives of the Committee participating in workshops to chair PIC-related working sessions and to be responsible for preparing the relevant sections of workshop reports;

(d) Committee members participating in workshops should present their experience to the Committee;

(e) To ensure the maximum impact of workshops on the effective implementation of the interim PIC procedure, countries should ensure that workshop participants, as far as possible, are those directly responsible for carrying out the responsibilities of designated national authorities.

47. The Chair noted that the holding of preparatory meetings of the task groups on the Sunday prior to the current meeting of the Committee had proved valuable and recommended that similar meetings be planned for the next session of the Committee.

#### IX. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

48. The Committee adopted its report on the basis of the draft report contained in document UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/L.1, which had been circulated during the meeting, as amended, and on the understanding that finalization of the report would be entrusted to the Rapporteur, working in consultation with the secretariat.

#### X. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

49. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the session closed at 4.50 p.m. on Friday, 23 March 2001.

Annex I

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATING COMMITTEE ADOPTED  
BY THE INTERIM CHEMICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE AT ITS SECOND SESSION, ROME, 19-23  
MARCH 2001

A. Cooperation and coordination in the  
submission of notifications of final regulatory action

The Interim Chemical Review Committee recommends that the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee:

1. Call upon parties to the Convention, to the extent possible, to update and resubmit their notifications of final regulatory action that did not satisfy the information requirements of annex I of the Convention, in line with the requirements of the interim PIC procedure;
2. Call upon designated national authorities and non-governmental organizations to facilitate efforts to delineate the scope of ongoing international trade in certain chemicals to be designated by the Committee upon the conclusion of its efforts to screen and prioritize chemicals that were the subject of previously submitted notifications of final regulatory action;
3. Consider the question of whether countries wishing to present supplementary data to support old notifications regarding industrial chemicals (which, unlike pesticides, have not been the subject of government re-evaluation programmes) should be permitted to utilize scientific data, such as risk evaluations, that did not exist at the time the relevant final regulatory action was taken and therefore did not form the basis for such action.

B. Review of notifications on monocrotophos forwarded to the  
Interim Chemical Review Committee

The Interim Chemical Review Committee, in accordance with paragraph 6 of article 5 of the Convention, recommends to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee that monocrotophos become subject to the interim PIC procedure, noting that the Interim Chemical Review Committee will develop a draft decision guidance document and forward it to the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee in accordance with article 7 of the Convention.

23 March 2001

Annex IIRESPONSE OF UNIROYAL CHEMICAL TO QUESTIONS ON MALEIC HYDRAZIDE POSED BY  
THE INTERIM CHEMICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE AT ITS SECOND SESSION

## 1. Manufacturers of maleic hydrazide

Uniroyal Chemical  
Drexel Chemical  
Fair Products  
Otsuka Chemical  
A manufacturer in China (name unknown)

## 2. The market share percent of each manufacturer

Uniroyal Chemical, Drexel Chemical and Fair Products share 100 per cent of the North American market. The individual market share of each company is confidential business information. Uniroyal and Drexel have approximately 80 per cent of the market in Europe and Asia. The market shares of Otsuka Chemical and the Chinese company are not known, but Uniroyal has analyzed samples of their technical product, and can confirm that their maleic hydrazide acid (technical grade) conforms to the specifications of less than 1 ppm hydrazine.

## 3. Are these market shares global or for the United States of America?

Answer included in question number 2 above.

## 4. What is the total quantity of maleic hydrazide manufactured on an annual basis?

Approximately 1500 metric tons of maleic hydrazide acid (technical grade) and approximately 2000 metric tons of maleic hydrazide potassium salt are manufactured world wide.

## 5. How can the manufacturing process be controlled to achieve a hydrazine content of less than 1 ppm?

By an adjustment of pH, the maleic hydrazide molecule is precipitated in an aqueous reaction medium. This separates the maleic hydrazide from the free hydrazine, which has a higher water solubility. The product is then centrifuged and further washed.

