

**ROTTERDAM CONVENTION ON THE PRIOR INFORMED CONSENT
PROCEDURE FOR CERTAIN HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS AND
PESTICIDES IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE,
DONE AT ROTTERDAM ON 10 SEPTEMBER 1998
[1998] ATSD 4619**

Documents tabled on 9 September 2003

National Interest Analysis

Text of the Proposed Treaty Action

Regulation Impact Statement

Annexures:

Consultations – Annexure 1

Current status list – Annexure 2

**NATIONAL INTEREST ANALYSIS: CATEGORY B TREATY
SUMMARY PAGE**

**Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous
Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade,
done at Rotterdam on 10 September 1998
[1998] ATSD 4619**

Date of Tabling of Proposed Treaty Action

1. 9 September 2003

Nature and Timing of Proposed Treaty Action

2. The proposed treaty action is ratification (under Article 25) of the Treaty, which Australia signed on 6 July 1999. It is proposed that Australia's instrument of ratification be deposited by the end of 2003.
3. Under Article 26 the Treaty will enter into force generally on the 90th day after deposit of the 50th instrument of ratification acceptance, approval or accession. As at 28 August 2003, 45 countries had ratified the Treaty. If Australia is not among the original Parties, the Treaty would enter into force for Australia on the 90th day after Australia's instrument of ratification is deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
4. Under Article 20, Australia would make a declaration that for settlement of disputes concerning the Treaty to which Australia is a party, Australia recognises both arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Treaty and adjudication by the International Court of Justice, consistent with existing policy favouring compulsory dispute settlement.

Overview and National Interest Summary

5. The objective of the Treaty is to promote shared responsibility and cooperative efforts among Parties in the international trade of certain hazardous chemicals in order to protect human health and the environment. Ratification will not affect Australia's national capacity to use, restrict or otherwise regulate chemicals domestically; all decision-making remains with the Australian Government.
6. The Treaty aims to facilitate information exchange between Parties on hazardous industrial chemicals and pesticides. Information is exchanged on Parties' import decisions and health and safety data on the chemicals listed under the Treaty. Additionally, for a chemical restricted or banned by a Party in its territory on human health or environmental concerns, the Treaty requires that that Party notify the importing Party prior to the export.
7. Australia would benefit from ratification because it would: enhance Australia's capacity to influence international efforts to address chemicals issues; increase Australia's access to information on hazardous chemicals; provide an efficient and effective mechanism to assist countries, particularly developing countries in our region, including Pacific Island states, to adopt and maintain sound chemical management, consistent with Australian policy in the region; and demonstrate Australia's commitment to supporting effective and balanced approaches to global cooperation on the environment. Ratification would also help promote and protect Australia's environmental, health and trade interests by participating in decisions under the Treaty, including to ensure that our particular national circumstances are taken into account.

Reasons for Australia to Take the Proposed Treaty Action

8. The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme voluntary Prior Informed Consent (PIC) procedure operated from 1989. In September 1998 a diplomatic conference adopted the Treaty and agreed that a revised voluntary PIC procedure should continue on an interim basis until the Treaty entered into force. Australia signed the Treaty in 1999 and participates in the interim PIC Procedure.

9. Chemicals are a vital part of daily life and have delivered major benefits to the community in the fields of agriculture, medicines and manufacturing. Chemical use and innovation will continue to play a significant role for the foreseeable future. The dramatic growth in chemicals production and trade during the past three decades has raised both public and official concern about the potential risks posed by hazardous chemicals and pesticides.

10. Inadequate management of chemicals has the potential to cause considerable health and environmental problems throughout their life cycle, from production through to disposal. This is reflected in the significant attention given to chemicals management issues internationally, including in the United Nations, and domestically by the Australian, State and Territory Governments.

11. The Australian chemical industry estimates that Australia has 1.6 percent of global chemical production. Chemical safety is of interest to Australia from a trade perspective as well as a health and environmental perspective. Ratification of the Treaty would provide a useful forum for Australia to advance its interests in chemical safety and enhance Australia's capacity to influence international efforts in chemical safety.

12. The Treaty procedures would benefit Australia as they provide basic information and the means to obtain further information needed to make national health and environmental decisions concerning the future use of identified chemicals of concern, without having to mandate bans or phase-out of chemicals.

