Pest Management Advisory Council
Meeting Report

June 6-7, 2005

The Pest Management Advisory Council (PMAC) met in Ottawa on June 6-7, 2005. Appendix A contains a list of all attending Council members and observers.

Opening of the Meeting

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.

Members were asked to introduce themselves and indicate their meeting expectations.

The chair presented a list of meeting rules which were accepted by Council.

Remarks from PMRA's Executive Director

Dr. Karen Dodds, Executive Director of PMRA, stressed the importance of working together for positive outcomes, of challenging the status quo, and of having open and fulsome exchanges of ideas. She emphasized that the Council's purpose is to provide advice to the Minister of Health on the federal pest management regulatory system and in particular on the broad strategic direction of the PMRA, and to provide a challenge function to the work of the Agency.

Dr. Dodds noted her priorities for the Agency which include implementing the new Pest Control Products Act, improving communications, both in making publications more understandable and in interacting more, improving stakeholder relations and improving openness and transparency.

The following summarizes the discussion following the opening remarks by Dr. Dodds:

- PMAC members were optimistic with the commitment to openness and transparency and emphasized the importance of maintaining vigilance in this commitment.

- Members briefly discussed that PMRA has an Economic Management Advisory Committee (EMAC). Some members wanted to further understand the roles of EMAC and PMAC with regard to the Evaluation of PMRA's Cost Recovery Evaluation. It was indicated that at an appropriate time in the future, the cost recovery evaluation would be brought to PMAC for discussion. Some members felt that the term "cost recovery" did not adequately represent what the term actually means.

PMAC Orientation

A history and overview of the Council was presented including information on the terms of reference.

The following summarizes the areas of discussion and clarifications given during the discussion:

- Members briefly discussed the balance of representation on Council. One member indicated that there was no representation from labour groups, although the interests of workers are represented by the member from the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety.

- It was clarified that the term social within the mandate, "To provide a challenge function to ensure that PMRA programs are consistent with the needs of Canadians within the overall national and global environmental, social, and economic context." includes public health considerations.

- One member was interested in having more opportunity to exchange views with other stakeholders on Council.

- It was re-affirmed that all views on Council are important and that the Council will work towards general consensus, but the recommendations and meeting reports will continue to reflect the diversity of opinions and views discussed at the meeting. This will ensure that the Minister gets the best advice, including if there are dissenting opinions and the reasons for them.

Implementation of the New *Pest Control Products Act*

a) Status of Regulatory Initiatives under the New *Pest Control Products Act*

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of the Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division in PMRA gave a presentation on the status of the new Pest Control Products Act and the various regulatory initiatives that support it.

The following summarizes major themes discussed and clarifications given during the discussion. In addition, this summarizes the further discussion from Day 2 of the meeting pertaining to bringing the new Pest Control Products Act into force:

- The Council stressed the importance of bringing the new Act into force as quickly as possible. It was discussed that the openness and transparency provisions of the new Act are needed urgently so that the data supporting major registration and re-evaluation decisions can be publically available.

- The original plan for implementing the Act included packaging all the Phase 1 regulatory initiatives together so that they would all be ready at the time the Act was brought into force. In order to bring the Act into force more quickly, the PMRA explained that the various Phase 1 regulatory initiatives can be split into Essential and Key Regulatory Initiatives.

  The **Essential** Regulatory Initiatives include:

  • Existing Pest Control Product Regulations;
  • List of formulants and contaminants of concerns ;
  • AMPs Regulations;
  • Fees Regulations.

  The **Key** Regulatory Initiatives include:

  • Adverse Effects Reporting;
  • Review Panel;
  • Sales Information Reporting;
  • Safety Information.

  The Council discussed two options. The first option was to keep both the essential and key regulatory initiatives as a package and bring the new Act into force with all of the regulations with a target of spring 2006. The second option was to bring the Act into force with just the essential regulatory initiatives aiming for the end of 2005. The key regulations would then follow with a target of being finalized in the spring of 2006.

- Council recommended that the second option be pursued as this would provide the quickest mechanism to bringing the new Act into force.

- It was discussed that a key part of this plan, beyond just publishing the regulations, is to ensure that both industry and PMRA are in a position to be able to deliver the various new provisions of the Act, including the training of PMRA staff and stakeholders.