## 6. How do you regulate the quantity of hydrazine in the potassium salt?

No hydrazine is produced in the formulation of maleic hydrazide into the potassium salt, and no hydrazine is formed during storage of the potassium salt. Nonetheless, the maleic hydrazide salt is routinely analyzed for free hydrazine content. The potassium salt formulation is also analyzed for free hydrazine content.

7. What is the quantity sold of each of the other salt formulation?

Diethanolamine (DEA) salt formulations were withdrawn several years ago. To the best of our knowledge, there is no DEA salt formulation marketed today; the last samples were seen more than 10 years ago.

In addition, to the best of our knowledge, the choline and sodium salts are no longer sold.

All of the maleic hydrazide formulation sold is as the potassium salt formulation, quantities of which are reported under question number 4 above.

8. Is maleic hydrazide a pesticide?

Maleic hydrazide acid or technical product is not a pesticide.

9. Why is it registered in the United States of America?

The United States of America requires registration of technical grade products in addition to end-use products, even if the technical grade products are used only for manufacturing end-use products.

10. What are the uses for maleic hydrazide salts?

Maleic hydrazide potassium salt is a plant growth regulator. It is used to control unwanted sucker (auxiliary bud) growth in tobacco and to control undesired sprouting of potatoes and onions in storage. It may also be used to control growth of utility turf grass along inaccessible or difficult to mow rights-of-way and to inhibit amenity tree and shrub growth under utility lines.



### Annex III

#### STORAGE STABILITY OF PESTICIDES, WITH SPECIAL ATTENTION TO REPORTED PROBLEMS IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The breakout group reviewed the problems associated with the storage of pesticides and identified storage as a major concern in pesticide use in developing countries. Decomposition of pesticides in developing countries apparently originates from improper packaging, storage practices and the presence of contaminants, and probably occurs during shipment, handling or storage at sites of sale or use. The breakout group agrees that the problems identified are also related to a lack of awareness among users and inadequate enforcement of existing legislation.

#### Suggestions

1. The breakout group suggests that competent national authorities in developing countries should give higher priority to storage and handling conditions, awareness of the hazards associated with them and enforcement of relevant legislation.
2. Competent national authorities in developing countries should be aware of the possible changes in the stability of stored pesticides due to the climatic conditions in their countries and the toxicological hazards associated with such changes. Their pesticide registration systems should require specification of pesticide storage stability at different temperatures and recommend pesticide waste management practices.
3. The breakout group suggests that, in order to develop national practices in this field, national authorities in developing countries make use of the relevant FAO Manual on the Development and Use of FAO Specifications for Plant Protection Products (fifth edition 1999), the FAO Guidelines for Packaging and Storage of Pesticides (revised 1995) and the FAO Pesticide Storage and Stock Control Manual (revised 1995).
4. The breakout group encourages the competent national authorities in developing countries to request industry to optimize the size and packaging of pesticide containers according to their country's specific requirements and encourages the competent national authorities to develop procedures for proper disposal. National authorities might wish to consult the FAO Guidelines on the Prevention of Accumulation of Obsolete Pesticide Stocks (1995) and Management of Small Quantities of Unwanted and Obsolete Pesticides (1999).
5. Manufacturers must develop pesticide labels that contain specific information about storage conditions and storage stability at high temperatures. Labels should be in the language of the importer and should resist damage during transportation and handling.
6. The breakout group recommends that competent national authorities maximize the use of information exchanges on accidents related to pesticide storage, as indicated in Article 14 of the Convention, through frequent contacts between designated national authorities in developing countries during regional meetings as well as through regular contacts between designated national authorities and experts from FAO.
7. The breakout group recommends that manufacturers develop, on the basis of cost-benefit analyses, adequate containers that will resist degradation under tropical conditions.
8. The breakout group recommends the inclusion of information on storage stability in decision guidance documents, if available.

