



**SUMMARY OF THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION
WORKSHOP ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS:
19-21 SEPTEMBER 2002**

The Stockholm Convention Workshop on Liability and Redress was held from 19-21 September 2002 in Vienna, Austria. More than 46 participants from 37 countries and the European Commission (EC), as well as representatives of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, attended this meeting hosted by the Government of Austria.

The objective of the workshop was to consider the possible need for a liability and redress regime for damages associated with persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in the context of the Stockholm Convention, and to provide input to the first Conference of Parties to the Stockholm Convention (COP-1).

During the meeting, the participants met in plenary sessions on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning, 19-20 September, to consider expert presentations on existing international regimes in the field of liability and redress, and on factual issues pertaining to the possibility of a liability regime for POPs-related damage. Participants also convened in two Working Groups to discuss possible scenarios where issues of liability and redress could apply in the context of the Convention. The Working Groups met in two sessions on Friday afternoon and Saturday morning, 20-21 September. These sessions were closed and are not covered by this report. The Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention and the Co-chairs will compile the workshop report and submit it for consideration at the first Conference of the Parties (COP-1).

**BACKGROUND TO THE WORKSHOP AND A BRIEF
HISTORY OF THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION**

The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants has been developed as a result of a global recognition of the need to reduce and eliminate the release of a certain category of hazardous chemicals (POPs) into the environment. POPs are chemical substances that persist, bioaccumulate and pose a risk of causing

adverse effects to human health and the environment. In February 1997 the UNEP Governing Council established an intergovernmental negotiating committee (INC) with a mandate to develop, by the end of 2000, an international legally binding instrument for implementing international action on certain POPs. The INC met in five sessions from 1998-2000. On 22 May 2001, in Stockholm, Sweden, the Stockholm Convention was adopted and was opened for signature by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

The treaty calls for international action on 12 POPs grouped into three categories: 1) pesticides: aldrin, chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, endrin, heptachlor, mirex and toxaphene; 2) industrial chemicals: hexachlorobenzene (HCB) and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs); and 3) unintended by-products: dioxins and furans. Governments are to promote best available techniques and environmental practices for replacing existing POPs while preventing the development of new POPs. Provision has also been made for a procedure identifying additional POPs and on the criteria to be considered in doing so.

Key elements of the treaty include: the requirement that developed countries provide new and additional financial resources; control measures to eliminate the production and use of intentionally produced POPs, eliminate unintentionally produced POPs, where feasible, and manage and dispose of POPs wastes in an environmentally sound manner; and substitution, involving the use of safer chemicals and processes to prevent toxic by-products. Precaution is operationalized throughout the Stockholm Convention, with specific references to this issue in the preamble, the objective and the provision on identifying new POPs.

Since the adoption of the Stockholm Convention, 151 countries have signed the treaty, and 21 have ratified it. The Convention will enter into force 90 days after receipt of the 50th instrument of ratification.

LIABILITY AND REDRESS: Although a liability and redress regime is not called for in the Stockholm Convention, the concern with the need for compensation for damage associated with POPs

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

motivated an ongoing discussion on liability and redress within the context of the Convention. This issue was raised during the fifth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC-5) held in Johannesburg, South Africa, from 4-10 December 2000. At INC-5 a developing country delegate suggested that a new article be incorporated into the Convention stating that specific guidelines regarding liability, responsibility and compensation would be developed in future. The Government of Austria expressed willingness to host a workshop on liability and redress, and INC-5 tabled a resolution addressing this issue. Due to time constraints, this was forwarded to the Conference of Plenipotentiaries in Stockholm for further discussion.

The Conference of Plenipotentiaries, held from 22 to 23 May 2001 in Stockholm, Sweden, adopted the resolution on liability and redress concerning the use and intentional introduction into the environment of POPs. This Resolution (Resolution 4) was adopted as a part of a package consisting of seven resolutions attached to the Final Act of the Conference (UNEP/CONF/4).

Resolution 4 recognized that the time is appropriate for further discussions on the need for elaboration of international rules in the field of liability and redress resulting from the production, use and intentional release into the environment of POPs. Welcoming the willingness of Austria to host a workshop on liability and redress, the resolution also invited governments and relevant international organizations to provide the Secretariat with information on national, regional and international measures and agreements on liability and redress, particularly those related to POPs. It invited the Secretariat, in cooperation with one or more States, to organize a workshop on liability and redress in the context of the Stockholm Convention, and decided that the report of this workshop would be considered at its first COP with a view to deciding what further action should be taken.

