

Online survey on priority actions to enhance the effectiveness of the Rotterdam Convention: Compilation of submissions

I. Background

1. The eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Rotterdam Convention, in decision RC-8/8, requested the Secretariat to develop an online survey to gather information on (i) priority actions to enhance the effectiveness of the Convention, and (ii) key information gaps related to point (i), to be sent to Parties by 30 June 2017.
2. Accordingly, the Secretariat developed an online survey in English, French and Spanish asking Parties to—
 - (a) describe a maximum of 5 (five) priority actions that could be undertaken to enhance the effectiveness of the Rotterdam Convention; and
 - (b) indicate key information gaps for each of the identified priority actions.
3. Parties were invited to complete the online survey by 31 October 2017. Submissions were received until 15 November 2017.
4. The results of the survey will form the basis for a Secretariat report analysing the legal and operational implications of the priority actions identified by Parties. The report will be made available to Parties and others for comments by 15 January 2018. The report and comments received thereon will be considered by a working group established by decision RC-8/8, with membership composed of representatives from Parties and open to the participation by non-Party states, which is mandated to (i) identify, on the basis of the abovementioned report and comments received thereon, a set of prioritized recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of the Convention, and (ii) develop a report identifying further steps for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting.

2. Participation and geographical distribution

5. As of 15 November 2017, the Secretariat received 24 responses from Parties to the Rotterdam Convention (including the European Union (EU) on behalf of its 28 member States), from 33 developed countries (OECD and EU member States) and 18 developing countries or countries with economies in transition (Africa 2, Asia and Pacific 7, Central and Eastern Europe 2, Latin America and Caribbean 7). There were no responses from small island developing countries. The response rate was 32 per cent.¹
6. The results of the survey form the basis for the present report.
7. The following table summarizes the level of response per region based on the number of Parties in each region:

Africa	2 out of 47 Parties	Republic of the Congo, Uganda
Asia-Pacific	8 out of 38 Parties (includes 1 as coordinated response through the EU)	Afghanistan, Bahrain, China, Jordan, Kuwait, Sri Lanka, Yemen As coordinated response through the EU: Cyprus
Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia	13 out of 22 Parties (includes 11 as coordinated response through the EU)	Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia As coordinated response through the EU: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia
Latin America and Caribbean	8 out of 28 Parties	Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Venezuela

¹ As of 15 November 2017, 158 States and the European Union were Parties to the Rotterdam Convention.

Western Europe and Others	20 out of 23 Parties (includes 16 as coordinated response through the EU)	Australia, Canada, Norway, Switzerland As coordinated response through the EU: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
---------------------------	--	--

8. A compilation of all responses received is available in the Annex.

Annex

Compilation of submissions

1.	Afghanistan.....	2
2.	Australia.....	3
3.	Bahrain.....	6
4.	Bosnia and Herzegovina	6
5.	Canada	7
6.	China.....	8
7.	Colombia	8
8.	Costa Rica.....	9
9.	Democratic Republic of the Congo.....	9
10.	Ecuador	10
11.	European Union and its member States.....	10
12.	Honduras.....	12
13.	Jordan.....	13
14.	Kuwait	13
15.	Mexico	13
16.	Norway	15
17.	Panama.....	16
18.	Peru	16
19.	Sri Lanka.....	17
20.	Switzerland	18
21.	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	19
22.	Uganda.....	20
23.	Venezuela	21
24.	Yemen.....	22

1. Afghanistan

Priority Action 1

— Description of action:

Develop secondary legislation and regulations to be implemented by NEPA, its partner agencies and ministries in Government under the Environment Law for the sound management of chemicals including pesticides listed in RC:

In order to strengthen sound chemical management, secondary legislation and regulations should be developed under the Environment Law. This will involve the review of existing regulatory frameworks relevant to fulfilling Afghanistan's participation and obligations under the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata conventions. Specific secondary legislation will be drafted for areas with gaps identified, particularly, Granting of Prior Informed Consent for the import of chemicals listed under the Rotterdam Convention.

— Related information gaps:

- > Lack of information about the relevant regulatory steps to make sure that the risks associated with their use are properly addressed
- > Capacity gap in policy making and regulatory action in the area of chemicals management
- > Lack of information and capacity to analyze the current chemicals situation in the country and develop legislations.

Priority Action 2

— Description of action:

Strengthen the capacity of chemicals partner agencies to enforce the Environment Law and obligations under BRS in relation to hazardous chemicals:

A specialist unit within NEPA should be established in order to lead the implementation and coordination of Afghanistan's chemical agreements (namely, Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata). NEPA has already established similar structures for ozone and climate finance, these units are able to provide targeted efforts on translating international commitments and obligations into national-level actions. Thus, this chemical unit will develop protocols for data collection relating to chemical inventories, lead on regular and systematic national reporting to MEAs, lead inter-ministerial chemical coordination, set up a GIS database, and establish a work plan for data collection. The chemical working group should be trained on the prior informed consent of Rotterdam convention and how to deal with hazardous chemicals.

— Related information gaps:

- > Information gap related to the safety and socio-economic aspects of the use of chemicals
- > Lack of information on the properties and risks of the majority of the chemicals substances imported to the country
- > Knowledge gap to manage the risk of chemicals and provide appropriate safety information to professional users
- > Lack of availability and accessibility of information to downstream users, government authorities and general public
- > Lack of expertise to diagnose diseases and illness due to exposure to hazardous chemicals
- > Lack of dedicated technical expertise in managing the chemicals listed in Rotterdam convention

Priority Action 3

— Description of action:

Establish a research programme to detect hazardous chemical in NEPA by an analytical laboratory:

Afghanistan currently does not have an analytical laboratory to analyse and detect hazardous materials in goods imported. Therefore, a detailed programme of research on chemical management should be conducted, which will provide the foundation for determining future actions in this area. Detailed protocols should be developed for the collection of samples including pesticides and industrial chemical from importer to issue permission letter. The results of the analysis should be presented as technical reports, which will help fill existing gaps in knowledge about chemical management in Afghanistan, as well as provide recommendations for policy actions to address the chemical pollutants identified, in particular to ensure that they are managed from Customs Services to reduce adverse impacts on health and environment.

— Related information gaps:

- > Insufficient information about the existing substances and their adverse effects

- > Insufficient data and information to estimate the release of chemicals and thus developing appropriate actions
 - > Information gap on the level of chemicals in samples like soil, water, waste sludge etc
 - > Gaps in information to collect and monitor data that is essential in maintaining the inventory of hazardous chemicals and implementing policies to management
- Priority Action 4
- Description of action:

Develop National Standards by Afghanistan National Standards Authority for Pesticides industrials:

Although Afghanistan does not have a large industrial sector, it imports many materials and consumer goods that fall into categories known possibly to contain hazardous chemicals. In order to identify those with acceptable uses, the chemical working group in collaboration with Afghanistan National Standard Authority should develop standards that could be used to permit or prohibit goods containing chemicals.
 - Related information gaps:
 - > Lack of information on the production, trade and use of chemicals
 - > Lack of information on the hazardousness of chemical substances
 - > Lack of information about the supply chain of chemicals
- Priority Action 5
- Description of action:

Provide protective equipment, analytical Capacity and trainings:

Incineration of Clinical Waste: Over 400 government and non governmental hospitals exist in Afghanistan which produces a lot of clinical waste and there is lack of the technology to incinerate them in an environmentally sound manner. Proper incineration system is an urgent need reduce the potential danger of chemicals in clinical waste. Management of PCBs: Analytical capacity and training should be provided to DABS (Afghanistan Power Supply Company) to survey existing transformers particularly those from the Soviet Union time that are still being used and other materials that contain PCBs.