13. Because of the large numbers of industrial chemicals available globally, better knowledge of the actions taken by other Parties would assist Australia by highlighting those industrial chemicals which may be of concern, thus providing a basis for Australia to focus resources on those chemicals of potentially greatest risk.

14. Globally the Treaty would be especially helpful to developing countries, whose assessment capabilities and regulatory regimes may not be as sophisticated as those of more industrialized nations. By sharing information, the Treaty endeavours to help countries importing those chemicals to understand more fully and to manage the risks associated with their use. In this way, ratification would provide an efficient and effective mechanism to assist countries, particularly developing countries in our region, including Pacific Island states, to adopt and maintain sound chemical management, consistent with Australian policy in the region.

Obligations

15. The Treaty contains obligations for Parties on the industrial chemicals and pesticides (including severely hazardous pesticide formulations) listed on Annex III. It is also expected that chemicals added during the interim procedure (shown in the table below) will be listed on Annex III at the first Conference of the Parties. Australia would accept those chemicals as part of the Treaty. The Treaty also contains obligations relating to chemicals severely restricted or banned by a Party in its territory.

Chemicals added or expected to be added during the Interim Prior Informed Consent Procedure	
Pesticides	
Binapacryl	Monocrotophos
DNOC and its salts	Toxaphene
Ethylene dichloride	
Ethylene oxide	
Severely Hazardous Pesticide Formulations	
Dustable powder formulation containing benomyl at or above 7%, thiram at or above 15% and carbofuran at or above 10%	
Industrial Chemicals	
Asbestos – other amphibole forms	
Asbestos – chrysotile	

16. Article 4 of the Treaty requires Parties to identify one Designated National Authority (DNA) or more to act as an international focal point for PIC activity and to communicate domestic decisions regarding PIC chemicals to the Secretariat established by the Treaty.

17. Under Article 5, the Treaty requires a Party to make a notification to the Secretariat of any chemical on which it makes a final regulatory decision relating to human health or environmental concerns that results in a severe restriction or ban in its territory.

18. Under Article 10, for all chemicals listed on Annex III at the time of entry into force, and for each chemical added to Annex III in the future, each Party must, within nine months of being requested, make a decision (import response) as to whether it will accept future imports of the chemical. It must then immediately implement that decision domestically. An import response can be altered at any time. Decision-making on all import controls for Annex III chemicals rests with each Party.

19. Under Article 11, Parties must implement mechanisms to communicate import responses to those concerned within the jurisdiction. When exporting Annex III listed chemicals, all exporting Parties must comply with the import response of each importing country as provided under Article 10. The Treaty sets out procedures to be followed by exporting countries when a country does not supply an import response.

20. Under Article 12, any Party that makes a notification (paragraph 17 refers) is required to provide additional information on the chemical to the importing Party prior to export.

21. Information required (under Article 13) for all exports of chemicals includes:

- where assigned, the use of the Australian Harmonized Export Commodity Classification (AHECC) on shipping documentation;
- adequate labelling, with information regarding risks and/or hazards to human health or the environment, to meet relevant international standards; and
- (if the chemical is to be used for occupational purposes) a safety data sheet in an internationally recognised format, with up to date information (in one of the official languages of the importing Party if practicable - to be sent to each importer).

22. Under Article 20 Parties have the option of making a declaration in relation to their preferred method of dispute settlement under the Treaty. A Party may declare it accepts either arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Treaty, or adjudication by the International Court of Justice, or both. The effect would be to make one or the other compulsory in the event that the other Party has accepted the same obligation. Consistent with existing policy favouring compulsory dispute settlement, Australia would make a declaration to accept both options.

Implementation

23. Australia has separate schemes for the regulation of pesticides and industrial chemicals. Pesticides are regulated through the National Registration Scheme for Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (NRS) under a suite of legislation. Industrial chemicals are regulated through the National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS) under the *Industrial Chemicals (Notification and Assessment) Act 1989* (IC(NA) Act). NICNAS is an agency within the Department of Health and Ageing.

24. Australia is currently implementing the interim PIC Procedure. However, this does not include the obligation under the Treaty relating to export controls.

25. Australia would continue to nominate two DNAs (as for the interim procedure arrangements), one each within the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Australia (AFFA) for pesticides and the Department of the Environment and Heritage (DEH) for industrial chemicals.

