



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
20 January 2006

Original: English

**Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm
Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
Second meeting**

Geneva, 1–5 May 2006

Item 5 (a) (i) of the provisional agenda*

**Matters for consideration or action by the Conference of the Parties:
measures to reduce or eliminate releases from intentional production: DDT**

**Evaluation of the continued need for DDT for disease vector
control and alternative strategies to replace DDT****

Note by the Secretariat

1. At its first meeting, the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention, in decision SC-1/25, requested the Secretariat to undertake, in cooperation with the World Health Organization (WHO), the following measures to enhance the evaluation of the continued need for DDT for disease vector control and to promote alternative strategies to assist Parties in their goal of reducing and ultimately eliminating the use of DDT:

(a) Keep under regular review the adequacy of information required under sections A, B, C and D of the format and questionnaire set out in annex III of decision SC-1/25, and propose to the Conference of the Parties any modifications that are deemed essential (para. 4);

(b) Keep under regular review the adequacy of the list of information needed for the evaluation of the continued need for disease vector control set out in annex IV of the decision and propose to the Conference of the Parties any modifications that are deemed essential (para. 7);

* UNEP/POPS/COP.2/1.

** Stockholm Convention, Article 3 and Annex B, part II; Report of the Conference of the Parties on the work of its first meeting (UNEP/POPS/COP.1/31), annex I, decision SC-1/25.

(c) Elaborate further the reporting and evaluation process on DDT, as envisaged in the first recommendation of the expert group on DDT,¹ and prepare cost estimates on such a process for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its second meeting (para. 8 (c));

(d) Provide an overview of alternatives and their effectiveness to assist Parties in their goal of reducing and ultimately eliminating the use of DDT (para. 8 (d));

(e) Work on ongoing efforts to provide global leadership for establishing partnerships on long-term strategies for developing and deploying cost-effective alternatives to DDT (paras. 8 (f) and (g));

(f) Undertake activities in the work plan outlined in annex III of document UNEP/POPS/COP.1/4 containing immediate actions to support the preparations of Parties for reporting on DDT and the review and assessment process required for future evaluations of the continued need for DDT (para. 8 (e)).`

Information required under the questionnaire

2. In paragraph 4 of decision SC-1/25, the Conference adopted a format for reporting by each Party that uses DDT for disease vector control pursuant to paragraph 4 of part II of Annex B to the Stockholm Convention, along with a questionnaire for reporting other information relevant to the evaluation of the continued need for DDT for disease vector control, both contained in annex III of the decision. As requested by the Conference, the Secretariat, in cooperation with WHO, reviewed the format and questionnaire with participants from countries that attended two regional workshops (see paragraph 7 below) to consider the process of data collection and management and reporting of information on DDT. This review highlighted the need for countries to receive further guidance on filling out the questionnaire. An electronic version of the questionnaire has been developed by WHO to facilitate collection and management of data. Additionally, a guidance document is being developed further to assist countries in completing the questionnaire. The electronic version of the questionnaire and the guidance will be available on the official Stockholm Convention website: www.pops.int.

Information needed for the evaluation of the continued need for DDT for disease vector control

3. In paragraph 7 of decision SC-1/25, the Conference adopted a list of information items needed to assist it in evaluating the continued need for DDT for disease vector control, which is contained in annex IV of the decision. As requested by the Conference, the Secretariat, in cooperation with WHO, has reviewed the list and has concluded that no modifications to the list are essential at this time.

Elaboration of the reporting and evaluation process on DDT

4. Activity 2 of the work plan referred to in paragraph 7 below includes a study on possible mechanisms for active information collection to provide an adequate information base for the evaluation of the continued need for DDT. The Secretariat requested WHO to conduct the study, a report on which is available as document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/2. The study includes information from selected countries on the data collection and reporting processes for DDT. Activity 1 (b) of the same work plan concerns the implementation of four regional induction workshops on reporting and data requirements for Stockholm Convention focal points and representatives from national malaria control programmes in ministries of health in countries that use, might in the future use or produce DDT. The reports from the first two of these workshops to be completed, along with the study from activity 2, have been used to develop a proposal for reporting on DDT and evaluating the continued need for DDT, which is

¹ The Expert Group recommended that the Conference of the Parties consider, among other things, taking action to “ensure that adequate investment is made for the reporting and assessment processes to provide a sound and reliable basis for the Conference of the Parties evaluation of the continued need for DDT. In this regard, it is recommended that a well-resourced mechanism for reporting and assessment on DDT use for disease vector control, be set up under the auspices of the Secretariat and WHO. This mechanism should involve active data collection and appropriate verification and validation processes, and should also enable systematic strengthening of relevant country capacity for data collection and management to progressively increase the role of countries in the reporting and monitoring process. (UNEP/POPS/COP.1/4, annex II, item 8, paragraph 1.)

contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/3. The proposal includes cost estimates on such a process for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its second meeting.

