Improved pesticide and chemicals management in the former Soviet Union

Pesticide quality in the countries of the former Soviet Union – challenges and opportunities identified in a recent FAO survey on pesticide management
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EU-funded Project EU/FAO project GCP/RER/040/EC initiated 2013 – Outcomes

• Outcome 1: Management of obsolete pesticides
• **Outcome 2: Pesticide lifecycle assessment**
  • Outcome 3: Cross cutting activities
  • Outcome 4: Project management
  • Outcome 5: Monitoring and evaluation
Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Ukraine, Uzbekistan
Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan (FAO SEC countries)
“Baseline Study”

2.1 Review of Pesticide legislation

2.2 Analysis of Pesticide life-cycle – based on FAO/WHO Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management;

2.3 Promotion of lower risk alternatives to Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs);

2.4 Development of Communications and Awareness materials for use at national level
Outcome 2

- **Sustainability** of selected arable crops based on a model (DEXiPM)
- implementation of the **Code of Conduct** and regulatory status of **highly hazardous pesticides** assessed.
- Regulatory status of **highly hazardous pesticides (WHO class Ia and Ib)**

Forms and questionnaires filled by national consultants. **Needs assessment** and **recommendations** endorsed by National Governments and stakeholders.

- **Status reports** revealed significant differences & communalities in the profiles of the countries. Numerous challenges were encountered. ...
The “Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management” - 2013

- Provides the **framework** for a management landscape of pesticides throughout life-cycle;
- Addresses **all areas of pesticide management**, through supporting manuals and guidelines (production, product quality, distribution, sale, use and disposal);
- Provides, through standard-setting, a **point of reference**, in particular for governments and the pesticide industry;
- Applies to **all public and private entities** involved in pesticides matters;
Code of Conduct, 2013
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Objectives of the Code Include...

- Risk reduction, protection of human and environmental health;
- Adherence to relevant Conventions (Stockholm, Rotterdam...) and international standards;
- Fosters responsibilities of the major stakeholders, i.e. governments and pesticide industry;
- Encourages alternative pest management approaches, eg by IPM
Countries need to **implement** the Code in their national legislation

FAO, WHO and UNEP to monitor observance

Format: **CoC questionnaire** covering Art. 3 to 11 with 10 to 30 questions each

**HHP questionnaire**

to be filled by National consultants and evaluated
4.1.16 In your country, does pesticide industry conduct residue trials prior to marketing, in order to provide a basis for establishing appropriate maximum residue limits (20)?

| Definitely yes | ☐ | Rather yes | ☐ | More less or | ☐ | Rather no | X | Definitely no | ☐ |

4.1.17 In your country, does pesticide industry conduct residue trials prior to marketing, at

Quantitative evaluation:  
Definitely yes → 4 points
Definitively no → 0 points
Challenges

- Working in a multilingual, multicultural environment (FAO, National consultants, International consultants)
- Identifying National consultants
- Translations back and forth needed (ENG → RUS → ENG)
- Need to find common language - some terms not known to National Consultants and Government officials
Observance of the Code – Main Findings & Communalities

- “Country profile” with degree of implementation (expressed as %) for Articles 3 to 11 (Pesticide Management to Advertising)
- Significant communalities & differences between countries identified
Pesticide Management & Testing (Art. 3 & 4)

- Some pesticide Registration in place in all countries
- IPM Development and testing of spray equipment scored very low
- Inadequate capacities & expertise for evaluating registration documents
- Laboratories for official residue monitoring and quality control of pesticides in all countries but...
Laboratories outdated...
Huge Challenges in Strengthening Official Quality Control Laboratories I

- Shortcomings in legal provisions for pesticide registration
- Concepts for optimal use of a QC laboratory are not well developed
- Existing laboratories: infrastructure, expertise of staff
Huge Challenges in Strengthening Official Quality Control Laboratories II

- Operational manuals for laboratories are inexistent
- International networking (CIPAC, FAO and WHO programmes on pesticide risk reduction) is weak to nonexisting
Needs identified are used for formulating projects to improve the situation.
The Way Forward: “Hard Facts”

Mobilizing funds for

• Technical update of laboratory infrastructure
• Trainings and twinnings
The Way Forward: “Soft Facts” I

- Strengthening pesticide registration and legal situation for better defining pesticide quality
- Strengthening official inspection services
The Way Forward: “Soft Facts” II

- Licensing system for import, storage and distribution of pesticides
- Operational Manuals for official quality control needed
- Lowering language barriers and international exchange
- Training, training, training…
Sustainability of Projects

- Financing of laboratories
- Autonomy status for retention of trained staff and budget
- Accreditation needed
- Synergy with residue laboratories
More soft challenges...

- Identifying sufficiently experienced QC experts for training
- Language barriers
- Introduction of suitable quality assurance schemes
Conclusions

• Survey results confirm the strong interdependence of pesticide management with quality control

• Strengthening official quality control in Eastern European countries will:
  → reduce substandard and counterfeit pesticides
  → contribute to risk reduction while safeguarding protection of crops and vector control
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