- Council members stressed the importance of remaining vigilant in completing the key regulations.

b) Review Panel Regulations

Francine Brunet, Head of the Regulatory Affairs Section in PMRA gave a presentation on the proposed content of the Review Panel Regulations.

- There was a discussion on the criteria for the establishment of a review panel relating to the use of the precautionary approach, particularly for re-evaluation decisions. One member noted that the goal of the regulation is to increase the opportunity to challenge decisions, and that an objection noting a lack of scientific certainty should be valid, as a key part of any decision is how the precautionary approach was applied. PMRA agreed and indicated that, where appropriate, proposed decision documents would outline how the precautionary approach was applied.

c) List of Pest Control Product Formulants and Contaminants of Health and Environmental Concern

Francine Brunet, Head of the Regulatory Affairs Section in PMRA gave a presentation on the List of Pest Control Product Formulants and Contaminants of Health and Environmental Concern (List).

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

- It was clarified that all formulants utilized in Canadian products are grouped into lists in a similar way to that used by the U.S. and the PMRA Formulants Program contains further information about these lists: http://www.pmra-arla.gc.ca/english/pdf/dir/dir2004-01-e.pdf, http://www.pmra-arla.gc.ca/english/pdf/reg/reg2005-01-e.pdf . If formulants have **not** been determined to be of health or environmental concern, the information pertaining to which products use these formulants and in what percentage is considered confidential.

- It was clarified that if a formulant or contaminant **is** of health or environmental concern, it would no longer be considered confidential and would be published on the List and would be subject to regulatory action as outlined in the Formulants Program. The public may request information on which pest control products contain formulants or contaminants of concern on the List.

- It was clarified that when PMRA does an evaluation, if a formulant or contaminant is found to be of concern, it will be added to the List which will be updated regularly.

- Although the Formulants Program articulates four lists and the new Act another list, Council members were interested in having one large list of all formulants and contaminants in database format, that clearly indicates which ones are of concern.

- It was discussed that if a major registration decision was dependent on additional analytical testing for contaminants of concern, and the decision was made under the existing Pest Control Products Act, the information about the substances on the List

would not be publically available. If the decision was made under the new Pest Control Products Act, the information about the substances on the List would be publically available. PMRA subsequently indicated that they would explore options related to these concerns.

- PMRA provided clarification on the time lines required for formulants to be tested such that they can be either be considered acceptable for use, or subject to regulatory action as outlined in the Formulants Program. The assessment of List 2 formulants found in food use products will be completed by the US EPA by August 2006. The PMRA is working with the US EPA to plan for the completion of assessments of remaining List 2 formulants. It was clarified that a formulant would not stay on List 2 indefinitely, and that it is meant as a tracking mechanism until more information becomes available. Some members wanted to ensure that the precautionary approach would be utilized for these products until more information becomes available.

d) Proposed Revisions to the Pest Control Products Regulations

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division in PMRA gave a presentation on the proposed revisions to the current Pest Control Products Regulations.

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

- At the request of Council, the member representing agricultural product manufacturers gave an overview of the Own Use Import (OUI) Program and provided clarification on industry concern with the program. The OUI Program allows users to import into Canada a foreign product that is determined to be equivalent to a Canadian registered product. The program is intended to allow access to competitively priced pest control products. The industry representative was concerned that this has resulted in a large volume of product being sold which is having a monetary impact on Canadian registrants. In addition, industry raised concerns that under the OUI Program, the product has no Canadian registrant and therefore no-one to be held responsible for new Canadian regulatory requirements such as adverse effects reporting and submission of sales data.

- The members representing the provinces and environmental groups expressed concern with the way the OUI Program was being used. The member representing Canadian farmers indicated that farmers are currently suffering a long-term income crisis in part due to steadily increasing costs for agricultural inputs and that the OUI program is important to Canadian farmers.

- The PMRA stressed the importance of allowing all Canadians an opportunity to comment on the OUI Program and indicated that it will be outlined in a notice of intent for the existing regulations which will be published for comment in the near future.