Provision of an overview of alternatives to DDT and their effectiveness

5. In response to the request by the Conference for an overview to be prepared on alternatives and their effectiveness to assist Parties in their goal of reducing and ultimately eliminating the use of DDT, the Secretariat has made available in document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/4 a study group report by WHO on malaria vector control and personal protection, which discusses current alternative malaria vector control options, their effectiveness and how and under what conditions they are used. The report addresses the overall effectiveness of alternatives to DDT for disease vector control, but there is still a need to determine their cost-effectiveness under local conditions in each country to allow Governments to make informed decisions on their selection and deployment. Local verification of certain alternatives within the context of integrated vector management is a component of a number of regional projects with selected Parties to the Stockholm Convention that have been approved for funding by the Global Environment Facility. The projects are being conducted by WHO in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), which serves as the implementing agency for the Global Environment Facility for the projects.

Establishing global partnerships to introduce cost-effective alternatives to DDT

6. WHO, in collaboration with UNEP and the Secretariat, has developed a draft global strategy for developing and deploying cost-effective alternatives to DDT. The draft strategy is currently under review by WHO, UNEP and the Secretariat.

Work plan for activities in support of Party reporting on DDT and the process for future evaluation of the need for DDT

7. A summary of the activities undertaken by the Secretariat in implementing the work plan contained in annex III of document UNEP/POPS/COP.1/4 is set out in annex I to the present note.

Possible Action by the Conference of Parties

8. The Conference may wish to:

(a) Take note of the study prepared by WHO on possible mechanisms for active information collection to provide an adequate information base for the evaluation of the continued need for DDT contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/2;

(b) Take note of the report on the elaboration of the reporting and evaluation process on the continued need for DDT contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/3, including the conclusions and recommendations contained therein, and, based on them:

- (i) Urge all national stakeholders to be involved in the data collection process for information on the use and management of DDT and its alternatives;
- (ii) Recommend that relevant national agencies establish formal linkages among themselves to ensure delivery of routine reporting pursuant to paragraph 4 of part II of Annex B of the Convention;
- (iii) Request the Secretariat to work closely with WHO to support Parties in establishing national procedures for data collection and reporting on DDT for disease vector control consistent with the activities outlined in the proposal for reporting on DDT and evaluating the continued need for DDT;
- (iv) Reaffirm that sufficient capacity at the national and sub-national levels is necessary for effective implementation, monitoring and impact evaluation of the use of DDT and its alternatives in disease vector control;
- (v) Encourage Parties using DDT to ensure that their needs in relation to subparagraphs 8 (b) (i), (ii) and (iv) above are reflected in their national implementation plans developed pursuant to Article 7;

- (vi) Recommend that the financial mechanism of the Convention, together with the Secretariat and WHO, support the capacity-strengthening activities identified in the report to establish suitable reporting mechanisms to ensure that Parties that produce or use DDT are able to complete the questionnaire referred to in paragraph 2 above in a thorough and comprehensive manner;
 - (vii) Adopt the draft elaborated DDT reporting and evaluation process contained in annex II to the present note, which is based on the proposal for this process contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/3;
 - (viii) Request the Secretariat, in collaboration with WHO, to carry out the activities of data collection, data analysis and assessment of the continued need for DDT for disease vector control as established in the proposal for reporting on DDT and evaluating the continued need for DDT and provide guidance to the Conference of the Parties in its evaluation of DDT at its third meeting;
- (c) Take note of the study group report prepared by WHO on alternatives to DDT use in disease vector control contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/4 and encourage the Global Environment Facility and other financial institutions to continue to support the work being undertaken to verify the cost-effectiveness of these alternatives at the national level;
- (d) Note the work being done by WHO in conjunction with UNEP and the Secretariat referred to in paragraph 6 above to establish the global strategy for developing and deploying cost-effective alternatives to DDT and accordingly request the Secretariat, in cooperation with WHO and UNEP, to submit the draft strategy to the Conference of the Parties for consideration at its third meeting;
- (e) Take note of the review of activities undertaken by the Secretariat in cooperation with WHO to support the preparations of Parties for reporting on DDT contained in annex I to the present note;
- (f) Remind Parties that produce or use DDT for disease vector control or have stockpiles of DDT of their obligation, as outlined in part II of Annex B of the Convention, to notify the Secretariat of such production or use;
- (g) Invite WHO to participate actively in the work referred to above and to undertake such other activities as may support the Conference of Parties in future evaluations of the continued need for DDT for disease vector control.