Establish expired pesticide stores: Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock should be provided with equipments to stock and dispose hazardous pesticides. Establishment of stores for expired pesticides is needed to be transferred or disposed of on an environmentally sound manner.
 - Related information gaps:
 - > Lack of information related to Regulation concerning plant protection products
 - > Lack of alternative plan in events of chemical disasters
 - > Lack of information on the improved risk management or controls which could lead to reduced exposures or emissions
 - > Gaps in information about the availability of appropriate technology to address chemical issues

2. Australia

- Priority Action 1
- Description of action:

Considering where consensus cannot be reached to list substances, options to amend the Convention should be considered. This includes but is not limited to, consideration of the proposal at COP8 by a group of African Nations to amend the decision making process through to the addition of a new Annex.
 - Related information gaps:

The PIC procedure is required for substances that are listed in Annex III to ensure that Parties are aware and consent to the importation of hazardous substances. Only substances that meet the criteria of being a hazardous substance are listed under the Convention. However some hazardous substances (i.e. those that are determined by the CRC to meet the listing criteria) are not listed under the Convention because there is a failure of Parties to reach a consensus.

This results in Parties who are supportive of the listing of the hazardous substance not have the opportunity to be made aware of the entry of the hazardous substance into their jurisdiction.

Previously proposed amendments to the decision making process to list new chemicals have included:

> Adapting the consensus decision making process for listing chemicals (Article 22) to that of the decision making process for amending the Convention (Article 21).

> Addition of new annexes to list chemicals to the Convention.

> Combinations of amendments to the Convention and addition of new annexes.

To better enable Parties to consider this issue and consider implications for amending the Convention, the following matters could be explored:

> Have other Conventions amended their text to address similar issues raised above (i.e. where consensus cannot be reached but a significant majority of Parties seeks a listing)?

> What are those Conventions and what changes/amendments were made?

> What were the practical outcomes from these changes/amendments (i.e. did they achieve their desired outcome)?

Priority Action 2

— Description of action:

Consideration should be given on how to make key terminology less ambiguous in the listing criteria and the Convention more broadly. For example, key terms are not defined in Article 2(d) (Severely Hazardous Pesticide Formulation), Annex II (b)(iii) (risk evaluation) and Annex IV Part 3.(d) (the quantity of the formulation used). As a result, Parties may understand or interpret these key terminology and/or criteria differently which may lead to disagreement or misunderstanding of the Convention's mechanisms, processes and decision making functions.

— Related information gaps:

Administration of the Convention could be improved by ensuring clarity on Convention processes and key considerations at each step. It can be difficult for some Parties to transfer knowledge between COP and CRC meetings. This may lead to inconsistency between meetings which is compounded over time i.e. definition of a risk evaluation. This may lead to confusion at a COP meeting on what a term means and then this diverts the attention of Parties from the main work of the COP. In addition there appears to be inconsistency between different COP meetings.

Some possible solutions to this may include:

> Providing policy on key terms;

> Educating Parties on key terms;

> Amending the Convention to provide greater clarity.

To better enable Parties to consider this issue, the following matters could be explored:

> What is the key terminology that Parties appear to:

> Have difficulty understanding (e.g. queries to the Secretariat);

> Have sought clarification on (e.g. requested further guidance);

> Have taken different views on (e.g. at COP's parties might take different views of a key term)?

> Has the Secretariat identified areas for further clarification?

> How have other Conventions dealt with the issues raised above (i.e. if they needed to clarify a key term what steps did they take)? If so:

> which conventions;

> how have they dealt with it (e.g. amend the Convention or pass a policy in accordance with the Convention or deal with it administratively)?

Priority Action 3

— Description of action:

Consideration should be given to how the Secretariat and/or Parties can further implement or assist other Parties to implement the PIC procedure and associated administrative processes. Methods to improve Parties' understanding of their obligations regarding the PIC procedure and operation of the Convention could be examined. Ways to increase the understanding of exporter's and importer's obligations could lead to better implementation of the PIC procedure. A review of support mechanisms for developing countries and the benefits from support should be evaluated.

— Related information gaps:

The ability of Parties to regulate the import and export of Hazardous substance is variable. As a result some Parties place a greater emphasis on the importance of the PIC process.

For Parties that place a greater emphasis on the PIC process it is important that they are supported to assist them in regulating a hazardous substance. Methods that could be considered include:

- > provision of support;
- > increased education and awareness campaigns;
- > mentoring/secondments to other Parties;
- > development of model regulatory frameworks.

To better enable Parties to consider this issue, the following matters could be explored:

- > How have other Conventions sought to implement similar requirements;
- > What options exist to assess the effectiveness of this and other Conventions, and implementation of the PIC procedure;
- > Are there more successful implementation mechanisms?

Priority Action 4

— Description of action:

Consideration should be given to how to increase the consistency of CRC recommendations with strategies or procedures that strengthen the foundation of recommendations to the COP on chemicals listings. Consideration could also be given to how interested entities and/or specialists could be engaged by the CRC to assist their deliberations, as utilised by the POPRC to resolve gaps in information.

— Related information gaps:

Recommendations by the CRC to the COP are based on the information available at the time and the individual committee members' knowledge and understanding of the Convention's criteria. Exploring avenues that help the CRC to provide consistent recommendations over time may help in the decision making process of the COP.

Improving the predictability in how the Convention operates may improve the consistency of:

- > Recommendations made by the CRC;
- > Decisions made at the COP;
- > Nominations;
- > Compliance with the Convention more broadly.

Potential areas to explore to improve consistency could include:

- > Increasing guidance to Parties;
- > Enabling external experts to be engaged;
- > Seeking information or assistance from other relevant bodies (e.g. companies, NGO's, etc);
- > Proactively engage with other Parties and relevant bodies.

Priority Action 5

— Description of action:

Consideration should be given to examining the factors considered by Parties when deciding whether to agree to list chemicals to Annex III and analyse if these factors align with the Convention's goals and criteria for listing. It is possible that Parties have differing access to information and a varied understanding of what considerations should and should not be considered by the COP.

— Related information gaps:

Exploring the factors considered by Parties in past decisions to list or not list chemicals to Annex III and whether these considerations align with the Conventions goals and criteria could improve the future effectiveness of listing chemicals. Parties' understanding of the objectives of the Convention was explored in the 2016 intersessional process and was a major point of agreement. Exploring how Parties' consider the Convention's objections in decisions to either support or block Annex III listings could provide insight into how to progress future listings.

The operation of the Convention may be enhanced through an analysis of the bodies (e.g. CRC and COP) and their relationship to each other. This may:

- > Reduce the duplication of work;
- > Minimise the re-prosecution of positions;
- > Improve the timeliness of decision making.

3. Bahrain

- Priority Action 1 — Description of action:
Change the decision-making system so that no one Party has the power to veto the listing of a hazardous substance on Annex III of the Convention. In recent years, there have been several cases where a dangerous substance has not been listed, even though it meets all the scientific criteria and the vast majority of Parties have supported listing
- Related information gaps:
Work to determine why in specific cases consensus can't be reached
- Priority Action 2 — Description of action:
Improve information on alternatives
- Related information gaps:
Secretariat to solicit information from Parties on alternatives
- Priority Action 3 — Description of action:
Analyses of impact of listing on the market and assessment of the scale and scope of the impact
- Related information gaps:
European Commission publication being prepared and can be made available by the Commission to Parties
- Priority Action 4 — Description of action:
Study in consultation with parties on how listing is used by industry and others
- Related information gaps:
Solicit information from industry who are in a position to know what situations exists that hinder the export market for listed substances
- Priority Action 5 — Description of action:
Increase building capacity
- Related information gaps:
Financial mechanism to provide support to developing countries

