

COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING CCC42
22 March 2007
18 Wormald Street, Symonston ACT

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jenni Mack (Chair), Joe Elbustani, Peter Cone, Liz Hanna, John Temperley, Neville Prowse-Brown, Jo Immig, Julie Buckley

APVMA OFFICERS PRESENT

Tim Dyke, Simon Cubit, David Loschke, Alan Norden (part), James Suter (part), Joan Ashton (part), Colin Byrnes (part).

APOLOGIES

Sam Beechey

AGENDA ITEM 1 – WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed members and attending APVMA staff.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – ADOPTION OF AGENDA

The proposed agenda was accepted. The attendance of CCC at the next PSIC meeting was included as an additional item.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – MINUTES OF CCC38

- 7.1 The last sentence of Item 7.1 should read: Julie Buckley suggested that if we were planning for the future we need to engage *information* technologies and *social software* such as blogs and wikis with which Gen Y and others were familiar. (additions in *italics*).
- 7.3 In the third paragraph second sentence, change ‘information’ to ‘equipment’.

Liz Hanna questioned the reporting of Item 7. 1 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy suggesting that discussion was not as positive as reported and that there had been strong negative comment.

Peter Cone took an alternate view explaining that the Committee was generally happy with the direction proposed.

The Chair noted the minutes would be circulated soon after the meeting and it would be useful if members could raise any issues with the minutes at this point.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – CORRESPONDENCE

Correspondence by Warren Godson to Jo Immig concerning post review activities relating to the CCA review was noted together with a draft response. In addition to the issues covered in the letter it was noted that the APVMA was pursuing a compliance matter.

Action 42.1 Jenni will amend the proposed letter to reflect comments.

It was noted that a CCC e-bulletin had not been produced after the last CCC meeting which might account for the fact that there was so little correspondence. Julie offered to assist with future e-bulletins.

It was also noted that the correspondence register still needed updating.

Action 42.2 Jenni will produce a draft of the CCC e-bulletin relating to CCC 41.

Action 42.3 Simon to locate the piece of correspondence relating to the query about chemical use in a Queensland golf course and add to the register.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

A paper was provided listing the actions from the previous meeting.

Actions 41.1, 41.2, 41.4, 41.5 and 41.8 have been finalised.

Actions 41.3, 41.6, 41.7, 41.9 and 41.10 are agenda items for CCC42.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – MEMBER MATTERS

6.1 Member activity since CCC41

Neville Prowse-Brown

Members NOTED Neville's written report that was taken as read. In speaking to the report Neville reiterated the frustrations of the rural community in relation to concerns over Commonwealth plans to regulate security sensitive chemicals.

Liz Hanna

Members NOTED Liz's written report. Liz drew attention to the NChEM workshops suggesting that the consultative process was not well designed. She asked that if the APVMA was aware of similar external initiatives could it advise the CCC and perhaps encourage agencies to consult with the CCC.

Jo Immig

Members NOTED Jo's written report. Jo also drew attention to the perceived failings of the NChEM consultative process from a community perspective and advised that an advisory group was about to meet to address some of these shortcomings.

Jo also provided copies of a ready reference pocket guide that is an output of the Safer Solutions project.

Joe Elbustani

No paper was provided. Joe expressed concern about the lack of chemicals with registered uses for specific horticultural applications. He also questioned the reliability of IPM strategies particularly proposed as alternatives.

His major issue was that while society demanded higher standards that prompted the removal of existing chemical uses, very little support was provided to primary producers to deal with the issues this created. He argued for easier ways to obtain permits and active support for alternative treatments.

Julie Buckley

No paper was provided. Julie drew the Committee's attention to the fact that in NSW in 2006 some 4000 people enrolled in TAFE courses that involved chemical training. Of these one third were enrolled in agricultural/horticultural/ conservation land management courses while the remainder undertook courses as part of SMART Train/Chemcert training programs. Julie also noted that two new national courses in Fumigation were registered in NSW last year.

Peter Cone

Peter provided a late paper outlining his activities since last meeting. Peter spoke to the items listed in his paper. Additional detail included that the GRDC and CRDC had provided funding of \$250k to train/accredit chemical resellers and supplies in providing advice to purchasers of chemicals about minimizing spray drift.

Peter also noted that, as a result of the drought, there had been pressure to release cotton trash as stock feed essentially against the provisions of the MOU between the cotton and the beef industry. The cotton and beef industries, however, had stood by the MOU.