26. Export obligations would be implemented by introducing export controls requiring exporters to seek export authorisation for any chemicals that are listed on Annex III or that are subject to an Australian notification.

- Amendments to the Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals legislation would describe the requirements and procedures to obtain export authorisation. Border controls would be implemented under the *Customs (Prohibited Exports) Regulations 1958*, to ensure pesticide exports comply with Australia's international obligations.
- Implementation for industrial chemicals would be through regulations under section 106 of the IC(NA) Act, which would set out the requirements for exporters.

27. Companies exporting pesticides or industrial chemicals covered by the Treaty would obtain authorisation from AFFA or NICNAS. Where appropriate, export authorisation may be granted to an exporter to cover all exports of Annex III chemicals for one calendar year to reduce the administrative burden on exporters and government. No export would be authorised contrary to the requirements of the Treaty.

28. AFFA and NICNAS would undertake communication strategies and provide training to exporters on the Treaty export obligations.

29. The notification of a final regulatory action to the Secretariat would be made by the relevant DNAs.

- For pesticides, notification would be informed by the nature of each final regulatory action taken by the National Registration Authority (NRA) that either cancelled the registration of a pesticide or severely restricted its use.

- For industrial chemicals, notification would depend on the total effect of actions taken by State, Territory and Commonwealth authorities on an individual chemical. NICNAS would take into account all such actions in deciding whether a chemical was banned or severely restricted nationally and thus needed to be notified. Amendments to the IC(NA) Act, in particular Section 106, are required to ensure that all information on notification and exchange requirements under the Treaty are met.

30. Relevant DNAs would provide import responses for chemicals added to Annex III.

Costs

31. A decision by Australia to ratify the Treaty would involve additional domestic costs including contributions to support the activities of the Treaty and costs for Commonwealth agencies associated with domestic implementation of the Treaty. It is estimated that costs to the Commonwealth would total \$0.5 million per annum.

32. Costs would also include an assessed annual contribution to the Secretariat core budget for Australia as a Party. Australia's contribution would be determined through standard UN scales of assessment and is estimated to be A\$80,000 annually. This may decrease as more countries become Parties to the Treaty.

33. With regard to Australian financial contributions for technical and other types of assistance, the Treaty does not impose any binding legal obligations. However, the Government may choose to make voluntary contributions.

34. There are no other direct foreseeable financial costs to the Commonwealth, the States and Territory governments or industry from taking the proposed treaty action.

Consultation

35. Extensive consultation was undertaken in consideration of ratification. All stakeholders consulted support ratification. Details are provided in Annexure 1.

Regulation Impact Statement

36. A Regulation Impact Statement is attached.

Future Treaty Action

37. Any amendments to the Treaty would be adopted by the Conference of the Parties. The text of any proposed amendment should be communicated to the Parties by the Secretariat at least six months before the meeting at which it is proposed for adoption. The Secretariat would communicate any proposed amendments to the signatories of the Treaty and for information, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Depository.

38. The Parties would make every effort to reach agreement on any proposed amendment to this Treaty by consensus. If all efforts at consensus have been exhausted, and no agreement reached, the amendment can as a last resort be adopted by a three-fourths majority vote of the Parties present and voting at the meeting (other than those referred to in paragraph 39 below, which relate to amendments to Annex III), (Article 21).

39. Chemicals, in addition to those already covered by the Treaty and the interim procedure, may be added to Annex III of the Treaty in the future in accordance with Articles 21 and 22 of

the Treaty. These include, for any given chemical:

- A minimum of two Parties from different PIC regions (the first Conference of the Parties will define the composition of the PIC regions) notifying a final regulatory action they have taken domestically to the Secretariat, or notification of a severely hazardous pesticide formulation by a Party that is either a developing country or a country with an economy in transition (Article 5).
 - The notified chemical would undergo rigorous analysis by a scientific review committee, whose recommendation to include the chemical would be advised to Parties at least six months prior to the Conference of the Parties at which the new chemical would be considered (Articles 5 to 7 and Articles 21 and 22).
 - Following these steps, the new chemical could only be added to the Treaty by a consensus decision taken by the Conference of the Parties (Article 22(5)).
40. Before Australia agreed to an amendment, including the addition of a new chemical, the domestic treaty-making process, including the development of a National Interest Analysis and a hearing by the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties, would be invoked. Every effort would be made to provide JSCOT with advice of new chemicals under consideration for listing (following recommendation by the scientific committee) as early as possible to maximise the time available prior to the Conference of the Parties.