4. Bosnia and Herzegovina

- Priority Action 1 — Description of action:
Regarding the obligation to submit a Importe Response for chemicals of Annex III, the following was made: Questionnaire with the required data for chemicals listed in Anex III RC during COP 8 were sent to members of the "Coordination team for the implementation of the Rotterdam Convention in Bosnia and Herzegovina".
Members will consider the status of chemicals and prepare Import Response for each chemicals. By the end of the year, OCP will submit final decisions to the Secretariat electronically.
- Related information gaps:
In one part of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Federation of B&H), the Decision on the status of industrial chemicals is missing, it need be adopted by the Federation of B&H Government, and that takes time to complete the procedure. The reason for this is the non-compliance of regulations in this part of the country with EU regulations. In the second part of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Republika Srpska) the regulations in this area are compliance with EU regulations. In order for DNA of Bosnia and Herzegovina to submit an Import Response for all chemicals, it is necessary to have the consent of both parts of the state as well as the legal basis.
- Priority Action 2 — Description of action:
During COP 8, the OCP of Bosnia and Herzegovina held a meeting with a member of the secretariat regarding the final regulation and we tried to find a solution for the full fulfillment of this obligation. For the time being, we have no national final regulatory action related to chemicals, we have taken them from the EU. At the stage of finding a solution to meet the conditions and submitting final regulatory measures by Bosnia and Herzegovina. Two members of the "Team for Coordination of the Implementation of the Rotterdam Convention in Bosnia and Herzegovina" will participate in a subregional meeting on this topic, that is planned for next year, and we are confident that this meeting will result in a smart solution to meet this obligation.

— Related information gaps:

Bosnia and Herzegovina has no mechanism and conditions for the adoption of the Final Regulatory Action on national level, we only use the FRA from the EU. That is reason why we did not notified to the Secretariat Final Regulatory Action, so far.

5. Canada

Priority Action 1

— Description of action:

Sharing of information on alternatives and a voluntary PIC procedure for substances that are not added to the Convention.

Canada sees value in the continued and further use of Article 14, and the sharing of information. Parties could further be encouraged to share information on alternatives to substances recommended for listing. Article 14 describes information-sharing and this is presently exercised by some Parties as a voluntary PIC mechanism for substances that have not yet achieved consensus for listing. This information is summarized in the PIC Circular and shared with all Parties.

— Related information gaps:

Although the Rotterdam Convention is neither a ban nor a recommendation to ban, and Parties can continue using listed substances, we have heard Parties state their reluctance to agree to listing when they have no identified alternatives. The information gaps to address would include information on what these alternatives are, relative costs & efficacy. It would be best if this information was provided by the Parties since they will have the experience, and may share similar pests and environmental conditions.

Priority Action 2

— Description of action:

A more robust discussion of pros and cons of a treaty amendment.

Proposals to amend the Convention in a way that would enable voting for the adoption of a decision to amend Annex III have been submitted and were briefly discussed at COP-8. Canada would suggest engaging in robust and informed discussions on the legal/implementation and operational impacts and challenges as well as benefits to be provided by such treaty amendments.

— Related information gaps:

The information gaps here include Parties' views, rationales and barriers moving forward. Information currently available is the Secretariat's COP4 thought starter paper entitled "Ensuring the continued effectiveness of the Rotterdam Convention", (UNEP/FAO/RC/COP.4/13) and the COP8 documentation with the proposed amendments: "Intersessional work on the process of listing chemicals in Annex III to the Rotterdam Convention: proposals to amend Articles 16 and 22 of the Rotterdam Convention", (UNEP/FAO/RC/COP.8/16/Add.1).

Priority Action 3

— Description of action:

The adoption of a compliance mechanism at the Conference of the Parties.

Canada has long supported the adoption of a facilitative compliance mechanism. This mechanism would allow for the discussion not only of challenges individual Parties are facing, but for the discussion of solutions to systemic problems facing many Parties. Once a facilitative compliance mechanism is agreed, a deeper understanding of how well the Convention is working can be established, and thereafter a formal evaluation of the effectiveness of the Rotterdam Convention could be undertaken.

— Related information gaps:

Compliance information would enable Parties to see where the Rotterdam Convention is effective and perhaps where it is less effective for substances already listed. We note that the text of a compliance procedure was agreed at COP-7, although the adoption of that text could not be agreed at COP-8.

Priority Action 4

— Description of action:

More work needed to determine what other effects on trade result when a substance is listed.

Canada reviewed the outcome of the study on the impacts of listing chemicals in Annex III that was developed by the Secretariat in document (UNEP/FAO/RC/COP.8/INF/21) to determine whether a listing led Parties to ban/restrict the substance. Canada recalls criticism raised at the intersessional meetings prior to COP8 which stressed that although a listing in Annex III may

not lead to official bans/restrictions, there were other indirect effects such as ineligibility of a listed pesticide for certain funded projects.

— Related information gaps:

Industry has reported that pesticides in particular become ineligible for certain projects upon listing in Annex III. More information to identify these situations is valuable, given the Rotterdam Convention is intended to be an information-sharing treaty and not a recommendation to ban a substance.

Priority Action 5

— Description of action:

Party-to-Party support and mechanisms for Parties to self-identify.

Canada believes that one way to enhance the effectiveness of the Convention is to provide in-kind support to Parties that do not have the capacity to undertake a risk evaluation, to document that evaluation and the national decision-making process, in order to enable them to prepare a more complete notification of final regulatory action (NFRA). This would therefore produce a more comprehensive basis for the work of the CRC and more robust recommendations to the Conference of the Parties. Canada continues to offer in-kind technical assistance to Parties upon request.

— Related information gaps:

In this case the self-identification of Parties who wish to receive such information would start the process, something that could be launched at the upcoming meeting of the intersessional working group". Parties could also indicate the manner in which this training would be most effective (webinars on the completion of NFRAs, site visit, etc.).

6. China

Priority Action 1

— Description of action:

We suggest the Secretariat to publish a guideline document on the "bridge" method for risk evaluation and hold the corresponding training, in order to improve the ability of chemical risk assessment in developing countries, help them to develop domestic chemical regulatory measures according to the risks, and provide scientific decision basis files based on "bridging information" when submitting the FRA reports.

— Related information gaps:

Two of the major problems, particularly in developing countries, are (a) lack of sufficient scientific information for the assessment of risks entailed by the use of a great number of chemicals, and (b) lack of resources for assessment of chemicals for which data are at hand.

7. Colombia

Priority Action 1

— Description of action:

Asistencia técnica y financiera a países en desarrollo y con economías en transición para que de manera temprana realicen inventarios y evalúen a nivel nacional, usos, riesgos y ocurrencia de incidentes con los productos químicos que la Secretaría decide trasladar (conforme al Artículo 5 - numeral 5 del Convenio) al Comité de Revisión de Productos Químicos, para que examine su inclusión en el Anexo III y la consecuente aplicación del Procedimiento de Consentimiento Fundamentado Previo (CFP).

Lo anterior con el fin de promover que las Partes proporcionen información oportuna, tengan una participación activa y se comprometan con las labores del Comité; igualmente para que preparen y fundamenten debidamente las posiciones que adopten respecto a las decisiones que se presentan a consideración de la COP.

— Related information gaps:

Inexistencia o limitados sistemas de registro e instrumentos administrativos de control sobre la fabricación, importación y usos de los productos químicos, que dificultan identificar las implicaciones reales de la inclusión de nuevos productos en el Anexo III, así como las necesidades de creación de capacidad para la consecuente implementación del CFP en esos casos.

En este escenario, ante la falta de información e incertidumbre sobre la capacidad requerida para el cumplimiento de las obligaciones del Convenio, las autoridades no disponen de las condiciones que les facilite identificar alternativas de solución frente a dificultades específicas y preocupaciones o temores de los fabricantes, y/o de quienes se dedican a la comercialización de los

productos, o de los usuarios, frente a las nuevas medidas que se puedan adoptar; estas circunstancias contribuyen en algunos casos a que se opte por oponerse a la inclusión de nuevas sustancias

Priority Action 2

— Description of action:

Procurar que la OMC reconozca y se comprometa a informar a sus miembros sobre el alcance y beneficios del Procedimiento de Consentimiento Fundamentado Previo respecto a la competitividad, sostenibilidad y manejo racional de los productos químicos. Explorar la viabilidad de suscribir un Memorando de Entendimiento con esa Organización, para el intercambio y divulgación de información relativa a la implementación del Convenio.