At the sixth session of INC (INC-6), the delegates considered the program of a workshop on liability and redress to be held in Vienna from 19-21 September 2002. INC-6 reiterated an invitation to the governments to submit information on measures and agreements relating to liability and redress prior to the workshop.

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP

OPENING OF THE MEETING

The workshop was opened on Thursday afternoon, 19 September 2002, with a welcoming speech from Gernhard Reiweger, Diplomatic Academy of Vienna. Manfred Schneider, Austrian Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, welcomed the participants, commended the World Summit on Sustainable Development commitments relating to chemicals management, and called for ratification of the Stockholm Convention by the end of 2004.

John Whitelaw, the Secretariat, expressed gratitude to the Government of Austria for hosting the workshop. He explained that the workshop is a response to Resolution 4 by the Conference of

Plenipotentiaries on the Stockholm Convention, in terms of which, *inter alia*, the Secretariat has been requested to organize a workshop on liability and redress in the context of the Convention. Whitelaw noted that to date there are 21 parties to the Convention, while 50 ratifications are required for the Convention to enter into force.

Whitelaw explained that the report of the workshop would be prepared by the Co-chairs and the Secretariat and submitted to COP-1. He highlighted that the purpose of the workshop is to exchange views without making any decisions, and to explore liability and redress mechanisms without prejudging whether such mechanisms are needed, noting that this decision is to be undertaken by the COP. He outlined the articles of the Convention pertaining to liability and redress, including: Article 3 (measures to reduce or eliminate releases from intentional production and use); Article 5 (measures to reduce or eliminate releases from unintentional production and use); Article 6 (measures to reduce or eliminate releases from stockpiles and wastes); and Article 17 (non-compliance). He explained that the workshop would consider scenarios under the Convention where liability mechanisms could be applied.

Participants then elected Gerhard Loibl, Austria, and Iman El-Banhawy, Egypt, as the Co-chairs of the workshop.

OVERVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL STATUS OF LIABILITY AND REDRESS

On Thursday, 19 September, the workshop considered a presentation by Gerhard Hafner on the status of international liability and redress regimes. The presentation was followed by a general discussion with questions from the floor.

Gerhard Hafner, University of Vienna, explained that the international legal order stipulates a duty of reparation for damage when three conditions are met: there is a breach of a legal obligation, the breach can be attributed to an actor, and causality can be established. Under a responsibility regime, the duty to repair exists only when a wrongful act is committed, and there are certain circumstances precluding wrongfulness. Under liability regimes, liability falls on the person who benefits from or controls the activity, and compensation may be due even if there is no wrongfulness. Existing international civil liability regimes cover a range of activities such as maritime and nuclear activities. Hafner clarified that the amount of compensation under these regimes is limited in order to cover damage without jeopardizing the activity itself. Compensation is paid in three tiers: by the liable actor through obligatory insurance, by a financial pool created by companies, and by the state of origin.

With regard to liability for environmental damage, he drew attention to the lack of a commonly accepted definition of the environment, as well as to difficulties in measuring environmental damage, proving causality and establishing the author. Hafner stressed that although in theory the legal burden of proof in establishing causality is on the alleged author rather than the victim, this is not generally recognized in practice. He concluded that liability in the transboundary context is a

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

problem area of international law, and that a general system that covers all transboundary activities is missing. Hafner stressed the need for a liability regime on hazardous substances and activities.

A participant from Colombia stressed the need to: define whether the user or producer of the hazardous substance should be held liable; focus on civil liability; favor strict liability; discuss timing and methods of compensation, such as via insurance or a trust fund; minimize exceptions; and address transboundary and environmental damage as well as long-term effects of POPs.

Hafner clarified the distinction between responsibility and liability, and explained that responsibility applies only when the wrongfulness of the actions is established, while a liability regime is applicable whenever causation of damage exists, even in the absence of wrongful actions. He clarified that other legal mechanisms should be applied to deal with damage if the source of damage cannot be identified.

A participant from Chile inquired about the possibility of compensation for long-term environmental damage in the context of the Convention. Hafner explained that when the damaging effects are delayed, it is harder to establish causation and apply a liability regime, and therefore that other legal mechanisms should be considered.