"Value" as defined in the new *Pest Control Products Act*

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of the Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division gave a presentation on why a discussion on value is timely. Richard Aucoin, Director of the Efficacy and Sustainability Assessment Division gave a presentation on PMRA's current approach to efficacy and value. This was followed by a Council discussion on value.

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

- All members felt this was a valuable topic for discussion and wanted future opportunities to discuss it further. Many members indicated that any discussion on value should emphasize the importance of reduced risk products.

- A variety of members indicated that the value of pesticides, whether from a cosmetic standpoint, a public health standpoint, a resistance management standpoint or various other lenses is subjective and interpreted differently by different Canadians, yet this subjectivity is not formally recognized in PMRA documents. Some members thought that PMRA documents should have an expanded discussion of the various value considerations.

- PMRA clarified the current process of value assessment and the nature of value considerations. Documents currently detail the acceptability of the risk and value, and demonstrate that the application rates and use directions are acceptable from a sustainability perspective. The evaluations do not currently consider whether the pest is a cosmetic pest or not and the documents do not articulate or rank non-chemical or mechanical pest control alternatives. Some members suggested that PMRA documents should clearly indicate how the product contributes to an overall reduction in risk and that PMRA should communicate more about these types of decisions.

- It was clarified that during the overall assessment of acceptability, the efficacy assessments can refine the number of applications, reduce the rate of application or increase the pre-harvest interval in order to increase the margin of safety and provide for an acceptable level of risk.

- Many members agreed it was necessary to both users and those recommending uses to know that a product has efficacy; others felt too much emphasis on efficacy requirements would discourage new products from gaining access to Canadian markets. This latter point was emphasized for minor use products with a suggestion that the minor use efficacy requirements be minimized.

- Some members raised the issue of the value of low risk products. Some members supported the need to substantiate claims of effectiveness while others indicated that the required quantity of efficacy data should be commensurate with the degree of risk.

Another member indicated the importance of promoting low risk products, but ensuring that there is research on any long term health effects on vulnerable sub-populations.

- Throughout the discussion on value, Council members suggested various considerations related to value assessment including:
  • contribution to reduced risk and reduced use,
  • social context,
  • re-evaluation decision impacts on global marketplaces,
  • the total body burden of a new chemical,
  • the necessity of the use,
  • the various ethical principles,
  • the public health impact,
  • the value of value assessments,
  • whether the product is a substitute for a higher risk product,
  • trade irritant,
  • what food and lawns look like,
  • comparative value assessments,
  • contribution to resistance management,
  • significance of a small increase in efficacy (90% versus 94%)
  • energy conservation and oxygen exchange of plants,
  • synergism when combined with other products or alternatives,

- All members agreed that PMRA should develop a framework for value assessment which would be brought back to PMAC for discussion. The approach would include an objective way of presenting the various value considerations with clear criteria, addressing the various considerations in decision making. It was suggested that PMRA look at what other OECD countries use in their value assessment as they develop the approach. The approach should indicate which considerations are subjective versus objective.

- PMRA was encouraged to consult with their provincial counterparts, the research community and minor use co-ordinators to fully scope out the issue of value.

- Members were asked to give further thought to the issue of value and send any further thoughts to Richard Aucoin at Richard_Aucoin@hc-sc.gc.ca.

Future Meetings in Conjunction with other Federal Science Advisory Boards

Dr. Karen Dodds, Executive Director of the PMRA indicated that four members of PMAC, namely, Dr. Karsten Liber, Kathleen Cooper, Derek Daws and former member Dr. Riina Bray participated in a Health Canada Science Advisory Board meeting on Health and the Environment. Members of the Environment Canada Science Advisory Board were also invited to attend.

The meeting was held on June 1st, 2005 to obtain the Board's input prior to the mid-June meeting of the Health and Environment Ministers of America (HEMA). Meeting attendees gave positive feedback, and indicated that this type of meeting is of value. It was indicated that there may be future opportunities for PMAC members to attend such venues, that PMAC would be solicited for interest, but that the terms of reference of any hosting Board would be respected.

Remarks from the Minister of Health

The Honourable Ujjal Dosanjh gave short remarks which included:

- The Minister gave his appreciation for the importance and complexity of the work of the Council and his thanks to the Council members.