— Related information gaps:

Hace falta mayor conocimiento y compromiso de quienes se dedican al comercio de los productos químicos, sobre la implementación del Convenio y su contribución al objetivo de lograr el manejo racional de dichos productos

8. Costa Rica

Priority Action 1

— Description of action:

Capacitación de las AND y Puntos de Contacto en el Convenio de Rotterdam y su sinergia con los Convenios de Estocolmo y Basilea.

— Related information gaps:

Falta comprensión de algunos aspectos del Convenio.

Priority Action 2

— Description of action:

Reuniones regionales de las AND y Puntos de Contacto (Centroamérica y México) sobre la implementación del Convenio de Rotterdam.

— Related information gaps:

Existen diferencias de criterios en la implementación del Convenio.

Priority Action 3

— Description of action:

Establecer un sistema en línea para la gestión de los consentimientos previos y su respectiva respuesta.

— Related information gaps:

No hay agilidad en el sistema de consentimiento fundamentado previo.

9. Democratic Republic of the Congo

Priority Action 1

— Description of action:

Apporter un appui financier aux pays en voie du développement et en transition pour l'élaboration et la vulgarisation des cadres légaux, des mesures réglementaires et administratives pour une application effective de la convention de Rotterdam.

— Related information gaps:

Ok

Priority Action 2

— Description of action:

Appui financier aux AND pour l'accomplissement de leur tâche sur la surveillance des intoxications de la population aux produits chimiques et pesticides dangereux pour une meilleure collaboration avec le secrétariat sur les notification relative à l'inscription des pesticides à l'annexe III de la convention de Rotterdam.

— Related information gaps:

Ok

Priority Action 3

— Description of action:

Encourager les pays producteurs des pesticides à faire de notification d'exportation avant d'exporter les produits chimiques dangereux vers les pays en voie du développement en toute responsabilité.

— Related information gaps:

Ok

Priority Action 4

— Description of action:

Fournir aux AND les moyens logistiques(ordinateur et connexion internet pour répondre aux notifications d'exportation en temps réel

— Related information gaps:

- Ok
- Priority Action 5 — Description of action:
Doter les AND des moyens nécessaires pour sensibiliser la population sur les risques liés à la manipulation des pesticides et produits chimiques dangereux
- Related information gaps:
Ok

10. Ecuador

- Priority Action 1 — Description of action:
Cambiar el mecanismo de decisión para la inclusión de plaguicidas y productos químicos peligrosos en el Anexo III, debido a que los esfuerzos realizados por varios países en el estudio de las afectaciones que provocarían estas moléculas no han logrado el impacto necesario al ser presentados en las reuniones de las partes. El intercambio de información es básico para que las partes puedan tener acceso a la misma de manera oportuna y puedan presentar las notificaciones de medidas reglamentarias firmes de acuerdo a lo requerido por la Secretaría del Convenio. Con este antecedente la Secretaría del Convenio adoptando la mejora continua en TIC'S debería proporcionar en especial a los países en desarrollo herramientas (videos tutoriales, apps, asesoramiento en línea) para que la información que las partes requieran y emiten sea de calidad para la toma de decisiones.
- Related information gaps:
Cambiar el mecanismo de decisión para la inclusión de plaguicidas y productos químicos peligrosos en el Anexo III, debido a que los esfuerzos realizados por varios países en el estudio de las afectaciones que provocarían estas moléculas no han logrado el impacto necesario al ser presentados en las reuniones de las partes. Tomar en cuenta que el enfoque del ingreso de los plaguicidas y productos químicos peligrosos en el Anexo III, responden a problemas en la salud humano y el ambiente, mas no a intereses comerciales que vayan en detrimento de la salud.
- > Alta rotación de puntos de contacto en los países
 - > Las partes no pueden revisar si tienen actividades pendientes o información por presentar
 - > Falta de capacitación interactiva por parte de la Secretaria hacia las partes para un manejo adecuado del flujo de la información
 - > Aspectos jurídicos aplicables para la inclusión de los estudios que permitan el cambio del mecanismo.
- Priority Action 2 — Description of action:
Capacitación para el involucramiento de las autoridades aduaneras y de comercio para la creación de normativa aplicable respecto a la necesidad de identificar los plaguicidas y productos químicos peligrosos para su control de ingreso, tomando en cuenta las experiencias de los demás países.
- Related information gaps:
Desconocimiento de normativas e intercambio de experiencias de otros países en la aplicación de restricción y/o control de productos químicos en aduana.
Falta de métodos y equipos de identificación y detección de productos químicos.
- Priority Action 3 — Description of action:
Establecer un mecanismo financiero previsible y adecuadamente provisto de fondos, con suficientes recursos nuevos y adicionales que permitan a los países en desarrollo y los países con economías en transición, cumplir los lineamientos que establece el Convenio.
- Related information gaps:
Hasta el momento los mecanismos de financiamiento cubren algunos de los convenios relacionados con sustancias químicas mientras que no cubren las necesidades para la aplicación del Convenio de Rotterdam

11. European Union and its member States

- Priority Action 1 — Description of action:
Improving the implementation of the Convention by Parties by improving
- > their capacity to properly implement and fully participate in the Convention processes (participation of experts in the CRC, submission of notifications of

final regulatory action (FRA), adoption of import decisions) and to implement chemicals management measures, including risk evaluations and the use of internationally available data on chemicals;

- > transparency of implementation at national level through better explanation of obligations of Parties and stakeholders;
- > involvement of stakeholders in implementation at national level to ensure that relevant stakeholders (e.g. exporters and users of chemicals) are fully aware of the consequences of listing, including the benefits;
- > information exchange on chemicals that are listed or recommended for listing (information on FRA to ban or severely restrict chemicals, including on risk evaluations carried out by Parties through FRA notifications and export notifications);
- > information exchange on alternatives to chemicals that are listed or recommended for listing;
- > awareness on the integrated approach to financing sound management of chemicals and waste (adopted by UN Environment (UNEP) Governing Council in its decision 27/12 in 2013), including the Special Programme to support developing countries and countries with economies in transition in strengthening institutional capacity for the implementation, among others, of the Rotterdam Convention, as well as other resources and support for implementation of the Rotterdam Convention such as the joint Technical Assistance Programme managed by the Secretariat.

— Related information gaps:

Information on

- > the main difficulties of Parties in implementation of the Convention,
- > the main capacity gaps of Parties,
- > the main information gaps of Parties,
- > the best approach to address the gaps.

Priority Action 2

— Description of action:

Establishing a mechanism for a voluntary PIC procedure through a standalone decision adopted by the COP that would invite Parties to apply a voluntary PIC procedure for chemicals on which consensus could not be reached. Parties would have the possibility to subscribe to that voluntary procedure either during or after the COP and to apply it until the next COP. This mechanism has two important advantages: 1) it would ensure that the chemicals are not parked somewhere but kept on the agenda of the COP; 2) it would allow all Parties that support the listing to apply the PIC procedure, thus ensuring that those Parties benefit from the Convention. In addition, such decision could also give the Secretariat certain tasks with respect to its implementation.

— Related information gaps:

Information on

- > the legal options and consequences,
- > the procedural requirements and steps for the implementation,
- > the timelines,
- > the practical consequences for implementation.

Priority Action 3

— Description of action:

Amendment of the Convention to allow for flexibility as regards the entry into force and/or the acceptance of the listing decision for individual Parties allowing Parties to suggest that their national needs are taken into account in the COP decision since Parties would have the possibility to request a deferred entry into force or to opt out of the listing with the possibility to opt in at a later date. This would require an amendment of the second sentence of Article 22(5)(c), which currently reads: "The amendment shall enter into force for all Parties on a date to be specified in the decision." This amendment would create two groups of Parties, those that ratified the amendment and those that did not ratify.