A participant from Algeria highlighted the importance of state responsibility and inquired about the applicability of compensation systems based on insurance or a trust fund. Hafner clarified that such systems could be feasible in the context of the Convention only if certain conditions are in place, such as the existence of an identifiable source of potential damage and the presence of a group of actors performing similar activities that involve risk.

A participant from the US asked about the reasons for establishing a liability regime at the international level. Hafner explained that elaborate liability regimes are necessary when there is high frequency of risks and/or where the amount of potential damage exceeds individual capacity to cover damage. He said that liability regimes could help to ensure fair competition and equality, as well as human rights to a healthy environment.

A participant from Germany inquired about the allocation of responsibility and liability under two hypothetical scenarios. In the first scenario, country A produces a substance banned under the Convention and sells it to country B. While damage does not occur during the production stage, it is inflicted on a third country C during usage by country B. Hafner clarified that both countries A and B would be responsible for breaching their obligations under the Convention, and that country B could be held both liable and responsible. The second scenario involves damages incurred by country C as a result of lawful production and use of DDT by countries A and B. Hafner explained that a responsibility case would not apply because countries A and B worked in compliance with the Convention, but they would still have a duty of compensation under a liability system.

Answering a question on the magnitude of damage and compensation, he explained that the amount of compensation and the definition of damage depend on political decisions by the parties designing the liability system. A participant from the Russian Federation underscored the difficulties with addressing issues of compensation and the lack of common methods to define human health and environment damages. Hafner highlighted that the limits of compensation depend on political will. A participant from Switzerland noted that an international civil liability regime should be considered if there is a risk of damage even in the absence of clear breach of state responsibilities. Hafner expressed the view that there is a clear need to consider a liability regime in the context of hazardous chemicals.

EXISTING INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS IN THE FIELD OF LIABILITY AND REDRESS

On Thursday afternoon and Friday morning, 19-20 September, participants heard and discussed presentations on the experience of other multilateral environmental agreements with liability and compensation regimes provided by the International Maritime Organization (IMO), and the Secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity (the CBD) and the Basel Convention.

On Thursday afternoon, 19 September, Christopher Young, IMO, provided an overview of current legal liability regimes established under the auspices of the IMO pertaining to damage to the marine environment. These include the 1992 Civil Liability Convention for Oil Pollution (CLC) and the 1992 International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage, both of which seek to provide efficient means for compensating victims of pollution caused by ships. Young identified the following key elements shared by these regimes: strict liability whereby the polluter pays for the inflicted damage without the victim having to prove causality; clear limits on the extent of financial liability; compulsory shipowners' insurance that covers damage; and a complementary compensation regime that relies on a fund financed by importers of oil and that is intended to cover damage that exceeds the limits of the shipowners' liability.

Young pointed out that under the 1992 CLC, compensation is paid only if a claimant has suffered "a quantifiable economic loss" from contamination, and if there is a reasonable degree of proximity between the contamination and the source of damage. Finally, Young noted two conventions that are not yet in force, but that seek to fill gaps in the international marine pollution regime: the 1996 International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances (HNS Convention), and the 2001 International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage.

Responding to inquiries about compensation derived from a fund, Young clarified that fund compensation is provided even when the sources of pollution are diffused, as in cases when pollution damage

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

from ships is ascertained but no particular ship is identified. On differences between redress, reparation and compensation, Young explained that the IMO neither redresses nor provides compensation for damage that does not involve quantifiable economic loss (such as species extinction). He further clarified that a state can be a victim. In response to a question on linkages among international regimes, he noted that the proliferation of legal agreements is due partly to continual changes in levels of environmental risks that sometimes render existing agreements out of date.

Xueman Wang, CBD Secretariat, emphasized that the discussion on liability and redress under the CBD is focused mainly on procedural issues and on information gathering rather than substance. She explained that the CBD deals with issues of liability and redress in two contexts: restoration and compensation for damage to biodiversity under Article 14 of the CBD, and redress for damage resulting from the transboundary movement of genetically modified organisms under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. Wang described ongoing work on these issues under the Protocol, including an *ad hoc* group of technical and legal experts, consultation with governments, and an upcoming workshop on liability and redress in the context of the Cartagena Protocol.

A participant from Colombia asked about the applicability of mechanisms and definitions being developed under the CBD in the context of the Stockholm Convention, and Wang explained that formulating rules and definitions on liability and redress under the CBD is still an ongoing process, and noted an upcoming workshop on liability and redress in the context.