John Temperley

6.1 Chair's report on annual meeting with Board

Members noted Jenni's written report that was taken as read. Jenni emphasised the positive response she received from the Board and the extent of their engagement with the CCC's work. She noted a major theme of her discussions with the Board was ways to strengthen the relationship between the Board and the CCC. Particular initiatives such as focused reports on key issues, inviting Board members to particular discussions etc were discussed at the previous night's working dinner. Others will be raised under items below.

6.2 Labelling Committee report

Liz Hanna reported on her participation in the meeting of the APVMA's Labelling Committee Working Group on Friday 16 March. Liz indicated that progress has been slow to date and that different stakeholders appear to have different objectives.

Prof Sless, from the Communication Research Institute (CRI), did a presentation on the application of information design principles to agvet chemical labels. The key point of the presentation was that labels are only effective if users understand them and can use them effectively. Col Byrnes noted the perspectives provided by Prof Sless have prompted interest in communication principles in label design and in revisiting the criteria for getting information on to labels ultimately defining what information needs to be on a label and what might be optional.

Two matters were raised as a result of the harshness indicators working group.

- 1) The need for consistent terminology
- 2) Key discriminating information to be in a larger font

6.3 International Developments

There was no report.

AGENDA ITEM 7 – WORK PROGRAM

7.1 Stakeholder Engagement Strategy

Jenni indicated the Board's view that the CCC may be able to add value to the stakeholder engagement strategy being developed for the APVMA by Simon Cubit, (Manager, Public Affairs). This affirms the CCC's own interest in the strategy and its status as part of the CCC work program.

Noting that the APVMA is holding a user forum on April 4 where the APVMA will seek to identify ways of better communicating with chemical users, Jenni suggested that it may be appropriate for the CCC to consider the issue comprehensively at the proposed May CCC meeting.

She also suggested that Dr Lyn Fragar, deputy chair of the APVMA Board be invited to attend.

Action 42.4 Jenni to invite Lyn Fragar

Action 42.5 Simon to develop drafts of his proposed strategy for the May meeting

Action 42.6 Members to provide Jenni and Simon with a one page summary of other stakeholder engagement strategies that they consider effective to inform discussion.

7.2 New Ways of Thinking About Chemicals/State of Nation Report

In introducing this agenda item Jenni noted that it was not due for some time but thought it prudent to get an early start on it. She suggested that the way to initiate this project may be to develop a scoping document, perhaps using chapter headings as guides.

Discussion on this topic suggested that the value of the final document may be in considering trends and attitudes and seeking to peer over the horizon.

Jenni proposed a working group of Liz, John and Jo that might develop a draft scoping document.

Jo suggested that members should jot down some impressions about the project and its potentials and email them to Liz, John and Jo before writing commenced.

Action 42.7 Liz, John and Jo to form a working group to develop a scoping document for the project for the next meeting

Action 42.8 Members to provide notes to members of the working group about the potential content or ideas about the project.

7.3 Indicators of Relative Harshness Project

Jenni reported that a working group of John, Julie, herself, Tim, Simon and Gavin Hall had met on March 21 to advance this project.

At that meeting a range of labels were considered and seven potential discriminators identified:

1. Signal heading (blank, caution, poison)
2. Safety directions
3. First aid instructions
4. Precaution statement (presence or absence)
5. APVMA/NRA approval number
6. Concentrate or ready-to-use (to reduce exposure to concentrate)
7. I thought this was ruled out as a bad discriminator

Action 42.9 Jenni to write up notes of the workshop and distribute

Jenni indicated the committee saw this project having a web –based output on the APVMA website where it could be promoted. It might include a diagram such as the APVMA poster ‘The Label, The Key’

Jo indicated that from her experience with the Safer Solutions project it is very important to consider the final audience. Her experience is that people are very busy and prefer an interactive website as their information source.

Julie indicated that it was important that the Committee find a way to draw attention to the signal headings.

Discussion also took place about the role of the APVMA in communicating the outcomes of the scheme and its ability to promote it.

It was noted that consumers could use the information to make choices and other organisations may be able to use the information to rate products, something the APVMA was not in a position to do.

7.4 Work Program Preamble

To better explain the overarching themes of the workplan a draft preamble was considered. .

Action 42.10 Jenni to revise preamble in light of Member comments

7.5 Reduced Risk Criteria Project Update

Alan Norden spoke to his paper that sought to update the CCC on progress regarding the exploration of criteria and guidelines for reduced risk chemistry in relation to human health and the environment.