Annex IV

Maleic hydrazide

The Interim Chemical Review Committee,

Noting that maleic hydrazide is not used directly as a pesticide but is formulated as different salts in order to facilitate application/delivery to the target organisms and its uptake by those organisms (for example the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide is more water soluble than maleic hydrazide itself and is consequently more readily absorbed/taken up by the target plant),

Relying on information submitted by industry representatives and a verbal report from the Committee member from China establishing that the only salt of maleic hydrazide moving in trade was the potassium salt,

Noting also that toxicological reviews by the World Health Organization and the European Union have established that maleic hydrazide containing not more than 1 ppm free hydrazine does not produce adverse effects on health,

Noting further that the Government of the United States of America has also undertaken a full toxicological review and has supported the re-registration of maleic hydrazide containing up to 15 ppm free hydrazine,

Considering that the key manufacturer, Uniroyal Chemical, has submitted data in support of a specification by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations for the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide containing less than 1 ppm free hydrazine for consideration at a meeting of the Organization in June 2001,

Considering Uniroyal Chemical's information concerning sampling and analysis of products on the market, which showed that all known commercially available potassium salts of maleic hydrazide have a free hydrazine content of less than 1 ppm, and

Noting that the free hydrazine content in the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide is less than 1 ppm,

1. Decides to examine the potassium salt and not to pursue consideration of the other forms of maleic hydrazide; and
2. Determines, considering the decision of the Interim Chemical Review Committee above to focus its deliberations on the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide and decision INC 7/4 relating to maleic hydrazide:
  - a) That under scenario 1, there is no evidence of ongoing international trade in the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide in which the concentration of free hydrazine equals or is greater than 1 ppm;
  - b) That under scenario 2, the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide with less than 1 ppm free hydrazine is still moving in trade and the regulatory action did not result in a decrease of the quantity of the chemical used or a decrease in the number of uses;
3. Recommends:
  1. That without prejudice or precedent to any future policy on contaminants, maleic hydrazide not become subject to the interim PIC procedure and a decision guidance document not be developed; that this decision be subject to written confirmation to the secretariat from the identified manufacturers by 1 January 2002 that the level of free hydrazine is not more than 1 ppm and to their commitment to seek and comply with the FAO specifications for the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide by 1 January

2004. The relevant designated national authorities should inform the identified manufacturers of this decision;

2. That the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee request the designated national authorities to identify additional manufacturers of maleic hydrazide other than Uniroyal Chemical, Drexel Chemical, Fair Products and Otsuka Chemical;
3. That the Food and Agriculture Organization give priority to the preparation of specifications for the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide;
4. That designated national authorities in future provide greater specificity about the chemicals subject to their reported regulatory actions to avoid the necessity of the Interim Chemical Review Committee having to interpret the notifications to determine which chemicals are to be considered.

Annex V

INITIAL LIST OF TASK GROUP/DRAFTING GROUP MEMBERS

TASK GROUP ON PILOT TESTING – SEVERELY HAZARDOUS PESTICIDE FORMULATION REPORT FORM

Coordinator: Secretariat (Bill Murray)

Azhari Omer Abdelbagi, Sudan  
Reiner Arndt, Germany  
Dudley Achu Sama, Cameroon  
Mohamed Ammati, Morocco  
Fatoumata Jallow Ndoeye, Gambia  
Julio Monreal Urrutia, Chile  
Bhakta Raj Palikhe, Nepal  
Sandra de Souza Hacon, Brazil  
Kasumbogo Untung, Indonesia

Observers: WHO (Nida Besbelli)  
PAN UK (Barbara Dinham)  
GCPF (Michael Neale)

TASK GROUP ON DEVELOPING A FORMAT FOR A DECISION GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR SEVERELY HAZARDOUS PESTICIDE FORMULATIONS

Coordinator: Secretariat (Bill Murray)

Dudley Achu Sama, Cameroon  
Cathleen Barnes, United States of America  
William Cable, Samoa  
André Mayne, Australia  
Yang Yong-Zhen, China  
Secretariat (Bill Murray)

Observers: WHO (Nida Besbelli)  
PAN UK (Barbara Dinham)  
GCPF (Michael Neale)

