

Pest Management Advisory Council Meeting Report

November 1-2, 2004

The Pest Management Advisory Council (PMAC) met in Ottawa on November 1-2, 2004. Appendix A contains a list of all attending Council members and observers.

Ambrose Hearn, Chair of PMAC, opened the meeting. Over the course of the meeting, a number of action items arose. These are listed in Appendix B.

Opening Remarks from the Ministers Office

Brian Klunder, Policy Advisory to the Minister of Health, gave opening remarks on behalf of Minister Ujjal Dosanjh. He thanked members for their recommendations from the May 17-18th, 2004 meeting and indicated that Minister Dosanjh would be corresponding with Council on this matter in the near future. He welcomed new members, including the recently appointed Chair, Ambrose Hearn, and thanked Joanne Buth for standing in as Chair at the last meeting.

He indicated that the PMRA file has been assigned to him and that he is looking forward to further recommendations of Council, and that Council members were welcome to call him at any time.

Roundtable Introductions/Review of Agenda

Council members introduced themselves and were given an opportunity to present their background, meeting expectations and what they hope to give to the meeting.

Len Ritter, University of Guelph, brings many years of both regulatory and academic experience to the table and has a keen interest in pesticide related health issues.

Madeline Waring, B.C. Department of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, has had many years of experience in provincial pesticide regulation and working with stakeholders. She brings the provincial government perspective to the table.

Wendy Sexsmith, A/Executive Director, PMRA has had many years of both provincial and federal pesticide regulatory experience. She is very interested in working with stakeholders, and ensuring that the direction PMRA moves in has the input and views of its stakeholder community. She provides the essential link between Council and the PMRA.

Karsten Liber, University of Saskatchewan, brings expertise in environmental toxicology to the table, specifically in the areas of pesticide related environmental effects, water pollution and contamination,

and insecticide toxicology.

Karla House, the alternate Council member from the Canadian Federation of Agriculture (CFA), indicated that the CFA represents the interests of the agricultural user community across the country.

Neil Arya, the alternate Council member representing the Learning Disabilities Association of Canada, indicated that as a family physician with the Ontario College of Family Physicians, he is trying to balance the pesticide related perception of risk and fear in the Canadian public.

Elizabeth May, with the Sierra Club of Canada, is interested in reducing pesticide use to a minimum, particularly the cosmetic use of pesticides, and in reducing human exposure to pesticides.

Kathy Cooper, with the Canadian Environmental Law Association, has worked on the pesticide file for many years and has a major focus on the protection of children from both chemicals and pesticides. She is interested in the new *Pest Control Products Act* (PCPA) and the reduced risk initiative moving forward.

Pamela Welbourn is a retired adjunct professor from Queen's University who brings expertise in toxicology to the table. She has a continued interest in public communication around pesticides.

Robert Whiting, an alternate from the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS) is interested in the rights of workers, specifically focussed around chemical safety. CCOHS develops programs towards this cause and helps governments develop information on occupational exposure.

Derek Daws, with the BC Poison Control Centre, is interested in the surveillance of pesticide incidents, and the voluntary reporting of adverse effects related to pesticides.

Dean Thomson represents the Canadian Horticultural Council and is chair of their Committee on Crop Protection and Environmental Issues. He is a 3rd generation apple grower and is interested in making progress on bringing new chemistries to Canada.

John Borden was formerly with Simon Fraser University and is now with Phero Tech. He is a forest entomologist working in the area of chemical ecology. He is very interested in the future of reduced risk pesticides, specifically in semiochemicals.

Joanne Buth is from the Canola Council of Canada, which represents 60,000 canola growers, is the Vice-president of Crop Production. Her primary goal is the long term survival of growers and ensuring these growers have access to pest management tools, international trade and competitiveness. She is a strong supporter of a science based regulatory system and the promotion of IPM, but has concerns over public confidence in the pesticide regulatory system.

Brian Tuffin, representing the Consumer Chemical Specialty Products Association of Canada, brings the industry perspective to the table. He is interested in advancing competitiveness, the betterment of science and technology, and the pesticide regulatory system so that there are better pest management solutions for Canadians.