Michael Gubb, the Secretariat, presented a paper on the Basel Protocol on Liability and Compensation for Damage Resulting from Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal. The Protocol provides a comprehensive liability and compensation regime and establishes strict liability. The main elements of the regime include: insurance and other financial guarantees; the right to seek full compensation from any or all liable persons; and a Technical Cooperation Trust Fund.

In the ensuing discussion, the participants discussed reasons for non-ratification of the Basel Protocol, including, *inter alia*, unresolved issues of financial limits, and a lack of information about the Protocol. A participant from Colombia called on Parties to ratify the Protocol. A participant from Canada highlighted results of a questionnaire conducted by UN Economic Commission for Europe to explore reasons for non-ratification, and informed of a projected Basel Convention Legal Working Group questionnaire on this matter.

FACTUAL ISSUES RELATED TO POPS AND THEIR IDENTIFICATION

On Friday morning, 20 September, Reiner Arndt, Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Germany, gave a presentation on the identification of POPs and their characteristics. He stressed the need

for communication between legal experts and scientists, and noted that the Convention could be an effective tool for controlling POPs as it covers all stages of their lifecycle, namely: production, storage, transport, processing, use, recycling, and waste. Arndt discussed obstacles to qualitative and quantitative assessments of POPs, and emphasized difficulties in: identifying and measuring their concentration in the environment; identifying sources of release; predicting and estimating local and long-range exposure; and assessing national and international hazards. He noted that the Convention provides a number of exemptions on uses of POPs, and expressed the view that the main challenge is to address the release of POPs during the usage rather than the production stage.

In the ensuing discussion, Arndt highlighted cooperation between the Stockholm and Basel Conventions on environmentally sound destruction of hazardous substances. Responding to questions on assigning liability for POPs-related damages, he reiterated the difficulties in identifying the source of POPs release and attributing specific damage to a POP. A participant from Argentina highlighted socially desirable activities involving POPs for which no alternatives exist. Arndt noted that identifying acceptable exemptions from obligations under the Convention is a matter of collective political decisions, and remarked that if an activity is exempted, consideration should be given to reducing its transboundary effects. An expert from Colombia stressed the long-range mobility of POPs and their damaging effects on human health, and asked what activities involving POPs could be covered by a liability regime. Arndt recommended that the Convention focus on reducing future releases of POPs.

A participant from Russia stressed the importance of addressing not only POPs but also other chemicals with proven hazardous effects, and highlighted the lack of financial resources to manage harmful chemicals in countries with economies in transition.

A representative from Senegal asked whether there are relevant international liability mechanisms to address problems associated with POPs stockpiles in developing countries. A participant from Switzerland, supported by a Greenpeace representative, stressed the potential preventive effect of liability regimes. A representative of Algeria suggested addressing substances that can be transformed into POPs, and establishing causation of POPs-related damages by identifying producers of POPs.

A participant from Canada stressed preventive measures and capacity building as priority issues at the current stage of the Convention implementation. She asked whether liability and redress issues could be more effectively addressed when national implementation plans, reliable inventories and monitoring mechanisms are in place. A participant from Tanzania recommended that UNEP work in close cooperation with the World Health Organization on developing alternatives to DDT.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

A participant from China underscored the lack of commonly accepted methods of monitoring POPs and inadequate capacities in developing countries. A participant from Greenpeace said that a liability regime would be a powerful tool for ensuring the private sector's compliance with the Convention, and said that the primary purpose of a liability regime should be to ensure victim compensation and change the future behaviour of those who are liable.

Regarding work on stockpiles in developing countries, Michael Gubb, the Secretariat, highlighted that funding is available through the Global Environment Facility, and drew attention to the Africa Stockpiles Programme, developed in cooperation with several international organizations to clean up stockpiles in an environmentally sound manner. Responding to a participant from the Russian Federation, Arndt indicated the need for discussion and more funding to address other hazardous chemicals. Regarding preventive effects of liability regimes, he stressed that they are more effective as a preventative mechanism in the case of chemicals with acute short-term damaging effects, rather than in the case of POPs. Responding to a participant from Canada, he highlighted that even if sophisticated monitoring methods were available, it would be hard to estimate damage and to identify a victim and/or the author of damage.