Withdrawal or Denunciation

41. Article 28 of the Treaty provides for withdrawal by a Party at any time after three years from the date of entry into force for that Party. Withdrawal would take effect one year from the date of receipt by the Depositary of such notification, or at any later date specified in the withdrawal notification. Australian withdrawal would be subject to the Australian domestic treaty-making process.

Contact details

Chemical Policy Section
Policy Coordination and Environment Protection Division
Department of the Environment and Heritage

Appendix 1 – Chemicals listed on Annex III and added during the Interim Prior Informed Consent Procedure

7.1.6.1 Pesticides	
2,4,5-T	<i>Ethylene dichloride*</i>
Aldrin	<i>Ethylene oxide*</i>
<i>Binapacryl*</i>	Fluoroacetamide
Captafol	HCH (mixed isomers)
Chlordane	Heptachlor
Chlordimeform	Hexachlorobenzene
Chlorobenzilate	Lindane
DDT	Mercury compounds
Dieldrin	<i>Monocrotophos*</i>
Dinoseb & dinoseb salts	Pentachlorophenol
<i>DNOC*</i>	<i>Toxaphene*</i>
Ethylene dibromide (EDB)	
Severely Hazardous Pesticide Formulations	
Methamidophos soluble liquid formulations of the substance that exceed 600g active ingredient per litre	Phosphamidon soluble liquid formulations of the substance that exceed 1000g active ingredient per litre
Methyl-parathion emulsifiable concentrates with 19.5%, 40%, 50%, 60% active ingredient and dusts containing 1.5%, 2% and 3% active ingredient	Monocrotophos soluble liquid formulations of the substance that exceed 600g active ingredient per litre
Parathion all formulations aerosols, dustable powder, emulsifiable concentrate, granules and wettable powders, excluding capsule suspensions	<i>Dustable powder formulation containing benomyl at or above 7%, thiram at or above 15% and carbofuran at or above 10%*</i>
Industrial Chemicals	
<i>Asbestos – other amphibole forms*</i>	Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB)
<i>Asbestos – chrysotile*</i>	Polychlorinated terphenyls (PCT)
Crocidolite	Tris (2,3-dibromopropyl) phosphate
Polybrominated biphenyls (PBB)	

*Chemicals added during the interim procedure (or expected to be added during the interim procedure)

**Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade,
done at Rotterdam on 10 September 1998
[1998] ATSD 4619**

Consultations

Throughout the negotiations of the Treaty text, prior to and since Australia signed the Treaty, the Commonwealth Government has conducted extensive consultations in relation to the possible ratification of the Treaty by Australia. The Treaty text is in close accord with Australian objectives for the negotiations, which reflected the input from stakeholders prior to completion of the text. Intergovernmental negotiations for the Treaty were conducted through PIC Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee meetings. An Australian delegation led by one of the core government agencies attended each of these meetings. Prior to each of these meetings, stakeholder views were sought and taken into consideration in the development of Australia's negotiating position.

Views on Australia's ratification of the Treaty were sought from affected and interested parties, including State and Territory governments, industry, non-government environmental organisations (a list of these parties can be found at Appendix 1 of the Regulation Impact Statement) and the general public. Public submissions were sought through media releases, website material and gazette notices.

A formal process for public consultation was held from July to October 2002 (concurrently with that for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)) and included:

- a press release in July 2002 calling for submissions on possible Australian ratification of the Treaty;
- background papers for stakeholders, including State and Territory governments, in July 2002;
- information on the DFAT website with links from other Government agency websites (AFFA, DEH, NICNAS);
- continuous reporting to the Commonwealth-States-Territories Standing Committee on Treaties (SCOT) of progress on consideration of ratification;
- notices in the 'Chemical Gazette' and the 'Agricultural And Veterinary Chemicals Gazette' in August 2002 seeking views on possible Australian ratification of the Treaty; and
- face-to-face meetings with NGOs and industry, including group question and answer sessions and one-to-one meetings; and teleconferences with States and Territories.

The following details contributions and responses received from stakeholders:

Industry, Non-government Organisations and Individuals

Minerals Council of Australia advised it had no concerns with the Treaty.