TASK GROUP ON DEVELOPMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL INCIDENT REPORT FORM

Coordinator: André Mayne, Australia

Azhari Omer Abdelbagi, Sudan  
Dudley Achu Sama, Cameroon  
Flor de María Perla de Alfaro, El Salvador  
Cathleen Barnes, United States of America  
William Cable, Samoa  
Mohamed El Zarka, Egypt  
Sandra de Souza Hacon, Brazil  
Julio Monreal Urrutia, Chile  
Kasumbogo Untung, Indonesia  
Beverley Wood, Barbados  
Secretariat

Observers: Germany (Achim Holzmann)  
PAN UK (Barbara Dinham)  
GCPF (Rainer Heusel)

#### TASK GROUP ON PRIORITIZATION OF WORK ON OLD NOTIFICATIONS

Coordinator: Karel Gijsbertsen, Netherlands

Dudley Achu Sama, Cameroon  
Mohamed Ammati, Morocco  
Reiner Arndt, Germany  
Cathleen Barnes, United States of America  
Mercedes Bolaños, Ecuador  
William Cable, Samoa  
Marc Debois, Finland  
Pietro Fontana, Switzerland  
Jan Ferdinand Goede, South Africa  
Janet Taylor, Canada  
Secretariat

Observers: GCPF (Richard Nielsson)

#### DRAFTING GROUP ON MONOCROTOPHOS

Co-chairs: Tamás Kömives, Hungary  
André Mayne, Australia

Azhari Omer Abdelbagi, Sudan  
Dudley Achu Sama, Cameroon  
Reiner Arndt, Germany  
Marc Debois, Finland  
Masayuki Ikeda, Japan  
Ravinandan Sibartie, Mauritius  
Janet Taylor, Canada  
Beverley Wood, Barbados



Annex VII

## LIST OF DOCUMENTS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE AT ITS SECOND SESSION

SYMBOL	TITLE
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/1	Provisional agenda (superseded)
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/1/Rev.1	Revised provisional agenda
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/Add.1	Annotated provisional agenda (superseded)
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/Add. 1/Rev. 1	Revised annotated provisional agenda
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/2	Review of the outcome of the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee – Action items/decisions relevant to the work of the Interim Chemical Review Committee
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/3	Status of implementation of the interim PIC procedure as it relates to the work of the Interim Chemical Review Committee
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/4	Consideration of the draft decision guidance document on maleic hydrazide referred to the Interim Chemical Review Committee by the sixth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee, in light of guidance provided by the seventh session of that committee
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/5	Operational procedures for the Interim Chemical Review Committee–Report of the work of task group 1 on format and guidance on submission of notifications of final regulatory action.
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/6	Operational procedures for the Interim Chemical Review Committee–Report of the work of task group 2 on the incident report form, format and guidance on submission of proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/7	Operational procedures for the Interim Chemical Review Committee–Report of the work of task groups 3A and 3B on formats for decision guidance documents on banned and severely restricted chemicals and severely hazardous pesticide formulations
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/8	Operational procedures for the Interim Chemical Review Committee–Report of the work of task group 4 on cooperation and coordination in the submission of notifications of final regulatory action
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/9	Preliminary analysis of the problems frequently encountered by parties in their preparation of notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/10	Use of Chemicals Abstract Service numbers and chemical descriptions in Annex III of the Rotterdam Convention
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.1	Compilation of examples of notifications of final regulatory action to ban or severely restrict a chemical
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.2	Letter from the Pesticide Action Network–North America

UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.3	Using regional workshops as a means to strengthen links between the needs of designated national authorities and the work of the Interim Chemical Review Committee
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.4	New information available at international level relevant to existing decision guidance documents
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.5	Operational procedures for the Interim Chemical Review Committee– Process for drafting decision guidance documents
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.6	Two verified notifications of final regulatory action from each of two prior informed consent regions–Monocrotophos
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.6/Add. 1	Monocrotophos–Documentation from Australia
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.6/Add.2	Monocrotophos–Documentation from Hungary
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.7	Compilation of notifications of control actions on maleic hydrazide
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.7/Add.1	Compilation of background documents and comments on the draft decision guidance document on maleic hydrazide
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.8	New experts on the Interim Chemical Review Committee
UNEP/FAO/PIC/ICRC.2/INF.9	Desired outcomes of the second session of the Interim Chemical Review Committee

-----