Alternative wording for that sentence could be:

- > The amendment shall enter into force on the date(s) to be specified in the decision.
- > The amendment shall enter into force as specified in the decision.

— Related information gaps:

Information on

- > the legal options for and consequences of such change,

- > the procedural requirements and steps for the implementation,
 - > the timelines,
 - > the practical consequences for implementation.
- Priority Action 4
- Description of action:

Amendment of the Convention establishing a new Annex for chemicals for which it is not possible to reach agreement on the listing in order to establish a voluntary PIC procedure for those chemicals. The chemicals would be automatically listed in the new Annex after the COP failed to list it in Annex III. All Parties bound by the amendment could apply the voluntary PIC procedure and would enhance the information exchange on chemicals listed in the new Annex.
 - Related information gaps:

Information on

 - > the legal options for and consequences of such change,
 - > the procedural requirements and steps for the implementation,
 - > the timelines,
 - > the practical consequences for implementation.
- Priority Action 5
- Description of action:

Amendment of the Convention establishing a voting procedure for the amendment of Annex III as last resort when it is not possible to achieve consensus. The new mechanism should ensure that a decision adopted by the voting procedure is binding for all Parties that ratified that mechanism. This amendment would create two groups of Parties, those that ratified the amendment and those that did not ratify. All decisions adopted by consensus would be handled in accordance with the normal procedure.
 - Related information gaps:

Information on

 - > the legal options for and consequences of such change,
 - > the procedural requirements and steps for the implementation,
 - > the timelines,
 - > the practical consequences for implementation.

12. Honduras

- Priority Action 1
- Description of action:

Capacitación continua a las Autoridades Nacionales y Puntos Focales referente a las obligaciones del Convenio.
 - Related information gaps:

Muchas veces las Autoridades desconocen las obligaciones derivadas del Convenio y no existe un responsable dentro de la Institución que de seguimiento al tema.
- Priority Action 2
- Description of action:

Establecer mecanismo para la formulación de proyectos nacionales y regionales tendientes a la aplicación efectiva del Convenio.
 - Related information gaps:

apoyo en la formulación de proyectos nacionales (fondos Habilitadores) para la implementación del Convenio y sus enmiendas.
- Priority Action 3
- Description of action:

Fortalecer los órganos subsidiarios del Convenio de Rotterdam.
 - Related information gaps:

Not answered
- Priority Action 4
- Description of action:

Capacitación al personal técnico en el cumplimiento del programa y en desarrollo de Evaluaciones de riesgo de productos químicos que sirvan de base para las Medidas Reglamentarias Firmes.
 - Related information gaps:

El país no ha presentado ninguna MRF debido a que no cuenta con los recursos para el desarrollo de evaluaciones de riesgo.

13. Jordan

- Priority Action 1
- Description of action:
Technical assistance and capacity-building for the implementation of the Convention: Establish Programmes for scientific and technical training of personnel, including customs personnel.
 - Related information gaps:
 - > Technical capabilities and laboratory equipment are low.
 - > Practical analytical techniques for monitoring substances for which there is significant concern in chemicals products are low.
- Priority Action 2
- Description of action:
Strengthening national coordination, hazard and risk assessments of priority chemicals leading to decision making whether to ban or severely restricted them.
 - Related information gaps:
Weak communication between Official Contact Point with the local Designated National Authorities
- Priority Action 3
- Description of action:
Provide safer and economical alternatives to the chemical listed in Annex III.
 - Related information gaps:
There are no alternatives to the chemicals listed in Annex III can be used locally
- Priority Action 4
- Description of action:
The party should put a mechanism to restrict trade in a chemical as a result of listing this substance in Annex III.
 - Related information gaps:
Lack of financial and technical capacity to carry out studies and research on the risks of chemicals.

14. Kuwait

- Priority Action 1
- Description of action:
Training for writing reports.
 - Related information gaps:
Train people engaged in Rotterdam convention on how they should write reports for every issue in the convention, or is there any official formula they should follow.
- Priority Action 2
- Description of action:
Sending the chemical notifications several times even if we send the response on it, is a confusing issue because we are studying the chemical every time you send the notification.
 - Related information gaps:
Having the notification for the chemical once to not be confused about sending the response or no.
- Priority Action 3
- Description of action:
Benefiting from the developed countries with how they are dealing with the chemicals with all its details (exporting, importing, etc)
 - Related information gaps:
Having examples, reports, presentation on these countries.

15. Mexico

- Priority Action 1
- Description of action:
El Convenio de Rotterdam podría modificar su mecanismo de toma de decisiones a fin de que sea similar al del Convenio de Estocolmo para evitar que los “compuestos químicos heredados” se mantengan fuera del anexo III durante varias Conferencias de las Partes (CdP).
 - Related information gaps:
Desconocimiento de la complejidad de modificar el procedimiento indicando en el párrafo 5 inciso b, del artículo 22 del texto del Convenio, sobre la forma de enmendar el Anexo III, con el objetivo de que las decisiones se tomen por

- mayoría en lugar de consenso, como se establece en el artículo 21, párrafo 3 del Convenio de Estocolmo.
- Priority Action 2 — Description of action:
 El Comité de Revisión (CR) del Convenio, podría fortalecer la justificación técnica y científica de las propuestas de los nuevos compuestos, ya que el sector empresarial nacional e internacional, ha expuesto razonamientos en contra de argumentos del CR, cuestiona su validez e influye la opinión de los tomadores de decisiones.
- Related information gaps:
 La información técnica, científica y estadística, que prepare el CR podría ser más contundente con el propósito de que documente de forma categórica las afectaciones a la salud y al ambiente por la exposición a un producto químico en el país que lo proponga.
 Como ejemplo, el sector empresarial nacional manifestó preocupación por el fundamento científico, la disponibilidad de alternativas costos/efectivas, la posible incidencia en el comercio y el rigor técnico-científico de la evaluación del CR sobre el paraquat. Afirma que el CR no aplicó criterios para evaluar la significancia de los efectos reportados y que la propuesta de inclusión fue indebidamente aceptada porque se basó en una encuesta dirigida e influenciada por RAPAM.
- Priority Action 3 — Description of action:
 Las Partes que no manifiesten conformidad con las propuestas del CR podrían respaldar su posición con suficiente anticipación, a fin de que el CR y las Partes evalúen las objeciones, reformulen la propuesta de inclusión y la pongan a consideración de las Partes de forma previa a las CdP.
- Related information gaps:
 Los procedimientos de las CdP no establecen la obligación de que los participantes acompañen su posición de negativa a la inclusión de un producto químico con pruebas técnicas y científicas.
 Algunas Partes no cuentan con capacidad institucional para argumentar su negativa al ingreso de productos químicos.
 Algunas Partes podrían carecer de coordinación interministerial para tomar decisiones colegiadas y consensuadas.
- Priority Action 4 — Description of action:
 El Secretariado del Convenio podría ofrecer capacitación o difusión sobre las implicaciones del ingreso de sustancias al Anexo III, ya que el sector empresarial considera que su inclusión implica la posible prohibición de los movimientos transfronterizos de dichos productos químicos.
- Related information gaps:
 El principal obstáculo es la carencia de recursos económicos para ofrecer capacitación o difusión.
 Algunos materiales y webinars que organiza el Secretariado están disponibles solo en idioma inglés.
- Priority Action 5 — Description of action:
 El grupo de trabajo integrado por representantes de las Partes, podría proponer una decisión acerca de la formulación de una metodología para tomar decisiones nacionales con relación a la inclusión de nuevos compuestos químicos al Anexo III, que tome en cuenta la relevancia de los aspectos ambientales, comerciales, de producción agropecuaria y de salud en cada Parte con la finalidad de facilitar la toma de decisiones de forma equitativa.
 Los representantes del CRC por la Región de América Latina y el Caribe rara vez proporcionan retroalimentación a las partes sobre las discusiones y avances realizados en los periodos inter CdP.
- Related information gaps:
 Ausencia de metodología y criterios técnicos y científicos en materia de comercio, protección a la salud y al ambiente de las Partes del Convenio para fundamentar su oposición al producto químico que el CR propone.
 Cuando un experto es incluido en el CRC, no existe una metodología sobre como deberá hacer de conocimiento de la región de los diferentes temas que son discutidos. Asimismo, no se realiza una consulta de información científica específica que sea considerada hacia el interior de las discusiones del CRC.