Lorne Hepworth is the President of Croplife Canada which represents the trade and industry associations around agricultural, urban and public health use of pesticides and plant biotechnology crops. He is at the table to fully and accurately represent the views of Croplife members which are based on two pillars, namely safety and innovation. He wishes to put forward actionable items on good public policy regarding the risk assessment and risk management of pesticides.

Henry Walthert, representing the Canadian Institute of Treated Wood, is bringing forward the interests of manufacturers of treated wood products. His career has been in forestry and he is interested in the completion of the re-evaluation of wood treatment products, the reduction of trade barriers, and the introduction of new chemistries.

Ambrose Hearn, Chair of PMAC, has been in the health field for many years. He has been Deputy-Minister with the provincial government and has been involved in the accreditation of health care institutions. He has also held positions as the head of the Ottawa Civic Hospital, CEO of the Victorian Order of Nurses and has chaired several federal/provincial committees. He is interested in good policy and sound advice that is expressed strongly but with respect.

The agenda was accepted.

The Chair established a number of ground rules including:

- One person speaks at a time;
- Everyone has a chance to speak that has an interest or view;
- We all show respect for each other's right to speak and to be heard;
- We will value questions, and positive criticism that allows us to move forward.

Implementation of the New *Pest Control Products Act* (PCPA)

Cameron Laing, A/Head of the Regulatory Affairs Section in PMRA gave an update of the new PCPA and the status of the supporting regulations. Presentation materials were distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- Council would like the new Act to be brought into force as quickly as possible.

- It was discussed that the new Act will be proclaimed as soon as possible in 2005. The proclamation is dependent on the publication of a number of key regulations. These regulations are complex to write and often generate a wide variety of comments from stakeholders that must be considered. A précis of these comments is included in the Regulatory Impact Analysis Statement published along with the final regulations in *Canada Gazette, Part II*. A revised PCPA Implementation Chart will be provided to Council.
- It was clarified that resources were provided to the PMRA to both bring the Act into force and to implement the various requirements of the Act. These resources are being managed by the PMRA as efficiently as possible.
- Some members wished to discuss the proposed Sales Information Reporting Regulations. Members were reminded that a detailed discussion on these proposed regulations was had at the last meeting, and that PMRA is giving due consideration to these comments, as well as a variety of written comments received as a result of publishing in *Canada Gazette, Part I*.

Adverse Effects Reporting

Jean-Pierre Lachaine, from the Health Evaluation Division at PMRA gave a presentation on the proposed regulations respecting Adverse Effects Reporting. These were published in *Canada Gazette, Part I* on October 23rd, 2004. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- It was clarified that the purpose of the proposed Adverse Effects Reporting system is to provide a mechanism for the post market surveillance and to provide information that will aid in the evaluation of the continued acceptability of a pest control product. It is not meant to replace the existing immediate emergency response/reporting systems in place to deal with urgent health and environmental issues, such as a poison control centre.
- PMAC members discussed the proposal that PMRA will post the incoming adverse effects report on their website in a timely fashion, and potentially before PMRA has had the time to do their evaluation of the report. Some Council members expressed concern that this information may be unsubstantiated and open to misinterpretation by the media or other groups. This misinterpretation may result in erosion of public opinion, or economic damage. The Council discussed the balance between transparency and not posting information that is waiting for substantiation. Council suggested that the reported adverse effect be somehow categorized according to whether it had been substantiated or not, and that this categorization be clearly communicated on the website. The PMRA was asked to give consideration to the fact that various individuals/groups with varying levels of education and understanding of pesticides

would be providing these reports, and that this may lead to misinformation being reported.