Annex I

A review of activities undertaken by the Secretariat in cooperation with the World Health Organization to support the preparations of Parties for reporting on DDT

Activity 1

Building capacities of countries to implement, monitor and assess the impact (including associated data management) of the use of DDT and its alternatives in disease vector control

- a) **Compilation and development of guidance materials to assist countries in information gathering and management (Timeframe: June 2005–June 2006. Estimated cost: \$40,000)**

Results

9. An electronic format has been developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) that simplifies the process of completing the questionnaire. This format has been tested by selected countries and experts and is ready for distribution to countries for reporting on the production and use of DDT for disease vector control.

10. A guidance document has been prepared by WHO in conjunction with UNEP and the Secretariat, and is available on the Stockholm Convention website: www.pops.int. It gives clarification on each question to assist in the process of completing the questionnaire.

- b) **Three to four regional induction workshops on reporting and data requirements for Stockholm Convention Focal Points and representatives from national malaria control programmes in Ministries of Health in countries that use, or potentially will use, and/or produce DDT (Timeframe: June 2005–June 2006. Estimated cost: US\$225,000–300,000)**

Results

11. As of 31 December 2005, two regional workshops have been completed. These are:

(a) **Asia region** – November 7–9, Bangkok, Thailand. Countries participating: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Thailand. Cost: \$100,000;

(b) **Africa region** – November 29–December 1, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Countries participating: Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, South Africa, Swaziland, Togo, Uganda, Namibia, Zambia, Zimbabwe. Cost: \$100,000.

12. Two additional two regional workshops will be held as follows:

(a) **Latin America and the Caribbean** – January 24–27, Salvador, Brazil;

(b) **North Africa and the Middle East** – March 22–24, Tunis, Tunisia.

13. The results of the two completed workshops have been included in the study prepared by WHO on possible mechanisms for active information collection to provide an adequate information base for the evaluation of the continued need for DDT contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/2 and developed under activity 2, below.

Activity 2

Carry out a study on possible mechanisms for active information collection to provide an adequate information base for the evaluation of the continued need for DDT (Timeframe: September 2005-March 2006; cost: US\$50,000)

Results

14. The study was completed by WHO and is contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/2.

Activity 3

Preparations for and conducting expert review and assessment of the continued need for DDT to assist the Conference of the Parties in its second evaluation of the continued need for DDT in disease vector control (timeframe: June 2006–November 2006)

Results

15. This activity is to be implemented after the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties. It is to include the following:

- (a) Collection of information from countries that produce, use, export, import and/or maintain stocks of DDT (cost: \$50,000);
- (b) Processing and analysis of country information and identification of data gaps (cost: \$50,000);
- (c) Collection of complementary information needed for the evaluation (cost: \$100,000);
- (d) Meeting of experts for review and assessment (two to three experts and one WHO representative from each of five regions (cost: \$75,000).

Annex II

Draft elaborated process for the reporting, assessment and evaluation of the continued use of DDT for disease vector control

Evaluation and reporting cycles

1. The Stockholm Convention requires that, commencing at its first meeting and at least every three years thereafter, the Conference of the Parties shall, in cooperation with WHO, evaluate the continued need for DDT for disease vector control (Annex B, part II, paragraph 6). The Conference of the Parties, according to its rules of procedure (rule 4), shall hold ordinary meetings every year for its first three meetings and thereafter hold ordinary meetings once every two years. Given the above, it will be necessary for the Conference to evaluate the continued need for DDT at each of its ordinary meetings beginning with its third meeting in 2007. Parties are only required to submit reports on DDT use every three years.