Avcare said that it supported ratification of the Treaty, provided the Australian agricultural and veterinary medicine industry was fully consulted on any proposed additional chemical under the Treaty, or any other issue that may impact on the agricultural and veterinary chemical industries in Australia arising from the Treaty. Avcare advised that it was the peak body for the agricultural and veterinary chemical industry in Australia and its members sponsor 90% (based

on dollar value) of all agricultural and veterinary chemicals sold in Australia and that all members had been consulted on this issue.

The Plastics and Chemicals Industries Association (PACIA) commended the Government's approach to consultation and noted that it had undertaken a consultative process with its members. It said that the industry supported the principles of the Treaty to "promote shared responsibility and co-operative efforts among Parties in international trade of certain hazardous chemicals in order to protect human health and environment". It said it strongly supported the commitment by the Government to keep domestic costs associated with domestic implementation as low as possible and that any cost recovery would be undertaken in a manner consistent with the Cost Recovery Guidelines.

PACIA also said that changes to the IC(NA) Act and all amendments to legislation, even if minor, should be made in a manner consistent with the COAG principles including significant stakeholder consultation.

The National Farmers' Federation (NFF) supported ratification of the Treaty and said that in relation to pesticides, the Australian regulatory system represented a rigorous and robust framework that drew upon the best available science to assess products to ensure they do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on public health, occupational health and safety, trade or the environment. It said that the regulations enforced within Australia took specific account of Australian conditions and were readily defensible within global trading markets. NFF said that on that basis, the existing system was well placed to underpin Australia's obligations under the Treaty.

NFF supported Australia's engagement in the expert group which assesses nominations against the criteria for listing additional chemicals to Annex III of the Treaty, thereby helping to ensure that all decisions triggering a nomination are made on the basis of comprehensive risk evaluation focusing upon human health and the environmental concerns. It supported measures to ensure that when traded, chemicals listed under Annex III or notified by the exporting Party, were accompanied by information relevant to risks and/or hazards to human health or the environment.

Greenpeace, the National Toxics Network, the World Wide Fund for Nature and the Australian Conservation Foundation all said (in identical submissions) that by requiring Parties to advise of exports of potentially hazardous chemicals, particularly those that were banned or severely restricted, a valuable source of information about hazardous chemicals and their use would be compiled. They said that this information would allow for a more informed prioritisation of global or regional action on hazardous substances. They noted that it would be in Australia's interests to be a Party at the first Conference of Parties to ensure active participation in decision-making processes under the Treaty.

They said that the Treaty would foster a broader product stewardship approach with participation in it ensuring a 'holistic' approach to addressing the hazards of banned and restricted chemicals, whether they were pesticides or industrial chemicals. They said this would reduce duplication in chemical registration and ensure that all departments involved in chemical regulation were kept informed of changes in registration status and scientific assessment of hazardous chemicals. They noted that the speedy entry into force of the Treaty would help address chemical management problems that individual countries could not manage alone.

Medicines Australia said that, having consulted widely with its membership, it had no concerns with Australia's proposed ratification of the Treaty. It said that members had not perceived that there would be any costs to the prescription medicines sector as the chemicals involved were not used in the industry.

State and Territory Governments

State and Territory Governments were kept informed of developments in consideration of ratification through the Commonwealth-States-Territories Standing Committee on Treaties, in addition to direct consultation undertaken.

The Victorian Government said that it recognised the requirement for international cooperation to deal with these chemicals, given their transboundary nature and that it was committed to protecting the environment from the impacts of hazardous chemicals and to working with other jurisdictions, including the Commonwealth, to achieve this end. It said that where implementation of Australia's obligations under the Treaty required action by States and Territories, it was essential that national consultative processes be used to ensure their support and commitment.

The Queensland Government said that it supported ratification of the Treaty in principle, subject to the institution of appropriate consultation mechanisms. Queensland noted that Australia currently participated in international chemical trading in hazardous chemicals and pesticides under interim guidelines consistent with the Treaty and its ratification would formalise existing procedures without significant impact on Queensland industry. It advised that extending the number of chemicals under the Treaty would have the potential to impact on Queensland industry and proposed the establishment of a consultative forum agreed to by all jurisdictions to consider chemical listing proposals.