- Some Council members expressed concern over the potential for public “misuse” of the reporting system and wanted the PMRA to consider this possibility when evaluating data. It was clarified that the registrant will follow up on unsubstantiated adverse effects to ensure accuracy of the report, and that PMRA would evaluate and formally respond to any reported adverse effects. This formal response would be placed on the register.
- It was clarified that the onus for reviewing published literature for reportable information is on the registrant and that chronic adverse effects are subject to reporting. Some Council members stressed that the accidental overuse of a pesticide, such as applying too much insect repellent on a child, should be reportable.
- It was clarified that for some types of adverse effects, there is an allowable “accumulation” period. This means that for the duration of the accumulation period, the registrant may collect and accumulate several different reports of adverse effects, and then send them to the PMRA within the specified reporting period.
- It was clarified that the Canadian system is substantially harmonized with the U.S. system, and that the principles behind the definitions are the same in both countries. Industry members on Council stressed the importance of harmonization in keeping costs of implementation down. The Council discussed the issue of reporting residues of pesticides in water and that the costs associated with detecting these residues increases when the residue level approaches the limit of detection. A request was made that PMRA fully consider the costs of implementing the proposed system.
- It was clarified that the proposed regulation only addresses the mandatory reporting of adverse effects. Reporting from the public, the health care providers or other stakeholder groups would be considered under the voluntary reporting system. The development of the voluntary aspect is currently under consideration by a PMAC Working Group.
- It was clarified that registrants would only have to report on incidents of efficacy failure for pesticides that are used to control a pest that poses a direct or indirect risk to human health. With regards to pesticide resistance, it was clarified that although pesticide resistance may take several months to observe, incidents of pesticide resistance would need to be reported by registrants when they are informed about it.
- Council members were encouraged to submit detailed written comments as part of the formal consultation process through publication in *Canada Gazette, Part 1*.

Report from the PMAC Working Group on Voluntary Reporting of Adverse Effects:

Jean-Pierre Lachaine, from the Health Evaluation Division, PMRA gave a presentation on the PMAC Working Group on the Voluntary Reporting of Adverse Effects. Jean-Pierre Lachaine reported that the Working Group had a conference call where a Chair was chosen and terms of reference were established. The terms of reference were distributed in the briefing binders. The Working Group is meeting on Wednesday, November 3rd to discuss the reporting forms and how the mandatory reporting will be evaluated. The meeting will include a presentation on the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act and will outline the scope of future voluntary reporting. Croplife Canada indicated that they wanted to be a member of this working group.

Risk Reduction Strategies

Action Plan on Urban Use Pesticides

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of the Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division, PMRA gave a presentation on the Action Plan on Urban Use Pesticides. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- It was clarified that a new process is in place to link the outgoing uses of products as a result of re-evaluation and the new uses being approved as a result of the reduced risk initiative. Council members were supportive of this new process.
- It was clarified that the Healthy Lawns Working Group has subcommittees which have a variety of stakeholders as members. Lists of subcommittee members were distributed to Council members. It was clarified that the Landscape module, which is the basis for the training of landscape service providers, was updated with additional information on IPM and completed in March 2004.
- It was suggested that the pocket folder, which currently contains predominantly cultural practices for lawn care, could also contain information on the pesticide regulatory system.
- Council members representing user groups remain concerned about too few new chemistries coming to Canada. Council members representing registrants indicated that a current government wide priority is harmonization with the provinces, and emphasized that the work underway on harmonizing federal/provincial pesticide classification systems was very important and would provide incentive for registrants to bring new chemistries to Canada. The Council member representing the provinces indicated that the provinces continue to work towards the goal of a harmonized classification system.

Risk Reduction in Agriculture

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of the Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division, PMRA gave a presentation on the Strategy for Risk Reduction in Agriculture. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- Council members indicated their continued support for this program.
- Council commended PMRA/AAFC for the strategy developed for Richardson Ground Squirrels and encourages PMRA to continue with its implementation.
- It was clarified that PMRA/AAFC is linked with the National Agri-environmental Health Analysis Report Program (NAHARP) and are developing synergies between this work and PMRA/AAFC's pesticide risk indicator work. Both areas of work need pesticide use data which may in part come from a pesticide use survey being developed by Statistics Canada, under contract by AAFC. It was clarified that PMRA provides input to AAFC to help refine survey questions, and PMRA's input for the first survey was focussed around key products under re-evaluations as well as those products with common mechanisms of action. The first pesticide use survey will be conducted in 2005 and is limited in scope.
- It was clarified that there is the intent to build evaluation into each of the strategies that considers indicators and a continuous improvement feedback mechanism. These could vary with each grower group and commodity.
- Council members representing user groups stressed the importance of bringing new product uses and chemistries to the Canadian producers, and that there needed to be more focus on how this can be better facilitated.
- In the overall context of reducing risk, the Council member representing agricultural registrants indicated that voluntary stewardship programs play a significant role and Canada is a world leader in this regard.