- The Minister indicated that the new Pest Control Products Act was an important step in increasing the openness and transparency of the federal pest management regulatory system, and that efforts to bring the new Act into force are on track with the target for the end of the calender year 2005.

The Minister asked the Council for their expectations of him. The following is a summary of members comments to the Minister:

- Members expressed their thanks and appreciation to the Minister for attending the PMAC meeting.

- Members want the Minister to maintain the priority on bringing the new Pest Control Products Act into force.

- One member asked the Minister to work closely with Environment Canada for environmental and wildlife protection.

Communications in PMRA

Trish MacQuarrie, Director of the Alternative Strategies and Regulatory Affairs Division in PMRA gave a presentation on recent activities of the PMAC Communications Working Group.

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

- It was clarified that the Working Group was not yet at a point of delivering a final communication product, but that PMAC's comments and suggestions on considerations, audiences, progress to date and overall direction were required.

- It was noted that communications is a key component of transparency and that PMAC

needs to make a strong commitment to communications and that PMAC will need to provide advice on ensuring appropriate resources are available to undertake communications.

- The Working Group was encouraged to proceed as quickly as possible on developing clear recommendations for PMAC to consider and have a full in depth discussion with well developed core messaging. It was suggested that the WG would benefit from additional provincial or federal government representatives.

- The communications strategy should have clear objectives and strategies for each of the key audiences, as well as measurable outcomes. It was suggested that public confidence in the federal regulatory system is a key outcome. It was suggested that the public is able to understand more than just simple messages including topics such as the processes around new products versus older products, the different categories of pesticides (eg. OPs versus organochlorines) and their relative toxicity to children. It was suggested that health practitioners are a key audience as they can transmit information to a wide audience.

- The importance of clear and honest messaging was emphasized. In particular, it was emphasized that PMRA messaging needs to be clear about the fact that not all products on the market have yet been re-evaluated according to the same scientific rigour of new products. While members recognize that progress on re-evaluation is being made, the fact that not all products have yet been re-evaluated creates a vulnerability for the PMRA. It was suggested that there be a key message around why label instructions are so important. Another suggestion for a key message is that there is a federal regulatory system for pesticides because they need to be regulated, that pesticides need to be handled safely, and that the system is doing its job to protect Canadians.

- A number of members were uncomfortable with use of the word, “safe”. Instead, it was discussed that the appropriate language and messages must be used, for example, “deemed to be of acceptable risk”. One member suggested that PMAC should be advising on the larger issues, and not on specific word usage, such as “safe”.

- It was suggested that when PMRA talks to the media about a proposed registration decision, it should be emphasized that the public has not yet commented and that the decision is not yet final.

- One member discussed that the issue of risk communication such as in PMRA’s decision documents is a separate issue from the ideas around a communication strategy.

- All PMAC members were welcome to contact any Communication WG members if there are additional thoughts on this subject.

Low Risk Products - Report from the Low Risk Working Group

Charalyn Kriz, Special Advisor to the Executive Director in PMRA gave a report from the PMAC Low Risk Working Group.

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

- In response to questions from Council members, a number of clarifications were provided on the areas of Working Group (WG) agreement including:
  - The WG did consider temporary registrations as a possible first step for low risk products;
  - That a tiered approach to data requirements would be taken;
  - That most low risk products would not need new data generated, but that the registrant would be able to provide rationales for data waivers including information from the published literature and the use of structure-activity relationships, as necessary.

- It was further clarified that a nontoxic mode of action refers to something other than a biological mode of action such as a physical barrier and that the Generally Regarded As Safe (GRAS) List utilized in the U.S. was not considered appropriate for the purposes of this group. It was clarified that there is guidance in place in other countries that give consideration to the issue of toxicity related to dose administered and whether there were hazards to children because of the amount or type of exposure and that these would be utilized as appropriate for any Canadian system.

- A number of general comments were made including that there are inconsistencies in the use of terms in PMRA, including "reduced risk", and "low risk", and that it is misleading as the considerations for low risk pertain more to low intrinsic hazard than to risk.

- It was discussed that WG participants have been challenged by this project and that there has been agreement on the principle that data needs should be commensurate with the level of risk, and that registered products should demonstrate efficacy. The WG had discussed that the first step in the process would be to determine if a product met the low risk criteria, and if it did, then there would be a consideration of efficacy.