On Friday afternoon, 20 September, the participants established two Working Groups to discuss possible scenarios where liability could apply in the context of the Convention. The Working Groups convened in closed sessions on Friday afternoon and Saturday morning, 21 September.

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUPS

On Saturday morning, 20 September, Co-chairs Gerhard Loibl and Iman El-Banhawy presented the reports of the two Working Groups. They noted that both groups had addressed the following issues: the possibility of shifting liability from states to private actors; difficulties in establishing retroactive liability; and obstacles to creating a viable liability regime, including difficulties in identifying the sources of release and victims of damage, as well as in attributing damage to a particular POP.

Co-chairs reported that the Working Groups discussed, *inter alia*, the time lag between POPs release and resulting damage, the long-range transport of POPs, and state versus civil liability. They also considered the following scenarios where issues of liability could apply in the context of the Convention:

- State A produces POPs unlawfully, state B uses POPs unlawfully, and state C suffers damage;
- Company X in state A produces a POP lawfully, company Y in state B uses the POP lawfully, and state C suffers damage;
- State A produces a POP unintentionally and state B suffers damage;
- State A has a stockpile of POPs, state B uses unlawfully, and state C suffers damage;
- State A manages a POP stockpile and state B suffers damage;
- State A moves a stockpiled POP or POPs waste to state B, and state

C suffers damage; and

- A new POP is produced and leads to damage.

The following points emerged from the discussion: there are no existing retroactive liability systems under either international or domestic law; rules established by the International Law Commission should apply to POPs; Resolution 4 does not cover unintentional POPs release or stockpiles management; and Article 3 (reducing releases from intentional production and use) obliges only countries that have regulatory schemes to prevent the production of new POPs.

Loibl further noted that while some participants felt the need to concentrate on responsibility rather than on liability issues, others expressed preference to considering the need for a liability regime in more detail. He pointed out that no conclusion on the need for a liability regime was reached, and that this matter should be further scrutinized.

A participant from the US suggested structuring further discussions on the need for a liability regime based on an EC White Paper on Environmental Liability that specifies conditions for an effective liability regime to remedy environmental damage, including: identifiable actors; concrete and quantifiable damage; and established causal link between damage and identified polluters.

REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP TO COP-1: Gerhard Loibl suggested that the Co-chairs together with the Secretariat prepare the draft workshop report and distribute it for comments by participants prior to submission to COP-1.

A participant from Colombia stressed the need to balance preventive measures and economic considerations; difficulties in identifying the author of damage, and recommended that the workshop report reflect the need for further debate on this issue.

Manfred Schneider, Austrian Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, highlighted extensive participation in the workshop and said that had it provided a valuable forum for discussions between lawyers, technical experts and diplomats necessary to address this complex issue.

The workshop was closed at 1 p.m., on Saturday, 21 September 2002.

THINGS TO LOOK FOR

JOINT FAO-WHO MEETING ON PESTICIDE

RESIDUES: The 27th Session of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues (JMPPR) will take place from 16-25 September 2002, in Rome, Italy. For more information, contact: Amelia Tejada, FAO; tel: +39-6-5705-4010; fax: +39-6-5705-6347; e-mail: Amelia.Tejada@fao.org; Internet: <http://www.fao.org/waicent/FaoInfo/Agricult/AGP/AGPP/Pesticid/Events/c.htm>

SUBREGIONAL TRAINING WORKSHOP ON INVENTORIES OF STOCKS OF OBSOLETE PESTICIDES: This UNEP Workshop will take place from 23-25 September 2002, in Krasnodar,

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

Russia. For more information, contact: UNEP Chemicals; tel: +41-22-917-8111; fax: +41-22-797-3460; e-mail: chemicals@unep.ch; Internet: <http://irptc.unep.ch>

57TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY: The 57th session of the General Assembly will begin on 10 September 2002 at UN headquarters in New York, and will, *inter alia*, determine the future mandate of the CSD. For more information, visit: <http://www.un.org/ga/>

PIC INC-9: The ninth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for an International Legally Binding Instrument for the Application of the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade (PIC) will be held from 30 September – 4 October 2002, in Bonn, Germany. For more information, contact the interim Secretariat: Niek van der Graaff, FAO; tel: +39-6-5705-3441; fax: +39-6-5705-6347; e-mail: Niek.VanderGraaff@fao.org; or Jim Willis, UNEP Chemicals; tel: +41-22-917-8111; e-mail: chemicals@unep.ch; Internet: <http://www.pic.int/>

SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOP TO PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATIVES STRATEGIES TO POP PESTICIDES: This UNEP Workshop is tentatively scheduled to be held on 1 October 2002, in Santiago, Chile. For more information, contact: UNEP Chemicals; tel: +41-22-917-8111; fax: +41-22-797-3460; e-mail: chemicals@unep.ch; Internet: <http://irptc.unep.ch/pops>

GEF-MSP SUBREGIONAL WORKSHOP ON SUPPORT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION: This UNEP workshop will take place on 1 October 2002, in Alexandria, Egypt. For more information, contact: UNEP Chemicals; tel: +41-22-917-8111; fax: +41-22-797-3460; e-mail: chemicals@unep.ch; Internet: <http://irptc.unep.ch/pops>

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION OF THE ARCTIC: This symposium, organized by the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), will be held from 1-4 October 2002, in Rovaniemi, Finland. This symposium will address pollution of the Arctic in an integrated circumpolar context, focusing on a range of pollutant issues. For more information, contact: the AMAP Secretariat; tel: +47-22-57-34-00; fax: +47-22-67-67-06; e-mail: amap@amap.no; Internet: <http://www.amap.no/news/symp2-2an-all-nopics.pdf>

GEF ASSEMBLY: The second assembly of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) will convene from 16-18 October 2002, in Beijing, China. For more information, contact: GEF Secretariat; tel: +1-202-473-0508; fax: +1-202-522-3240/3245; e-mail: secretariat@worldbank.org; Internet: <http://www.gefonline.org/assembly/assembly.htm>, gefweb.org

UNFCCC COP-8: The eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) will convene from 23 October - 1 November 2002, in New

Delhi, India. For more information, contact: UNFCCC Secretariat; tel: +49-228-815-1000; fax: +49-228-815-1999; e-mail: secretariat@unfccc.int; Internet: <http://unfccc.int/cop8/>

19TH SESSION OF THE FAO PANEL OF EXPERTS ON PESTICIDE SPECIFICATIONS, REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS, APPLICATION STANDARDS AND PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT: This FAO Panel of Experts will meet from 27-29 October 2002, in Rome, Italy. For more information, contact: Gero Vaagt, FAO; tel: +39-6-5705-5757; fax: +39-6-5705-6347; e-mail: Gero.Vaagt@fao.org; Internet: <http://www.fao.org/waicent/FaoInfo/Agricult/AGP/AGPP/Pesticid/Events/c.htm>

WORKSHOP TO PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES TO POP PESTICIDES: This UNEP Workshop is scheduled for 1 November 2002, in Nairobi, Kenya. For more information, contact: UNEP Chemicals; tel: +41-22-917-8111; fax: +41-22-797-3460; e-mail: chemicals@unep.ch; Internet: <http://irptc.unep.ch/pops>

FOURTH SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL FORUM ON CHEMICAL SAFETY (IFCS): FORUM IV is scheduled for 1-7 November 2003, in Bangkok, Thailand. FORUM V will take place in Hungary in late 2005 or 2006. For more information, contact: Judy Stober, IFCS Executive Secretary; tel: +41-22-791-3650; fax: +41-22-791-4875; e-mail: ifcs@who.ch; Internet: <http://www.ifcs.ch>

MONTREAL PROTOCOL MOP-14: The 14th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol will be held from 25-29 November 2002, in Rome, Italy. For more information, contact: Ozone Secretariat; tel: +514-954-8219; fax: +514-954-6077; e-mail: michael.graber@unep.org; Internet: <http://www.unep.org/ozone/mop/14mop/14mop.shtml>

WORKSHOP ON LIABILITY AND REDRESS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL: The Convention on Biological Diversity Workshop on Liability and Redress in the Context of the Cartagena protocol is tentatively scheduled for 2-4 December, in Rome, Italy. For more information, contact: Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity; tel: +1-514-288-2220; fax: +1-514-288-6588; email: secretariat@biodiv.org; Internet: <http://www.biodiv.org/>

BASEL CONVENTION COP-6: The sixth Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention will take place from 9-13 December 2002, in Geneva, Switzerland. For more information, contact: Secretariat of the Basel Convention; tel: +41-22-979 8218; fax: +41-22-797 3454; e-mail: sbc@unep.ch; Internet: <http://www.basel.int/>