Communications in PMRA

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of the Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division, PMRA gave a presentation on Communication activities within the PMRA. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- Council has a strong interest in PMRA's communication activities and a decision was made to form a PMAC Working Group to provide advice to PMRA on its communications program. The following individuals/organizations volunteered to participate on the Working Group: Madeline Waring or an alternate provincial member, Elizabeth May (Sierra Club of Canada), Robert Whiting (CCOHS), the Consumer Chemical Specialty Products Association and Croplife Canada,. The Working Group will initiate the work quickly and report back to Council at the next meeting.
- Some Council members stressed that the PMRA should ensure it is as transparent as possible with stakeholders regarding their input to surveys and research and monitoring activities.
- Council members are interested in discussing the details of PMRA's communication plan and the resources allocated to the various activities.
- With the implementation of the new *Pest Control Products Act*, Council members encouraged PMRA to communicate further about it. It was clarified that a detailed communications plan (presented to PMAC on June 3-4, 2003) would be used as the new Act is brought into force.
- Some Council members were very interested in the various communication activities underway, and whether the activities were effective in reaching their target audiences. Others indicated that the PMRA needs to release formal responses to hot issues more quickly, that they engage in public debate about pesticides and address issues in more detail. It was clarified that PMRA has a team of communication experts whose duties include communication planning, responding to media inquiries, writing information notes and questions and answers, as well as collaborating with Departmental communication experts. In addition, PMRA scientists are also involved in responding to emerging or reactive issues such as West Nile Virus. PMRA indicated that recent efforts, such as creating the "Information Note", are intended to increase proactive communication.
- Many Council members would like to see more communication activities directed to the general public. It was discussed that the public is actively engaged in debate over pesticides but in many cases, have limited information on which to form their opinions. Some Council members thought that physicians and academics should also be a target audience. Some Council members would like more communication aimed at municipalities. In this regard, provinces were encouraged to actively communicate with municipalities.
- Council members discussed that care needs to be taken in delivering communication messages to distinguish between those pesticides that are new or have recently undergone re-evaluation versus those that have not.
- One Council member pointed out that PMRA had, in one specific instance, handled a

compliance issue in a manner perceived to be biased towards industry. PMRA indicated that this specific situation was perceived not to have been handled appropriately and indicated that procedures have been put in place to avoid such perceptions. PMRA also suggested that in future, discussions in these specific cases can be arranged with the parties to ensure that a full understanding of the issue is provided.

Update on Harmonization:

Richard AuCoin, A/Chief Registrar, PMRA gave a presentation on harmonization activities within the PMRA. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- Council continues to support international harmonization efforts.
- It was clarified that progress on how the PMRA will implement the Globally Harmonized System (GHS) is continuing through work with a sectoral stakeholder group and through NAFTA. It was agreed that at an appropriate time in the future, GHS would be brought to Council.
- The importance of harmonization was stressed by Council members representing user groups. Harmonization, particularly of global MRLs, is seen as a key component of ensuring Canadian growers have access to the tools they need. The importance of joint reviews was stressed and that there remains a lot of work to be done on chemical pesticides and in particular, on biopesticides.
- It was discussed that work to overcome barriers to harmonization is underway. At the June NAFTA Executive Board Meeting, it was agreed to initiate discussion and resolution on the differences in the approach to worker exposure assessment. In early 2005, PMRA is planning a workshop to discuss crop field trial zone issues. It was also discussed that PMRA has initiated communication with CEOs of companies to communicate the need for new chemistries to come to Canada.
- Council members representing registrants emphasized that the work underway on harmonizing federal/provincial pesticide classification systems was very important and would provide incentive for registrants to bring new chemistries to Canada.
- PMRA indicated that they would publish a list of reduced risk actives available in Canada versus the U.S. by the end of the year. Some Council members expressed interest in having additional information on the list, including detail on the proportion of registered versus pending registration, and a comparison of the uses of the various active ingredients.