- There was discussion with a variety of comments including that if low risk products are going to have a statement on their label on the level of risk (or hazard), then perhaps there should be comment on the level of value that the product demonstrates. Related to this, a comment was made that consumers have come to expect that a registered product would both have acceptable risk and acceptable value, and that these products should be clearly identified if the value has not been demonstrated. In addition, it was discussed that products registered in other countries may not behave the same way when used in Canada, in particular for products that are for soil borne pests, and that efficacy in Canada

should be demonstrated. One member commented that there should not be too much emphasis put on having a PCP number as not all consumers identify with what a PCP number means.

- There was discussion with a variety of comments including that if a temporary registration is given for a low risk product on the condition that efficacy be demonstrated, that sufficient time be given to allow the registrant to generate the appropriate data. Another member indicated that a long period of initial registration time be given to these products with no initial efficacy requirements so that the marketplace will decide if the product has value.

- One member expressed interest in whether there was a list of products that were exempt from registration, but suitable for use if consumers wanted to make their own low risk home brews. Another member suggested that since homebrew products are currently illegal, it would be beneficial if a list of products that would be suitable and safe for homeowners to utilize could be developed.

- One member indicated that the low risk registration process is important in the agricultural industry and that the resultant outcome of this work should be proactive and not reactive so that changing pest issues can be dealt with quickly.

- PMRA indicated that there is a low risk section in the Agency that could help facilitate the availability of products through use of decisions and rationales of other countries.

- It was clarified that the minutes to the various conference calls were provided in the briefing binders for information only. It was also agreed that minutes from conference calls would be translated and placed on the PMRA website.

- The WG indicated that there would be a face to face meeting held in September with the goal of reporting back to PMAC in the fall with a proposal.

Other Business

The action items arising from the November 2004 meeting were reviewed.

Council members were given an opportunity to ask questions on the Information Items in the binder. One member expressed an interest in having a presentation on the voluntary reporting of adverse effects reporting at the next PMAC meeting.

General Meeting Comments:

- One member requested that briefing material provide a more focussed question for the

reader in order to help them understand the crux of the issues. It was also asked that the briefing material be sent to members as early as possible.

- One member suggested that a PMAC webboard would be a useful mechanism to share information.

- One member expressed concern that the grower groups were not adequately represented on Council.

Recommendations to the Minister/Major Points of Agreement:

The following recommendations to the Minister/Major Points of Agreement were made:

1. The Council appreciates PMRA's recent efforts to be more open and transparent and encourages continued emphasis in improving stakeholder relations.

2. It was re-affirmed that meeting reports will continue to reflect the diversity of opinions and views discussed at the meeting.

3. The Council agreed that in order to expedite bringing the new Act into force, that the essential[1] regulations would be finalized first and brought into force with the Act, and that the key regulations would continue to be a priority, but would be brought into force after the Act with a target date of spring 2006.

4. The Council continues to agree that communications at PMRA is of high importance, and encourages the Working Group to continue its work, addressing considerations provided by PMAC members.

Summary of Action Items:

During the discussion of Action Items, which are summarized in Appendix B, a number of discussion points were raised.

- If the Council of Chief Medical Officers of Health was interested in knowing what products are suitable for control of pest outbreaks that may impact public health such as West Nile Virus, a request for this information, on behalf of the Council, should be made to the Chief Registrar's Office in PMRA.

- One member was concerned with the results of human biomonitoring research done in the

[1] See discussion related to the Implementation to the new Pest Control Products for details related to essential versus key regulations.

United States that showed high levels of pesticide, and was interested in what biomonitoring research was being done by Statistics Canada.

- PMRA provided clarification that the reassessment of List 2 formulants found in food use products will be completed by the US EPA by August 2006. The PMRA is working with the US EPA to plan for the completion of reassessments of remaining List 2 formulants.

Recommendations for Future Agenda Items

Members suggested a variety of topics for future agenda items including:

- Biomonitoring research on pesticides. The presentation could also include information relating to urban biomonitoring in the City of Toronto.

- Opportunity for informal exchange of information as a standing agenda item

Date for Next Meeting

Members discussed that the next meeting will be held in the first half of November and that availability for possible dates will be determined electronically.