16. Norway

Priority Action 1

— Description of action:

The intersessional work on enhancing the effectiveness of the Rotterdam Convention should focus on narrowing down the list of the proposals and options that came out of the 2016 Riga meeting (see UNEP/FAO/RC/COP.8/INF/20) and COP-8. It is furthermore important to distinguish between proposals and options that are within the scope of the Convention/ mandate and procedures of the CRC and those that are not.

— Related information gaps:

Developing countries may face unique challenges in relation to imports and exports of hazardous chemicals, the environmentally sound use of such chemicals and the implementation of the Convention. However, only a limited number of developing country parties participated in the 2016 Riga meeting and the intersessional work leading up to COP-8. Therefore, information from a broader range of developing countries on the benefits/ usefulness of the Convention, as well on actions that would make the Convention more valuable to them are important to consider in the process leading up to COP-9. If not provided in response to this questionnaire such information could be actively pursued e.g. by the involvement of the secretariat.

Priority Action 2

— Description of action:

Options that can help improve the effectiveness of the Convention and at same time, assist parties in implementing the Convention should be a prioritized:

> Identified technical assistance needs of developing countries and parties with economies in transition should be taken into consideration (see UNEP/FAO/RC/COP.8/INF/25 and other documents under agenda item 5 (a) at COP-8).

> It is important to provide assistance to parties to strengthen their capacity for submitting notifications of final regulatory action for banned or severely restricted chemicals, proposals for listing of severely hazardous pesticide formulations and import responses.

— Related information gaps:

Not answered

Priority Action 3

— Description of action:

Strengthen the CRC by further increasing the transparency of its work by considering:

> The need for having documents and proceedings translated/ interpreted in the six UN languages

> Opening up for further involvement of observers in the work of the CRC by allowing early comments on task group reports, inviting comments on DGDs, allowing e.g. parties to participate in intersessional work etc.

> Taking into account that parties that have submitted a final regulatory action, but that are not members of the CRC, may have valuable information to contribute.

— Related information gaps:

Not answered

Priority Action 4

— Description of action:

Strengthen information exchange by:

> Promoting a more active use of the information shared via PIC circular at the national level.

> Improving the format of the PIC Circular to make it more user-friendly/accessible.

> Exploring new ways for information exchange among parties in line with article 14 by arranging workshops, developing websites etc. where Parties can share information (e.g. open data, databases and tools) that can support implementation at the national level.

> Encouraging parties to share additional information and where possible, to include such information in DGDs.

> Including information from other MEAs/IGOs in the DGDs where relevant/possible.

— Related information gaps:

Not answered

- Priority Action 5
- Description of action:
Initiate awareness raising activities to ensure that relevant stakeholders such as national governments and industry have correct information about the Convention and its objectives.
 - Related information gaps:
Not answered

17. Panama

- Priority Action 1
- Description of action:
Mejorar el intercambio de información entre las partes y la Secretaría y entre los países: esto podría lograrse a través de creación de redes regionales de intercambio de información.
Esta red regional debe tener una comunicación directa con la Secretaría y las demás redes regionales.
 - Related information gaps:
Poco intercambio de información entre los países y entre los países y la Secretaría en tiempo real.
No existe una plataforma en línea para subir la información de país, debe ir por los canales regulares de mensajería, demorando el acceso a la información.
- Priority Action 2
- Description of action:
Establecer herramientas para medir el cumplimiento de los países con las obligaciones del Convenio, y de esta manera distribuir de mejor manera los fondos disponibles.
 - Related information gaps:
No se visualiza un compromiso a nivel político ni técnico en los países.
- Priority Action 3
- Description of action:
Transferencia de tecnología de los países desarrollados a los países en vías de desarrollo, para mejorar cuestiones como las evaluaciones de riesgo, análisis químicos y sistemas de gestión de sustancias químicas.
 - Related information gaps:
Falta de intercambio de información y de estandarización de las herramientas y tecnologías.

18. Peru

- Priority Action 1
- Description of action:
Fortalecer las capacidades nacionales para la generación/recopilación de información sobre impacto a la salud y el ambiente por el uso de químicos peligrosos, que permitan la dación de medidas reglamentarias firmes (FRA) sobre la base de información de calidad.
 - Related information gaps:
Debilidad del sistema de registro y monitoreo de intoxicaciones por químicos peligrosos, por la autoridad de salud.
Monitoreos ambientales sin enfoque de evaluación de riesgos.
Falta de pericia para utilizar "información puente" para sustentar una FRA.
- Priority Action 2
- Description of action:
Los objetivos del Convenio de Rotterdam es compartir información sobre químicos peligrosos sujetos al comercio, pero existe la percepción de que el Convenio dispone su prohibición. Esta es una de las razones por la que varios químicos peligrosos no estén en el Anexo III, al no existir consenso para su inclusión. Por ello se sugiere, el desarrollo de un estudio respecto del impacto de la inclusión de los químicos en el Anexo III y la prohibición o restricción que desencadenaron en los países Partes, posteriormente.
 - Related information gaps:
No se tiene información si la inclusión de un químico peligroso en el anexo III genera la prohibición o restricción del plaguicida en los países Parte, o si por el contrario el comercio del químico peligroso no se ve afectado en los países que deciden seguir usándolos.
- Priority Action 3
- Description of action:

Preparar y circular entre las Partes del CR una encuesta que permita recabar información nacional sobre un químico peligroso que motiva una FRA presentada por cualquier país (no esperar a tener 2 FRA de regiones distintas). Tal encuesta debiera considerar una sección informativa sobre las razones de salud o ambiente que motivaron la FRA, y otra sección sobre la situación del químico en el país encuestado: registro del químico, nombres comerciales, volumen de producción/importación, usos/aplicaciones, concentraciones/dosis, cultivos, alternativas disponibles, etc. según corresponda. De esta manera se puede sensibilizar a las autoridades y motivar la toma de decisiones.

- Related information gaps:
Se carece de una fuente confiable y accesible sobre las medidas que los países toman respecto a ciertos químicos peligrosos respecto del cual han emitido una medida reglamentaria (FRA). La circular PIC no sufre esta necesidad.
- Priority Action 4 — Description of action:
Listado de alternativas para los químicos del Anexo III, y para los químicos candidatos para su inclusión, y su difusión por diversos medios: talleres nacionales, regionales, comunicaciones escritas a las autoridades involucradas, etc.
- Related information gaps:
Representa un reto para la autoridad de registro/regulación de un químicos peligroso, no contar con alternativas técnica y económicamente viables y disponibles, para promulgar una FRA.
- Priority Action 5 — Description of action:
Desarrollo de directrices u orientaciones para identificar, evaluar, y controlar los riesgos de los plaguicidas altamente peligrosos, para ayudar a los países en vías en desarrollo o con economías en transición para la toma de decisiones con miras a la meta 2020.
- Related information gaps:
En el plano nacional circula en el mercado plaguicidas altamente peligroso que cuentan con registro, y la autoridad competente no cuenta con directrices u orientaciones para manejar los riesgos en función a la realidad nacional.