Briefly, Alan sought comment on a letter to go to DEW and OCS as a prelude to a meeting to develop project briefs. He also indicated that the APVMA is proposing to engage an industry-based professional to examine existing industry IPM practices.

Action 42.11 Members with any comments on the letter and proposed timeline are to forward them to Alan

Action 42.12 Jo Immig was nominated as the CCC representative in the meetings with DEW and OCS

Action 42.13 Alan to provide details of the IPM assessment at the next meeting of the CCC.

7.6 AERP Ag

Jenni indicated that the Board had expressed concern at the low levels of AERP Ag reports that had been lodged and had asked the CCC for its views on the program.

The Committee agreed that an appropriate first step was to consolidate comments from previous minutes and that it would be appropriate to consider the views of previous member Anne Stanton, who was very interested in AERP Ag.

Action 42.14 Jenni to consolidate minuted comments and organise for them to be sent to members.

In response to questioning Tim Dyke pointed out that there were a variety of ways in which feedback on adverse experiences could be obtained in addition to the formal process of AERP Ag. These include coronial reports, Poisons Centre information, and worker's compensation data. All were important and should be considered as potential sources.

7.7 Chemical Review

The Committee considered written reports relating to the progress of the atrazine, ectoparasiticide, 2,4,D and diazinon reviews with Joan Ashton of the Chemical Review team providing answers to questions.

Atrazine

At CCC 41 it was agreed that the APVMA would convene a forum with community groups to discuss the APVMA's risk management approach to the atrazine review. The forum will be held in May possibly in association with CCC43.

Action 42.15 Jo to provide Joan with preferred dates

Action 42.16 Jenni to write to Board member Claude Gauchat inviting him to attend the forum.

Ectoparasiticides

Paper noted

2,4-D

In supplementing information in the report David Loschke advised of differences between spray drift and vapour drift (on application), noted that permits that had been issued and advised that the other esters would be considered in the second part of the review.

Diazinon

Paper noted

Review communication strategy

Simon Cubit outlined to the Committee new consultative measures, currently being trialled on the neomycin review, which may soon apply to all reviews. These measures are designed use a variety of communication mediums to throw the consultative net wider than previously.

People can now subscribe via the website to distribution lists for individual reviews, which would include an information pack and progress updates as well as the key review documents.

7.8 APVMA Administrative Appeal Mechanisms

Arising from the workplan the chair indicated that the CCC was keen to better understand how it could support the APVMA when it took action to support community health and invited James Suter, APVMA Legal Counsel, to explain appeal mechanisms.

James indicated there were three paths that concerned companies or individuals could take in seeking legal redress of an APVMA decision. The first of these was an internal review, the second merits review (was the right decision reached?) through the Administrative Appeals Tribunal (AAT). The third was a judicial review (was the right legal process followed?) to the Federal Court.

James indicated that historically the APVMA has had a low litigation profile, however that was changing with a record 14 requests for review in 2006. He reviewed the process that people seeking formal review may take, using recent case histories as examples including a current case in the AAT that for the first time it was questioning the science behind a decision.

7.9 Risk assessment for insecticide products

This agenda item arose from concerns raised by a member at the promotion of an insecticide product that automatically sprayed product into a room. A paper was provided outlining current assessment processes. A number of CCC members expressed their concern about the marketing of the product and the claims that were made.

AGENDA ITEM 8 - APVMA REPORTS

- 8.1 Pesticides Program
- 8.2 Veterinary Medicines Program
- 8.3 Quality Assurance and Compliance Program
- 8.4 APVMA Committee updates
 - Registration Liaison Committee
 - Industry Technical Committee
 - Industry Liaison Committee
- 8.5 Chemical issues – no paper

9. AGENDA ITEM 9 - 2007 MEETING DATES

May Meeting

It was noted that the PSIC Stakeholder Forum will be held on May 17, the day initially proposed for CCC43. It was agreed that the next CCC meeting would be held either on May 16 or 18.

Action 42.17 Jenni will communicate with members to settle on the date

August Meeting

It was noted that that the proposed August 15 meeting is the day before the Canberra-based meeting of APVMA 27.

It was proposed that this meeting might instead be held at the property of CCC member Joe Elbustani on either the 13, 14 or 15 August.

Action 42.18 Jenni will communicate with members to settle on the date

CLOSE

The Chair thanked members and staff for their attendance.

Meeting closed at 3.00 pm.

Signed

Jenni Mack (Chair)

Simon Cubit (Secretariat)