Update on Re-evaluation:

John Worgan, Director of the Re-evaluation Management Division, PMRA gave an update on re-evaluation activities within the PMRA. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- Council members continue to support the re-evaluation program including the recent communication efforts to link the results of re-evaluation decisions with new reduced risk registrations and the publishing of a re-evaluation report. Council members encouraged the PMRA to publish a variety of information in the report including a summary list of the key dates that products are no longer able to be sold, and links to adverse effects reports.
- Some Council members expressed frustration with the changing time lines published for re-evaluation decisions on lawn care products, and encouraged the PMRA to complete these reviews, particularly 2,4-D, as soon as possible.
- It was clarified that PMRA is in the process of planning for the 15 year cyclical re-evaluation of pesticides to ensure efficiency in the re-evaluation process.
- It was clarified that when a product's uses are discontinued or withdrawn, a reasonable period of time is allowed for the transition to the new label, or to be removed from the shelf. If it is anticipated that there will be remaining product, the details of disposal are usually worked out with the manufacturer.

PMRA Electronic Regulatory System:

Valerie Robertson, Director of the Submission Co-ordination Division, PMRA gave a presentation on the PMRA Electronic Regulatory System (e-PRS). Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- It was discussed that PMRA actively communicated on the launch of this system by doing a press release and writing an article scheduled for publication in the near future, in the magazine Institute of Public Administration in Canada.
- It was clarified that registrants may still submit paper to the PMRA. The paper information

would be converted both electronically and into microfilm for future retrieval. PMRA indicated that a submission builder tool is provided to companies to aid in overcoming any technical barriers.

Reduced Risk Products:

Richard AuCoin, A/Chief Registrar, PMRA gave a presentation on reduced risk products. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- Council members again indicated their support for the published list of reduced risk products (see discussion point under Harmonization).
- It was discussed that there are sometimes simple reasons for the differences between the U.S. and Canada, including that the pest may not be in Canada or that the manufacturer has no agent to facilitate Canadian registration.
- Council members again stressed the importance of bringing as many of the reduced risk products as possible to Canadian growers. It was clarified that the regulatory system is based on registrants submitting applications for a registration, not the PMRA soliciting registrations. This is consistent with the approach in all other developed countries. However, PMRA does want to help facilitate submissions to fill existing gaps, and towards this end, Council members were encouraged to talk to the Chief Registrar to help facilitate tripartite discussions between registrants, user groups and the PMRA.
- It was clarified that there is a distinction made between conventional pesticides and biopesticides, as outlined in the Regulatory Directive on PMRA's Approach to Reduced Risk Products.
- It was discussed that biopesticides are generally species specific and therefore have limited revenue generating potential. It was suggested by one Council member that there are some types of biopesticides, eg. semiochemicals/plant extracts, that should be treated differently from other biopesticides. It was also suggested that the new Low Risk Working Group (see below under Low Risk Pesticides) should consider whether a different approach to regulating these products would be appropriate.
- It was clarified that the term "reduced risk" is not on the label, but that it is used within PMRA published documentation related to a particular product.

- It was discussed that aiding in the registration of reduced risk products, specifically biopesticides, is similar to the minor use situation which now is being resolved through an AAFC/PMRA partnership. Some Council members discussed the idea of creating an advisor or agency to help facilitate access to biopesticides, or that PMRA work with AAFC in this regard. Some Council members wanted to discuss this further at the next PMAC meeting.

Low Risk Products:

Charalyn Kriz, Special Advisor to the Executive Director, PMRA gave a presentation on low risk products. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- Council members supported the idea of forming a working group to help develop a more flexible regulatory approach to low risk products. The Working Group and its terms of reference would be established including how the group would interact with and include the expertise of members of a Low Risk Working Group that currently exists under the direction of the World Wildlife Fund. A number of members/organizations volunteered for the Working Group including John Borden (Phero Tech), a provincial representative, Croplife Canada, Elizabeth May (Sierra Club of Canada).
- Council members had a variety of ideas for the Working Group to consider including whether the low risk products would be subject to re-evaluation, whether notification could be used as a mechanism for registration, how the sensitivity of unique sub-populations would be considered, whether some types of biopesticides or plant extracts would be considered low risk, how to clearly communicate the differences between reduced risk and low risk and ensuring very clear criteria are developed for categorizing a product as low risk.
- It was discussed that the approach to low risk products would have to exercise caution on low risk products that make public health claims. It was discussed that in this case, registrants would have to demonstrate efficacy.

