



**United Nations
Environment Programme**

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

Distr.: General

English only

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

Third meeting

Geneva, 10–13 March 2008

Item 2 (b) of the provisional agenda¹

**Organizational matters:
organization of work**

Scenario note for the fourth meeting of the Chemical Review Committee

Note from the Secretariat

The Secretariat has the honour to transmit to the Chemical Review Committee, in the annex to the present note, information for the fourth meeting of the Committee prepared by the Chair of the Committee, Ms. Hyacinth Chin Sue (Jamaica).

¹ UNEP/FAO/RC/CRC.4/1.

Annex

Scenario note for the fourth meeting of the Chemical Review Committee

I have prepared the present scenario note for the fourth meeting of the Chemical Review Committee (CRC) to communicate my plans and general expectations to participants and assist them in preparing for the meeting. The documents for the fourth meeting of the Chemical Review Committee were sent to all Committee members during the week of 7 January 2008 and, on request, to all interested observers. They are also available on the Rotterdam Convention website (www.pic.int).

Up to 15 new members will be participating in a meeting of the Chemical Review Committee for the first time. So, I would like to spend most of the first day (Monday 10 March) on a review of the work of the Committee. I propose that we begin working on the candidate chemicals on Tuesday with a view to concluding substantive discussion on them by Wednesday afternoon. I foresee finishing the meeting and adopting the report by midday on Thursday 13 March 2008.

A. General Objectives of the fourth meeting of the Chemical Review Committee

- I propose to begin the technical work with a presentation by the Secretariat on the role and mandate of the Committee as well as a review of the key elements of the Rotterdam Convention, in particular the PIC procedure and the role and purpose of decision guidance documents. This will be followed by an open discussion between members of the Committee and an opportunity for questions and answers. The goal of this introductory presentation is to help ensure a common baseline of understanding among Committee members prior to embarking on a detailed consideration of operational procedures of the Committee and reviewing candidate chemicals.
- I would then like to briefly review the operational procedures developed by the Committee, in particular the work of the intersessional Task Groups and drafting groups, as well as the various working procedures and policy guidance developed by the Committee to facilitate its work. The goal of this discussion will be to provide an opportunity for members of the Committee to ask questions and ensure a common understanding of the work they are to undertake.
- The Committee will review the notifications of final regulatory actions for six chemicals (five pesticides - alachlor, aldicarb, carbaryl, methyl parathion and mirex and one industrial chemical - chrysotile asbestos) to determine if they meet the requirements of the Convention. If appropriate, the Committee will recommend whether one or more of these chemicals should be included in Annex III of the Convention and decide to establish drafting groups to prepare decision guidance documents.

The following are some of the principle issues to be considered:

- In line with the process for drafting decision guidance documents adopted at the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Decision RC-2/2), the six candidate chemicals have been clustered into three groups with the following priorities proposed by the Bureau
 - Group 1 includes two pesticides for which there are notifications from two PIC regions that would appear to meet the criteria of Annex II (alachlor and aldicarb).

- Group 2 includes three pesticides for which there are notifications from two PIC regions where only one notification would appear to meet the criteria of Annex II (carbaryl, methyl parathion, mirex).
- Group 3 includes an industrial chemical for which there are two notifications from two PIC regions where neither notification would appear to meet the criteria of Annex II (chrysotile asbestos).
- In consultation with the Bureau, I have identified experts from among the Committee members to work in intersessional Task Groups responsible for a preliminary assessment of these chemicals. These Task Groups will, as appropriate, develop rationales as to how the requirements of the Convention have been met by these notifications.
- The intersessional Task Groups will present the results of their preliminary assessment to the full Committee for review and comparison with the information requirements in Annex I and the criteria in Annex II of the Convention.

A. Possible outcomes

The following is a list of the expectations that I have for the outcomes of the meeting:

(a) Familiarization of the new CRC members with the operation of the Committee in order to fully participate in the discussions of the Committee and any intersessional work that it might decide to undertake.

(b) For alachlor and aldicarb a determination regarding the acceptability of the notifications and, if appropriate, preparation of a rationale as to how the criteria of Annex II have been met. If the notifications are found to be acceptable, recommendation to the Conference of the Parties to list these chemicals in Annex III of the Convention and establishment of intersessional drafting groups and work plans for preparing decision guidance documents.

(c) For chrysotile asbestos, carbaryl, methyl parathion and mirex, a determination of which, if any, of the submitted notifications meet the requirements of the Convention and, for these notifications, the preparation of rationales setting out how they have been found to meet the criteria of Annex II.