Meeting Evaluation

Members were encouraged to fill out the meeting evaluation form.

Council members were thanked for their participation, and the meeting was adjouned.

Appendix A:

List of Meeting Participants and Observers

CHAIR:
Mr. Ambrose Hearn, *Independent*

COUNCIL MEMBERS:
Mr. Chris Andrews, *Canadian Nursery and Landscape Association*
Dr. Neil Arya, *Ontario College of Family Physicians*
Dr. Richard Bélanger, *Laval University*
Mr. Gary Brown, *Canadian Horticultural Council*
Ms. Kathleen Cooper, *Canadian Environmental Law Association*
Mr. John Cross, *Philom Bios*
Mr. Derek Daws, *B.C. Poison Control Centre*
Dr. Karen Dodds, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Mr. Drew Franklin, *Canadian Consumer Specialty products Association*
Dr. Claire Infante-Rivard, *McGill University*
Ms. Margaret Kirkeby, *Consumers' Association of Canada*
Ms. Julia Langer, *World Wildlife Fund*
Dr. Karsten Liber, *University of Saskatchewan*
Ms. Elizabeth May, *Sierra Club*
Mr. Glen Sampson, *Nova Scotia Agricultural College*
Mr. Henry Walthert, *Canadian Institute of Treated Wood*
Ms. Madeline Waring, *B.C. Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries*
Dr. Eric Young, *Council of Chief Medical Officers of Health*

ALTERNATES:
Mr. Peter MacLeod (for Rick Smith), *CropLife Canada*
Ms. Shannon Watt (for Bob Friesen), *Canadian Federation of Agriculture*
Dr. Robert Whiting (for Anne Gravereaux), *Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety*
Ms Angela Rickman (for Elizabeth May on the 7th)**,** *Sierra Club*

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

PRESENTERS:
The Honorable Ujjal Dosanjh, *Minister of Health*
Dr. Richard Aucoin, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Francine Brunet, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Charalyn Kriz, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Trish MacQuarrie, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*

OBSERVERS:

Mr. Biran Klunder, *Minister's Office*
Mr. Allan Brown, *DupontCanada*
Ms. Shannon Coombs, *Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association*
Mr. Stéphane Dupont, *Biocontrol Network*
Ms. Anne Fowlie, *Canadian Horticultural Council*
Mr. Craig Hunter, *Canadian Horticultural Council*
Mr. Roy Lidstone, *Bayer Cropscience*
Mrs. Pat MacGregor, *Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada*
Dr. Meg Sears, *Independent*
Ms. Judy Shaw, *Syngenta Crop Protection Canada, Inc.*
Ms. Kathy Stapleton, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Tracy Schneider, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Janice Hopkins, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Dr. Connie Moase, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Cathy Adcock, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Mary Mitchell, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Dr. Valerie Robertson, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms Angela Rickman, *Sierra Club*
Ms. Karen Lloyd, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Mr. Frank Wandelmaier, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Cheryl Chaffey, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Dr. Peter Delorme, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Mr. Jason Flint, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Suzanne Chalifour, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Mr. Pierre Beauchamp, *Pest Management Regulatory Agency*
Ms. Pamela Kern, *Consultant*
Mr. Michael Tansey, *Consultant*

Appendix B:

Summary of Action Items:

1. PMRA to provide the summary of comments received on several of the proposed regulations to PMAC members.

2. PMRA to provide the list of all formulants in database format, indicating in some manner, those formulants that are on the List of Formulants and Contaminants of Concern.

3. Members were asked to give further thought to the issue of value and send any further thoughts to Richard Aucoin at Richard_Aucoin@hc-sc.gc.ca.

4. PMRA to send PMAC a copy of the re-evaluation “401" list.

5. PMAC Secretariat to look into the status of pesticide biomonitoring research by Statistics Canada.

6. PMAC Working Group terms of reference and membership lists will be sent to PMAC members and members can indicate if they are interested in participating on the Working Groups.

7. New PMAC members will be sent information related to participation on re-evaluation conference calls.

8. PMRA to explore options related to the concern over the public availability of information supporting major registration decisions under the existing Pest Control Products Act.