Safety Factors Used in Human Health Risk Assessment:

Diana Somers, Director of the Health Evaluation Division, PMRA gave a presentation on how safety factors are used in human health risk assessments at PMRA. Presentation material was distributed at the meeting and are available on the PMRA website.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion.

- Council members expressed their appreciation for this presentation.
- It was clarified that the use of an extra safety factor for the protection of children is consistent with the U.S. It was also clarified that the 1993 study referenced in the presentation pertaining to the use of an extra safety factor for the protection of infants and children was a more thorough investigation than the investigation that led to the 1999 WHO - JMPR statement.
- The process of doing occupational and residential exposure assessments was explained. It was clarified that for many occupational exposure scenarios, generic data is used from the Pesticide Handlers Exposure Database.
- It was clarified that a variety of information is used in the calculation of MRLs including consumption data for various age groups, median residue levels from crop residue trials and modelled estimates of water levels. These are used to estimate the food/water exposure, known as the potential daily intake. It was also clarified that if the calculation only considered the maximum residue levels, the estimates would be overly conservative.
- It was discussed that a Science Advisory Panel had been struck in the US to deal with the unresolved issue of human trials for pesticide risk assessment. The panel has provided its report suggesting very stringent criteria in the event that human pesticide trials be considered. The EPA has not yet come forward with their response to the SAP. PMRA agreed to provide Council with their policy regarding the use of human data.

“PMRA does not condone the use of human trials for pesticide testing, but there have been instances where data human data is available for chemicals that have both a drug and pesticidal use and that PMRA uses this as supplemental information during the review process. Where there is human data available regarding sensitivity or pharmacokinetics/ pharmacodynamics, PMRA would also use it in their reviews as supplementary information.”

Other Business

Points of General Discussion

- It was discussed whether the Council would benefit from a retreat prior to the next meeting. There was consensus that Council did not feel the need for a retreat at this time, particularly because the Council is now meeting twice per year. Some Council members indicated an interest in an expanded roundtable session at the next meeting. It was also discussed whether Council would consider the idea of meeting in a location other than Ottawa. Council had no preference, but indicated the importance of PMRA staff to be available for presentations, and the importance of managing the meeting budget.

- Council was very receptive of the idea of an orientation session at the PMRA where Council members could talk to PMRA staff.
- The rules of Council membership were explained to Council, including the efforts to create a balance of stakeholders. It was also explained that the Minister appoints a member for a term of two years, as per the terms of reference. PMRA explained that it is not just the organization, but also the individual, who is appointed to Council. In the event that an individual representing an organization is unable to finish their term, the organization is asked to recommend a replacement to the Minister. The process of membership review was also discussed, including that every two years approximately one third of Council is renewed, and two thirds remain for continuity. One Council member suggested that more health practitioners and more organizations representing possible health effects of pesticides be appointed to Council, given that the Council reported to the Minister of Health. Another member suggested that AAFC have a seat on Council.
- Council members discussed a number of ideas to improve efficiency for the next meeting including that previous minutes be included in the meeting binder, that URLs be included in presentations, and that if Council already knows the background on an agenda topic, then a presentation is not necessary and that it would serve the purpose to just have an opportunity for discussion with the responsible person from PMRA.

Recommendations and Key Areas of Agreement for the Minister

The Council agreed on the following recommendations to the Minister.

- 1) The Council recommends that the new *Pest Control Products Act* be proclaimed as quickly as possible.
- 2) The Council recommends that Health Canada finalize the re-evaluation of the herbicide 2,4-D as soon as possible.

In addition, Council highlighted the following Key Areas of Agreement.

- The Council continues to support the agricultural risk reduction program.
- The Council is very interested in PMRA's communication activities and has formed a Working Group to provide advice in this regard.
- The Council continues to support international harmonization, including internationally consistent MRLs, and continued resolution of the efficacy and worker exposure differences between Canada and the U.S.

- Council members continue to support PMRA's re-evaluation program including the recent communication efforts to link the results of re-evaluation decisions with new reduced risk registrations and the publishing of a re-evaluation report.
- The Council agreed to the formation of a Working Group on Low Risk products in order to work with the PMRA to develop a more flexible regulatory approach for these products.
- The Council stressed the importance of bringing new pest management product chemistries to Canada and indicated that this was a key issue in the long term survival of Canadian producers.