19. Sri Lanka

- Priority Action 1 — Description of action:
Banned compounds such as endosulfan (1998) and paraquat (2011), but in either case the notification objectives had not been fulfilled (criteria b(iii) of Annex II) due to lack of a monitoring system for poisonings other than intentional misuse (i.e. suicides).
Although, intentional misuse is not a criterion for taking decisions under the Rotterdam Convention, however, authorities can take as "early warning" for substances of severely hazardous pesticides by looking at trends of suicide tools. may be devise such guidelines to identify such cases for long-term action (Sri Lanka has shown positive association of severely hazardous pesticides vs probable suicide tools).
- Related information gaps:
lack of mechanism to link/reporting such cases.
- Priority Action 2 — Description of action:
Challenges:
> Limited capacity and skills for risk assessment.
> Insufficient mechanisms to effectively control the influx of the chemicals, particularly the industrial chemicals.
> Absence of proper regulatory mechanism in place under the available legislations to address the issues pertaining to the industrial chemical management.
> Poor public awareness on hazardous associated with chemicals.
> Insufficient communication, coordination and cooperation among the stakeholders.
> Health and environmental adverse effects are not properly monitored.
Need technical & financial help in resolving these issues.
- Related information gaps:
Technical & capacity development

- Priority Action 3 — Description of action:
The top most occupationally acute pesticide formulations are Chlorpyrifos 40% EC, Profenophos 50% EC, Abamectin 1.8% EC and Glyphosate 36% SL. The final outcome of this study was disarrayed due to financial constraints, lack of insufficient coordination, cooperation and commitment among stakeholders, and prevented further ascertaining severely hazardous pesticide formulations (SHPF). Therefore, further assistance will be beneficial for progression.
- Related information gaps:
Refinement of findings in the more organized way.
- Priority Action 4 — Description of action:
Illegal import by false HS codes & non-binding mechanism for producing countries to prevent illegal transport under the Convention.
- Related information gaps:
Country compliance/binding mechanism for preventing illegal transport
- Priority Action 5 — Description of action:
Assigning dedicated HS codes for the full spectrum of compounds listed in the Annex III of the Convention for better identification of pesticides needs thorough scrutiny & dedicated efforts for implementation.
Therefore, increased custom awareness is essential.
- Related information gaps:
Poor custom awareness.

20. Switzerland

- Priority Action 1 — Description of action:
Explore, in a process that includes parties only, how the option of amending the Convention by development of a new legal instrument could increase the effectiveness of the Rotterdam Convention.
This process should include the option of amending Article 22, paragraph 5 (b) to enable voting for the adoption of a decision to amend Annex III.
- Related information gaps:
Not answered
- Priority Action 2 — Description of action:
COP to adopt compliance procedures.
- Related information gaps:
Not answered
- Priority Action 3 — Description of action:
The provision of a team of experts that can be consulted for questions regarding the notification of final regulatory action and Include in the FRA Evaluation Toolkit a list of commented summaries of risk evaluations that are not risk assessments that fulfill criterium IIb(iii).
- Related information gaps:
The information sent to the BRS secretariat by a Party in order to notify a final regulatory action (FRA) has to contain the information requirements of Annex I. The possibility to contact an expert could be helpful for Parties drafting a notification of FRA.
One of the key criteria in Annex II of the Convention for listing chemicals under the Convention is to establish that the final regulatory action has been taken as a consequence of a risk evaluation.
There are only few Parties that have notified FRA based on risk evaluations that are not risk assessments that fulfil the criterion IIb(iii). A summary of such evaluations (in the FRA Evaluation toolkit) could be helpful for countries not performing risk assessments when deciding upon regulatory measures.
- Priority Action 4 — Description of action:
Study on impacts of listing: What is the realistic picture of what is happening after the listing of a chemical? Are there bans on a national basis? Do we receive more FRAs for the listed substance? Is listing stimulating the development and use of alternatives?
- Related information gaps:

- What is the realistic picture of what is happening after the listing of a chemical? Are there bans on a national basis? Do we receive more FRAs for the listed substance? Is listing stimulating the development and use of alternatives?
- Priority Action 5 — Description of action:
 Awareness-raising: Increase the understanding about the purpose and value of the Rotterdam Convention and of the implications of listing and look at the SDGs related to the sound management of chemicals and health and use the link as one of the forces.
- Related information gaps:
 Why is there the misconception that the Rotterdam Convention restricts trade when it actually is about sharing information (that contributes to a clear, transparent and effective trading system)?

21. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

- Priority Action 1 — Description of action:
 Develop procedures/mechanisms for inter-institutional interaction, communication among the public and private sectors, academic research and decision makers.
- Related information gaps:
 Since the Convention covers pesticides and industrial chemicals that have been banned or severely restricted for health or environmental reasons in international trade, there are many institution (including private sectors, academic research and decision makers) involved for their implementation. There is noticed lack of communication between all mentioned institution, therefore developing procedures/mechanisms is important as a action.
- Priority Action 2 — Description of action:
 Establish a strong and sustainable system for communication among focal points /designated national authorities under Rotterdam Convention.
- Related information gaps:
 As in many countries, there are three Designated National Authorities (DNAs) to be responsible for implementation of the Rotterdam Convention in Macedonia. Namely, the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning as a DNA for implementation of the Convention in general, the Ministry of Agriculture as a DNA for pesticides, the Ministry of Environment together with the Ministry of Health as a DNA for industrial chemicals.
- Establishing a strong and sustainable system for communication among focal points /designated national authorities is highly important.
- Priority Action 3 — Description of action:
 Gap analysis in existing legislation on chemicals and pesticides under the Rotterdam Convention.
- Related information gaps:
 There are overlapping in the legislations dealing with pesticides and industrial chemicals.
- Priority Action 4 — Description of action:
 Organised joint activities between all stakeholders for better implementation of the main provisions of the Rotterdam Convention.
- Related information gaps:
 Organised joint activities will clarify all weaknesses and opportunities in implementation of the main provisions of the Convention. It will enhance the exchange of informations between all stakeholders at the same time.
- Priority Action 5 — Description of action:
 Joint activities in enhancing cooperation and coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions at national, regional and international level.
- Related information gaps:
 Joint activities/sharing the experince at national, regional and international level among three conventions, the synergy among the three conventions is the omnibus of enhancing the effectiveness of implementation of the conventions.

22. Uganda

- Priority Action 1
- Description of action:
 - Ensure the understanding of the aims, objectives and requirements of the Convention;
 - Develop a national action plan or strategy for the implementation of Rotterdam Convention;
 - Foster sectoral cooperation among the stakeholders in the implementation of the Convention;
 - Related information gaps:
 - Technical assistance from RC Secretariat for awareness campaign for stakeholders covering aims, objectives and requirements of the Convention.
 - Country lacks a national action plan or strategy for the implementation of Rotterdam Convention
 - Inadequate Inter-Ministerial coordination and collaboration on RC processes
- Priority Action 2
- Description of action:
 - Limited in-country technical capacity to meet the RC obligations: For example;
 - > The consolidated data on the industrial chemicals under the RC have not been collected for import response.
 - > No consolidated database on the status of chemicals usage, manufacture, formulation and import.
 - > Mechanisms for inter-ministerial interaction, the public and private sectors, research and decision makers need to be created and updated.
 - > Technical capacity constraints do exist within the Government and other organizations.
 - > Difficulties are faced in collecting technical information for making decisions on pesticides and industrial chemicals.
 - > No effective infrastructure to monitor and report cases of poisoning by pesticides and industrial chemicals.
 - Therefore the country priority is to fill the above gaps
 - Related information gaps:
 - Database development of the Chemicals under RC used in the country
 - Inadequate technical capacity to implement the RC
 - Inadequate infrastructure to support the processes
- Priority Action 3
- Description of action:
 - Low Awareness and Sensitization on MEAs issues including RC
 - The complexity of available information materials and the few media practitioners contribute to low public awareness of the RC. Awareness materials on RC are scarce at national level and almost absent at local level. Equally, awareness programs on RC are inadequate and completely absent. This is further complicated by the lack of a communication strategy for MEAs resulting into erratic awareness programs that are usually ineffective. Furthermore, inadequate integration (synergy) of chemical MEAs into educational programs limits public appreciation of MEAs issues. Public awareness programs that are not followed by concrete actions or demonstrations attract less interest from the public and decision makers. Therefore the country priority is to fill this gap
 - Related information gaps:
 - Inadequate Awareness and Sensitization on MEAs issues including RC
 - Inadequate integration (synergy) of chemical MEAs into programs limits public appreciation of MEAs issues
- Priority Action 4
- Description of action:
 - Technology Transfer and Limited research
 - Low priority given to environmental issues in the national research policy and strategic plans, and inadequate infrastructure and facilities for research in specific MEA issues such as Persistent Organic Pollutants, affect the capacity of relevant institutions to conduct related research. In addition, manpower for research has also been affected by the government policy of scaling down expenditure to maintain macroeconomic stability. Furthermore, the poor research-extension linkage, as well as weak mechanisms for technology dissemination has led to limited application of research findings. Therefore the country priority is to address the technology and research gaps.