The WA Government noted that Australia's chemical regulatory system is one of the best in the world. It said that ratification of the Treaty would lead to improved provision of information between signatory countries and that any measure to improve the flow of information would be a benefit to safety and health, and a long-term benefit to the community.

The other States and Territories raised no concerns about the Treaty.

**Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous
Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade,
done at Rotterdam on 10 September 1998
[1998] ATSD 4619**

Current status list of ratifications

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)</u>
Angola	11 Sep 1998	
Argentina	11 Sep 1998	
Armenia	11 Sep 1998	
Australia	6 Jul 1999	
Austria	11 Sep 1998	27 Aug 2002
Barbados	11 Sep 1998	
Belgium	11 Sep 1998	23 Oct 2002
Benin	11 Sep 1998	
Brazil	11 Sep 1998	
Bulgaria		25 Jul 2000 a
Burkina Faso	11 Sep 1998	11 Nov 2002
Cameroon	11 Sep 1998	20 May 2002
Canada		26 Aug 2002 a
Chad	11 Sep 1998	
Chile	11 Sep 1998	
China	24 Aug 1999	
Colombia	11 Sep 1998	
Congo	11 Sep 1998	
Costa Rica	17 Aug 1999	
Côte d'Ivoire	11 Sep 1998	
Cuba	11 Sep 1998	
Cyprus	11 Sep 1998	
Czech Republic	22 Jun 1999	12 Jun 2000
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11 Sep 1998	
Denmark	11 Sep 1998	
Ecuador	11 Sep 1998	
El Salvador	16 Feb 1999	8 Sep 1999
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Ethiopia		9 Jan 2003 a
European Community	11 Sep 1998	20 Dec 2002 AA
Finland	11 Sep 1998	
France	11 Sep 1998	
Gambia		26 Feb 2002 a
Germany	11 Sep 1998	11 Jan 2001
Ghana	11 Sep 1998	30 May 2003

Greece	11 Sep 1998	
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Guinea-Bissau	10 Sep 1999	
Hungary	10 Sep 1999	31 Oct 2000
Indonesia	11 Sep 1998	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	17 Feb 1999	
Israel	20 May 1999	
Italy	11 Sep 1998	27 Aug 2002
Jamaica		20 Aug 2002 a
Japan	31 Aug 1999	
Jordan		22 Jul 2002 a
Kenya	11 Sep 1998	
Kuwait	11 Sep 1998	
Kyrgyzstan	11 Aug 1999	25 May 2000
Latvia		23 April 2003 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		9 Jul 2002 a
Luxembourg	11 Sep 1998	28 Aug 2002
Madagascar	8 Dec 1998	
Malaysia		4 Sep 2002 a
Mali	11 Sep 1998	5 June 2003
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania	1 Sep 1999	
Mongolia	11 Sep 1998	8 Mar 2001
Namibia	11 Sep 1998	
Netherlands2	11 Sep 1998	20 Apr 2000 A
New Zealand	11 Sep 1998	
Nigeria		28 Jun 2001 a
Norway	11 Sep 1998	25 Oct 2001 A
Oman		31 Jan 2000 a
Pakistan	9 Sep 1999	
Panama	11 Sep 1998	18 Aug 2000
Paraguay	11 Sep 1998	18 Aug 2003
Peru	11 Sep 1998	
Philippines	11 Sep 1998	
Portugal	11 Sep 1998	
Republic of Korea	7 Sep 1999	11 August 2003
Saint Lucia	25 Jan 1999	
Samoa		30 May 2002 a
Saudi Arabia		7 Sep 2000 a
Senegal	11 Sep 1998	20 Jul 2001
Seychelles	11 Sep 1998	
Slovenia	11 Sep 1998	17 Nov 1999
South Africa		4 Sep 2002 a
Spain	11 Sep 1998	

Suriname		30 May 2000 a
Sweden	11 Sep 1998	
Switzerland	11 Sep 1998	10 Jan 2002
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Sep 1998	
Tajikistan	28 Sep 1998	
Thailand		19 Feb 2002 a
Togo	9 Sep 1999	
Tunisia	11 Sep 1998	
Turkey	11 Sep 1998	
Ukraine		6 Dec 2002 a
United Arab Emirates		10 Sep 2002 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Sep 1998	
United Republic of Tanzania	11 Sep 1998	26 Aug 2002
United States of America	11 Sep 1998	
Uruguay	11 Sep 1998	4 March 2003