

**SAICM/UCT
Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHP) Community of Practice (CoP)
Discussion 3 2021 Guide**

Title	Alternatives in Phasing Out HHPs: Industry innovations and the Substitution process
Date	15th September 2021
Time	14h00 – 15h30 (GMT +2)
Facilitator	Prof Andrea Rother, University of Cape Town, South Africa
Presenters	Lilian Tornqvist, KEMI and Andrew Ward, CropLife
WebEx registration link	To register for this discussion, click on this link: https://unep.webex.com/unep/j.php%3FRGID=r2449351799e3ed3d1b6f7c868a077b09
SAICM/UCT HHP CoP Sign-up link	Make sure you have signed up for the HHP CoP: https://saicmknowledge.org/community
What's App Group	Join the HHP CoP What's App Group to receive information: https://chat.whatsapp.com/JFBuAOTRuRZONAqm8JHpp0

Should you require assistance or have questions, contact: uctcops@outlook.com

Discussion Format:

- This is not a Webinar, but rather a discussion among different stakeholder groups.
- The discussion presenter/s will briefly present a verbal introduction and introduce the questions listed in this discussion guide.
- Three questions will be posted during the 1 ½ hour discussion. The presenter/s will address questions and comments posted by members in the chat room and participants are encouraged to respond to each other as well.
- All are encouraged to join the discussion which will be held in English. Feel free to write in another language and members will assist where possible with translation

PRESENTER BIOSKETCH



Dr Lilian Tornqvist works for the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI) as a Senior adviser in the “International unit” and has held the position for the past 11 years. Her main activities and responsibilities include, giving advice regarding chemicals risk management and establishment of institutional capacity and enforcement. She furthermore serves as a JMPM FAO advisor.



Dr Andy Ward is the CropLife International Stewardship Director, based in Brussels. Andy holds a PhD in pest and resistance management from the School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia in the UK. He worked in agricultural development for donor-funded programs and the CGIAR international agricultural research centres for 20 years. It is the practical side of work that he enjoys most and has been able to benefit from living and working in Africa for 12 years including three years in Nigeria where he did his PhD fieldwork, and five years in Zambia. During this time, he learnt the importance of partnering with the private sector for sustainable agricultural development. Andy is passionate about enabling farmers to implement changes that transform their livelihoods whilst managing environmental impacts.

QUESTION 1 (14:00 GMT+2), Lilian Tornqvist

Background:

The following procedures and steps have been agreed for risk reduction of HHPs in a country/region and the application of comparative assessment and substitution is a key step:

- HHPs identified
- Need assessment: For what purpose is the HHP being used? What chemical and non-chemical alternatives are registered/available, or can be made available? What are the limitations of the alternatives?
- Assessment of alternatives: Data on chemical and biological products alternatives are generally available from different databases, -in dossiers or in open databases. In addition, information on non-chemical methods could be provided by other sources.
- Risk mitigations
- Decisions by authorities
 - Cancellations
 - Restrictions with deadlines and review within limited time period

Question 1: Which stakeholders in your country or region are available to the authorities (regulators) or could be engaged with for consultation during decisions on viable alternatives to identified HHPs?

Are there any barriers to these engagements?

Resources/Information for the Discussion:

- [Plant Production and Protection Division: Highly Hazardous Pesticides \(HHPs\) \(fao.org\)](http://www.fao.org)
- [Sustainable use of pesticides \(europa.eu\)](http://europa.eu) (recent evaluation 2021)

- [The information campaign on safe pesticide management - Säkert Växtskydd \(sakertvaxtskydd.se\)](https://sakertvaxtskydd.se)

Polls (will be posted during the discussion but participants are encouraged to think about it in advance)

1. How could enforcement support the decisions on HHPs made by the authorities (regulators) in your country? Propose 2-3 major activities linked to the decisions and list your country.
2. Propose three critical steps in a possible process, including timelines, to phase out or minimize the use of HHPs still on the market in your country or region”. List country/region in response. (open-ended)

QUESTION 2 (14:30 GMT +2), Andy Ward

Background

Research and development in the plant science industry has and continues to develop a wide range of tools for effective crop protection. Such innovations, if registered for use, provide exciting alternatives to the use of HHPs.

Small-scale farmers in LMICs do not just need tools but also information and organisations that will support a realistic transition from HHPs to better alternatives. Therefore, any discussion on alternatives should also consider how alternatives will be incorporated into the operating environment.

The May 2021 SAICM HHP CoP meeting illustrated how the challenges facing farmers, as they strive to produce a harvest of both quantity and quality, are multiple. There are reasons why farmers continue to use HHPs, and we should consider these when we are looking to promote alternatives. This is especially so in LMICs. Realistically a transition to the farm level of alternatives to HHPs will not happen overnight, it will be a process requiring support from multiple stakeholders and multiple disciplines to guide this transition for the good of farmers, consumers, and the environment.

Question 2: What are the important steps that need to be taken so that farmers can transition from HHPs to alternatives?

Resources/Information for the Discussion:

- E.M. Rogers Diffusion of Innovation (1962), updated summary [here](#)

Polls (will be posted during the discussion but participants are encouraged to think about it in advance)

1. To ensure the success of the transition away from HHPs which stakeholders should be involved and why? Open ended – list your country in your response
2. In your opinion, how long would it take more than 50% of a farming population to identify, develop, and adopt a new innovation or methodology?
 - a. 1-2 years
 - b. 5 years
 - c. 10 years
 - d. 15 years
 - e. 15+ years
 - f. Don't know.

QUESTION 3 (14:55 GMT+2), Andy Ward

Background:

There are multiple alternatives to the use of HHPs. However, these technologies cannot bring benefits to farmers if they are simply ‘sitting on the shelf’. They need to be understood by key stakeholder groups, accessible, and attractive to farmers – convincing farmers to choose them over HHP options. A sample of such alternatives will be presented.

Question 3: What is required so that innovative crop protection tools and approaches are successfully incorporated into IPM approaches by farmers?

Resources/Information for the Discussion:

- <https://croplife.org/news/7-innovations-that-could-save-our-planet-2/>
- <https://croplife.org/crop-protection/innovation-in-crop-protection-products/>

Polls (will be posted during the discussion but participants are encouraged to think about it in advance)

1. Which of the six innovation(s) do you think are viable as alternative uses to HHP use in your country?
2. In your opinion, could the CropLife innovations presented be incorporated realistically into IPM approaches by farmers in your country?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Some could
 - d. I do not know