- Related information gaps:
 - Inadequate infrastructure and facilities for research in specific MEA issues such as Persistent Organic Pollutants
 - Low technology transfer
 - Inadequate research in specific MEA issues
- Priority Action 5
 - Description of action:
 - Inadequate funding
 - Although environmental issues including ensuring sound chemicals management is on the global agenda, financial resources for implementation of programs and projects were limited as development partners did not live to their expectation and commitment made to finance them, particularly in the developing countries. In Uganda, sound chemicals management issues have not been given high priority in terms of financial allocation due limited resource basket. Accessing available resources at the global level has equally been affected by the inability of relevant sectors to prepare timely and acceptable proposals using guidelines provided by funding agencies. Therefore the country priority is to address the financing gap.
 - Related information gaps:
 - Inadequate funding for ensuring sound chemicals management

23. Venezuela

- Priority Action 1
 - Description of action:
 - Mejorar los mecanismos de intercambio de información para una mayor eficacia del Convenio de Rotterdam, a través de la creación de una biblioteca virtual donde se publiquen investigaciones sobre los riesgos asociados a los productos químicos sujetos a comercio internacional.
 - Related information gaps:
 - Se requeriría mayor capacidad en los servidores para incluir los documentos digitales que sirvan de sustento para la inclusión de productos químicos.
- Priority Action 2
 - Description of action:
 - La Secretaría del Convenio deberá realizar las observaciones a los países antes que se cumplan los lapsos de remisión de la información. Haciendo énfasis en los siguientes aspectos:
 - > Los Formularios de Respuesta sobre la Importación y Formulario de Notificación de la Medida Reglamentaria Firme para Prohibir o Restringir Rigurosamente un Producto Químico, tienden a ser confusos al momento de realizar el llenado de la información. Las respuestas a los formularios no cuentan con reglas unificadas para su llenado, lo cual genera dudas a la hora de completarlo y estas inconsistencias pueden ser motivo de incumplimiento en los tiempos de respuesta. Por tanto la Secretaría debe realizar mayores esfuerzos para la unificación en los criterios de llenado y evaluación de los mismos.
 - > No se realiza oportunamente la actualización de los datos de los puntos focales y autoridades nacionales designadas.
 - Related information gaps:
 - > Se requiere asistencia técnica para la unificación de criterios en el llenado de los formularios.
 - > Conocer las restricciones que tiene la Secretaria para la actualización de los datos de los puntos focales.
- Priority Action 3
 - Description of action:
 - Mejorar la asistencia técnica y financiera del Convenio de Róterdam para el manejo seguro de los productos químicos que están sujetos al comercio internacional, la misma puede ser orientada en las siguientes áreas:
 - > Capacitación técnica para el fortalecimiento institucional de los laboratorios y aduanas.
 - > Asistencia financiera para investigaciones de análisis de riesgo a los productos químicos, a fin de contar con información nacional. Es de gran importancia que se fortalezcan dichas investigaciones, debido a las condiciones físico-naturales de cada país.
 - Related information gaps:

- Realizar mayores esfuerzos para la provisión de recursos financieros para las actividades de asistencia técnica y proyectos dirigidos a fortalecimientos de las capacidades nacionales en la evaluación de riesgo de productos químicos.
- Priority Action 4 — Description of action:
 Contar con mayor información sobre las alternativas de los compuestos químicos, es decir, una vez incluido un producto en el marco del convenio se deben disponer de datos suficientes acerca de las alternativas económicas, tecnológicos y de uso de los mismos.
- Related information gaps:
 Not answered
- Priority Action 5 — Description of action:
 Ampliar la participación en el Comité de Examen de Productos Químicos, mediante la incorporación de más miembros para tener diferentes visiones sobre los químicos a evaluar. Este hecho, además permite un mejor intercambio de información entre las diferentes regiones.
- Related information gaps:
 Requeriría revisar la decisión mediante la cual se creo el Comité de Examen de Productos Químicos.

24. Yemen

- Priority Action 1 — Description of action:
 > Development of a resource kit to promote ratification and implementation in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 > Updated toolkit regularly and reorganized to reflect experience in its use in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 > development new documents and existing materials updated and reproduced Updated toolkit regularly and reorganized to reflect experience in its use in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 > As many documents as possible translated to make them available in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 > Prepare an electronic version of the resource kit to facilitate access to the information and reduce the costs of reproduction in the six official languages of the United Nations.
- Related information gaps:
 Lack of a resource kit to promote ratification and implementation in the six official languages of the United Nations.
- Priority Action 2 — Description of action:
 > Promoting technical assistance for the development of the infrastructure and the capacity necessary to manage chemicals to enable implementation of this Convention.
 > Parties with more advanced programmes should provide technical assistance, including training, to other Parties in developing their infrastructure and capacity to manage chemicals throughout their life-cycle."
 > Organize training and awareness-raising meetings for new Parties that have recently ratified the Convention and for Parties that are experiencing difficulties in meeting their obligations under the Convention.
 > Implementing training programs and providing information and documents in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 > Providing a platform for information-sharing about national regulatory decisions on chemicals and pesticides in the six official languages of the United Nations.
- Related information gaps:
 > Lack of awareness and training in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 > Lack of training, information and documents in the six official languages of the United Nations.
- Priority Action 3 — Description of action:
 > Amending the procedure for the adoption and entry into force of an amendment to Annex III;
 > Option for increased information exchange through the Secretariat.

- Priority Action 4
- Related information gaps:
 - Because the article (21) is not modified.
 - Description of action:
 - > Development of elements of national action plans and other strategies for the implementation of the Convention in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 - > National and subregional meetings convened each year in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 - > Assist to development of elements of national action plans and other strategies for the implementation of the Convention in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 - > Promoting technical assistance for the development of the infrastructure and the capacity necessary to manage chemicals to enable implementation of this Convention.
- Priority Action 5
- Related information gaps:
 - Lack of national action plans and other strategies for the implementation of the Convention in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 - Description of action:
 - > Providing a procedural mechanism to help countries – particularly developing countries – give effect to their national import decisions.
 - > Greater effort is needed to ensure that scientific information is synthesized and presented clearly to be useful to decision makers and non-specialist stakeholders.
 - > Providing a platform for information-sharing about national regulatory decisions on chemicals and pesticides in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 - > Help participating countries learn more about the characteristics of potentially hazardous chemicals that may be imported in the six official languages of the United Nations.
 - Related information gaps:
 - > Insufficient information relevant to developing countries, and lack of information on alternatives.
 - > Limited information sharing between Parties in the region which is made more difficult with frequent changes of focal points for the conventions;
 - > Continued lack of capacity in developing countries, such as inadequate IT equipment, limited ability to obtain background materials needed, data interpretation capacity, and access to decision support systems.
 - > Lack of a mechanism to assist countries - particularly developing countries - in implementing the Convention