Recommendations for future agenda items:

A number of ideas for future agenda items were suggested, including:

- Further discussion on tripartite discussions between PMRA, registrants and user groups.
- A discussion on increasing PMRA's use of enabling innovation.
- A discussion on the use of pesticides in schools, particularly the indoor use. It was clarified that if the PMRA were to undertake any work in this area, it would have to be in conjunction with the provinces.

In addition, it was indicated that the next meeting agenda would include a review of action items arising from the November 1-2, 2004 meeting as well as a meeting evaluation.

Date for Next Meeting

- It was indicated that the Council would aim to meet in the spring and fall. The next meeting will likely be scheduled in May, 2005.

**Appendix A:
Council Members, Alternates, Secretariat, Observers and Presenters in Attendance at the
November 1-2, 2004 meeting.**

CHAIR:

Mr. Ambrose Hearn

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Dr. John Borden, *Simon Fraser University*
Ms. JoAnne Buth, *Canola Council of Canada*
Ms. Kathy Cooper, *Canadian Environmental Law Association*
Dr. Derek Daws, *B.C. Poison Control Centre*
Dr. Lorne Hepworth, *CropLife Canada*
Dr. Karsten Liber, *University of Saskatchewan*
Dr. Len Ritter, *University of Guelph*
Ms. Wendy Sexsmith, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Mr. Dean Thomson, *Canadian Horticultural Council*
Mr. Brian Tuffin, *Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association*
Mr. Henry Walthert, *Canadian Institute of Treated Wood*
Ms. Madeline Waring, *B.C. Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries*
Dr. Pamela Welbourn, *Queens University*

ALTERNATES:

Dr. Neil Arya (for Dr. Riina Bray), *Learning Disabilities Association of Canada*
Dr. Robert Whiting (for Anne Gravereaux), *Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety*
Ms. Karla House (for Bob Friesen), *Canadian Federation of Agriculture*

SECRETARIAT:

Ms. Trish MacQuarrie, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Lynn Skillings, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Josée Beaudoin, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*

OBSERVERS:

Ms. Anne Fowlie, *Canadian Horticultural Council*
Mr. Craig Hunter, *Canadian Horticultural Council*
Ms. Kathleen Paynter, *Canadian Horticultural Council*
Ms. Jill Lane, *Canadian Aerial Application Association*
Ms. Shannon Coombs, *Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association*
Stéphane Dupont, *Biocontrol Network*
Ms. Rose-Marie Ur, *Liberal MP*
Ms. Chera Jelley, *assistant to Ms. Ur*
Mr. Paul Steckle, *Liberal MP*
Mr. Greg McClinchey, *assistant to Mr. Steckle*

Ms. Sandy Hamamoto, *assistant to Mr. Steckle*
Mr. Chris Warfield, *Bayer CropScience*

GUESTS/PRESENTERS:

Mr. Brian Klunder, *Health Minister's Office*
Ms. Karen Lloyd, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Mr. Cameron Laing, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Mr. Jean-Pierre Lachaine, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Dr. Richard Aucoin, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Mr. Alan Tomlin, *Agriculture and Agri-food Canada*
Mr. John Worgan, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Valerie Robertson, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Charalyn Kriz, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Dr. Diana Somers, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*

Appendix B:

List of Action Items arising at the November 1-2, 2004 meeting.

- 1) PMRA to provide a list of reduced risk active ingredients and biopesticides in Canada and the U.S., with uses if possible.
- 2) PMRA to provide an updated implementation plan for the new Act.
- 3) PMRA to establish PMAC Working Groups on Communications and Low Risk products
- 4) PMRA to follow up with Growers Associations and Industry CEO's regarding the need for tripartite actions to enhance the availability of new, safer products in Canada.
- 5) PMAC members to provide comments on proposed Adverse Effects Regulations through the Canada Gazette process.
- 6) PMAC to be provided with the various aspects considered in establishing a balance of members on PMAC.
- 7) PMRA to provide Council with the policy on the use of human data in assessments of pesticides.
- 8) PMRA to provide an outline for an orientation program to PMAC for comment.
- 9) The PMAC Secretariat would ensure that previous meeting minutes and any relevant policies, or regulations are included in the meeting binder. Also, presentations are to include URLs where appropriate.