

Review of Previous PMAC Recommendations to the Minister

Presentation to PMAC

Lynn Skillings

May 18, 2004



November 1998

- ◆ Recommendation:
PMAC requested that the next meeting agenda address re-evaluation and U.S. *Food Quality Protection Act of 1996 (FQPA)*, and its impact on the Canadian regulatory process.
- ◆ Action Taken:
Feb 99 meeting had discussions of both the FQPA and PMRA's Re-evaluation Program



November 98, February 99, May 99, January 2000, March 2001

- ◆ Recommendation:
The Council's recommendations for the first four years focussed on amendments to the *Pest Control Products Act* (PCPA).
- ◆ Action Taken:
The new PCPA received Royal Assent on December 12, 2002.



January 2000

- ◆ Recommendation:
The Council requested that PMRA develop a proposal for the consideration of the Council with regard to the adoption of IPM in two pilot areas (canola and one other).
- ◆ The Council also urged the Minister to work with his Cabinet colleagues to ensure adequate resources to support IPM research and advance its adoption.
- ◆ Action Taken:
Pilot initiatives were undertaken in several areas, and were reported on at Nov. 02 meeting and included canola, apples, integrated fruit production, potatoes, pulses and Healthy Lawns.
- ◆ New resources were provided to PMRA and AAFC related to Risk Reduction Strategy development.



March 2001

- ◆ Recommendation:
Some Council members support for new legislation depended upon adequate resources being provided in the area of minor use pesticides.
- ◆ Council noted that the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) is responsible for making funds available to growers to enable the development of data supporting these minor use registrations.
- ◆ Action Taken:
In May 02, the Government announced a new joint initiative between PMRA and AAFC, including new funding to give Canadian producers better access to minor use and reduced-risk pesticides.



March 2001

- ◆ Recommendation:
The Council emphasized that adequate resources to implement the legislation are essential (i.e. a higher level of funding than is currently available in this area).
- ◆ The Council noted concern about the lack of adequate resources for the pest management regulatory system, including re-evaluation and research.

- ◆ Action Taken:
Additional resources were provided to implement the new legislation.

Additional resources were allocated to the PMRA and to other government departments that are involved with research and monitoring of pesticides.



November 2002

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council recommended that the IPM projects be evaluated with a view to assessing their impact on pesticide risk reduction.
- ◆ Action Taken:
This is being included in the IPM projects.



November 2002

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council recommended that PMRA clarify/refine the definitions of “reduced risk” and “minor use” pesticides.

- ◆ Action Taken:
The Reduced Risk and Minor Use programs were discussed at the June 2003 meeting.



November 2002

- ◆ Recommendation:
The Council asked for an opportunity to provide preliminary comments on the content of proposed new regulations under the new Act before they were published in Canada Gazette Part I.
- ◆ Action Taken:
Council was given the opportunity to comment in May - June 2003 on Discussion Documents on each of the 4 key new regulations published.



November 2002

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council recommended that a Communications Strategy for the new legislation be developed with a view to enhancing public knowledge and confidence in the regulatory system and the safety of pesticides. Council requested that the Strategy include the publication of an Annual Report, with the ability for Council to make specific suggestions on its content and mechanisms for its dissemination. Council requested that a draft report be discussed at the next Council meeting.
- ◆ Action Taken:
These topics were addressed at the June 2003 PMAC meeting.
- ◆ Presentations were given outlining the communication strategy proposed for the new PCPA as well as various communication activities ongoing within the PMRA, including:
 - ◆ the annual report;
 - ◆ a document that will be used to communicate with the public regarding the new PCPA;
 - ◆ the plans for a new look to the PMRA website.



June 2003

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council requested that the definition of minor use be clarified and that the minor use program track the actual use of pesticides on these minor use crops.
- ◆ Action Taken:
Two PMAC meetings have addressed this issue.
- ◆ Further consideration is underway re: whether to propose specific regulations concerning minor use.
- ◆ PMRA website now has a button for minor crops, so that PMRA publications on this subject are readily accessible.
- ◆ Methods of obtaining use information are being explored with AAFC (crop profiles).



June 2003

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council requested that the emphasis of the minor use program be on reduced risk products.
- ◆ Action Taken:
The need for placing emphasis on reduced risk products has been clearly communicated to AAFC.
- ◆ PMRA is continuing to emphasize with the pesticide industry the importance of joint reviews so that new reduced risk products are available at the same time and for the same uses in Canada and the U.S.



June 2003

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council recommended that Health Canada (HC), Environment Canada (EC), the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (AAFC) direct funding towards pesticide research including bio-monitoring, residues on food and environmental monitoring.
- ◆ Action Taken:
EC, DFO, AAFC, NRCan and CFIA received funding in the Building Public Confidence TB (BPC TB) to conduct research and monitoring activities.
- ◆ HC did not receive any funding but 3 branches conduct some limited pesticide research.
- ◆ A Pesticide and Pest Management Workshop was held in Dec. 2003 with all 5NR WG members.
- ◆ Annual report is under development summarizing progress on the research projects funded.



June 2003

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council recommended that the PMRA Communications Strategy include messages on re-evaluation, the adverse effects reporting system, the registration process and how the public can become engaged on pesticide issues.
- ◆ Action Taken:
The Communications Strategy was revised based on PMAC comments and is being implemented. The strategy will include messages on re-evaluation, adverse effects reporting, transparency and public access.



June 2003

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council requested that the PMRA Annual Report include a variety of quantitative information.
- ◆ Action Taken:
PMAC comments have been taken into account in drafting the progress report, which was sent for members' comments on March 16.
- ◆ The annual report will meet the reporting requirements under the new PCPA, and will include a variety of quantitative information.
- ◆ In preparing the report, PMRA will follow standard reporting procedures with management approvals.



June 2003

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council recommended that the re-evaluation program within PMRA have an overall higher profile within communication activities with an emphasis on the re-evaluation process, activities and progress.
- ◆ Action Taken:
Re-evaluation progress is highlighted in the annual report.
- ◆ Strategic communication considerations have now been integrated into the re-evaluation work plan.
- ◆ There is now a re-evaluation button on the PMRA website, to provide easy access to information on this subject.



June 2003

- ◆ Recommendation:
Council recommended that the Adverse Effects Reporting system focus on health and the environment, with a lesser emphasis on efficacy.
- ◆ The Council also recommended that a Working Group, reporting to PMAC, be struck and tasked with establishing strong linkages with the medical community and Poison Control Centers to encourage voluntary reporting of adverse effects.
- ◆ Action Taken:
PMRA will be publishing the new regulations on adverse effects reporting in the Canada Gazette, Part 1, taking into account the PMAC comments as well as comments from other stakeholders.
- ◆ Under PMAC, a working group is being established to discuss the framework of a voluntary adverse effects reporting system. The first meeting is proposed for the next few months.