Format and questionnaire for reporting, collation and validation of data

2. The format for reporting and the questionnaire for additional information on DDT was adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its first meeting. Parties are expected to complete them for each reporting cycle. The electronic version of the questionnaire and reporting format provides an opportunity for data to be collected, collated and analysed electronically. Additionally, active data collection from other sources will be undertaken and cross-checked with the data from Parties to avoid duplication and to validate data collected.

Analysis of data

3. A joint web-based WHO/UNEP/Secretariat information clearing-house on the use of DDT and its alternatives in disease vector control will document lessons learned and best practices on integrated vector management. It will facilitate timely access of Parties to a single point of relevant global information, promote the exchange of experiences by Parties and assist the Conference of the Parties evaluation processes. The information will enable comparisons and assessment of trends, among other things.

Expert group for assessment

4. An expert group will evaluate the information collected from individual Parties and other sources and submit conclusions and recommendations to the Conference of Parties through the Secretariat. The group will include a maximum of 15 experts identified by the Secretariat, WHO and UNEP Chemicals, and will include experts from each United Nations region and selected Parties that are currently using DDT for disease vector control.

5. The expert group will:

(a) Undertake a situational analysis on the production and use of DDT and the conditions of such use, including a review of the responses by countries to the questionnaire;

(b) Evaluate the availability, suitability and implementation of products, methods and strategies that may offer alternatives to DDT;

(c) Evaluate progress in strengthening the capacity of countries to transfer safely to reliance on such alternatives, based on a review of the opportunities and needs in countries for sustainable transition;

(d) Make recommendations on the evaluation and reporting mechanisms taking into account the provisions of paragraphs 4 and 6 of part II of Annex B to the Convention;

(e) Consider and assess the effectiveness of the actions being taken by Parties to accomplish the following:

- (i) Development of regulatory and other mechanisms to ensure that DDT use is restricted to disease vector control;
- (ii) Implementation of suitable alternative products, methods and strategies, including resistance management strategies to ensure the continuing effectiveness of those alternatives;
- (iii) Measures to strengthen health care and to reduce the incidence of disease;
- (iv) Promotion of research and development of safe alternative chemical and non-chemical products, methods and strategies for Parties using DDT, relevant to the conditions of those countries and with the goal of decreasing the human and economic burden of disease. Factors to be promoted when considering alternatives or combinations of alternatives shall include the human health risks and environmental implications of such alternatives. Viable alternatives to DDT shall pose less risk to human health and the environment, be suitable for disease control based on conditions in the Parties in question and be supported by monitoring data.

Evaluation schedule and cost

6. The sequence of events leading up to any evaluation by the Conference of the Parties of the continued need for DDT use in disease vector control will require approximately 13 months and include distribution of questionnaires; time for Parties to complete the questionnaires; analysis of data; expert group review of the analysis and development of recommendations; completion and translation of the expert group report; distribution of the report at least six weeks in advance of the meeting of the Conference; and the eventual evaluation by the Conference at its meeting. For the review of the Conference at its third meeting, the following schedule is planned.

Event	Timing
Distribute questionnaire	April 2006
Parties complete questionnaire	May–September 2006
Analysis of data	October 2006
Expert group meeting	November 2006
Complete expert group report	December 2006
Translation of expert group report	January–February 2007
Distribution of expert group report	Early March 2007
Third meeting of Conference	Late April–early May 2007

7. The recurrent costs for each two-year budget period for the collection of data and the assessment of DDT use in disease vector control are estimated at \$275,000. These include collection of information from countries that produce, use, export, import and/or maintain stocks of DDT (\$50,000); collection of complementary information needed for the evaluation (\$100,000); processing and analysis of country information and identification of data gaps (\$50,000); and the meeting of experts for review and assessment.

Reporting schedule

8. As Parties that use DDT in accordance with Annex II of the Convention are required to submit reports on use every three years, the schedule will vary depending on the date on which a Party has notified the Secretariat that it requires DDT.

9. In order to facilitate the evaluation process described above, Parties are requested to report on their DDT use at the same time that they submit their questionnaires as part of the evaluation process.