

Better Cotton Highly Hazardous Pesticides Exceptional Use Process v.3.0

To be used with the Better Cotton Principles and Criteria

Issue date	15 September 2024
Latest version effective date	22 September 2025
Version	3.0
Contact	Ownership of this document is with the Better Cotton Standards System Integrity Team. For any enquiries, please contact: standards@bettercotton.org .

Background and Context

Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) are pesticides that are associated with significant health and environmental risks. Reducing the total toxicity of pesticides applied to crops and ultimately eliminating the use of HHPs is integral to protecting the health of farmers, workers and farming communities, while also conserving the environment. One method to achieve this is to prohibit or restrict access to certain types of pesticides in the context of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategy. However, in some cases, viable alternatives may not yet exist for specific HHPs. In these circumstances, phasing out HHPs without better alternatives can lead to adverse impacts, such as greater use of broad-spectrum insecticides, pesticide resistance and/or negative impacts on yields and livelihoods. To address this challenge, Better Cotton in its P&C has set up a specific exceptional use process for HHPs.

The aim is to have a clear, transparent, and rigorous process to make informed decisions on the exceptional use of HHPs that are otherwise prohibited or targeted for phase out under the P&C. The process aims to ensure a thorough and impartial consideration of the impacts of continued use of the respective HHP vs. the impacts of phasing out (including evaluating the trade-offs of available alternatives). It also ensures that any granted exemptions are subject to specific monitoring and reporting requirements and include longer-term commitments to phasing out and finding better alternatives.

Summary

- Applications for exceptional use are reviewed by members of the dedicated Better Cotton Pesticides Committee¹.
- Recommendation for Exceptional use is made for specific active ingredients at a country or Partner level.
- Exceptional use is applicable for a defined period of maximum five seasons (any further extension requires an updated review).
- Exceptional use is subject to specific, defined conditions as outlined in this document
- Where an active ingredient is newly added to the Better Cotton HHP list, Programme Partners or Large Farms will have a one-season grace period to submit an exceptional use application.

Process Overview

1. Initiate a request for exceptional use

- a) Programme Partners (PPs) or individual Large Farms (LFs) can initiate the process by communicating the need for exceptional use to their local Better Cotton Country Team.
- Producers located in the same country or region are encouraged to reach out jointly if they have similar needs and challenges. Better Cotton Country Teams will support Producers or Programme Partners in gathering the necessary elements to submit an application for exceptional use. The final application must come from the Better Cotton Country team².
 - Partners or Producers should initiate this process at least 120 calendar days before the start of sowing, as in some cases, further information or external input may be required for the application.

2. Submit an application

- All applications must be submitted in full, with clear and complete information in all sections of the application form unless irrelevant. Incomplete or poorly substantiated applications may be returned without review.
To support applicants in submitting high-quality applications, Better Cotton will make the following resources available:
- An [annotated version of the application form](#), with guidance notes and explanations for each question.
- Examples of well-prepared past applications, demonstrating the expected level of detail and evidence. [Exceptional Use-Abamectin appli-Pakistan.docx](#)
- A [Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQ\)](#) document addressing common issues and misunderstandings.

¹ The composition, roles and responsibilities and decision-making modalities of the Better Cotton Pesticides Committee are laid out in a separate Terms Of Reference attached in Annex .

² Or strategic partner, in countries where Better Cotton works through local strategic partners

- Direct support from Better Cotton Global Standard System Integrity team is provided during application preparation, including feedback on draft applications (if submitted at least 30 days before the final deadline).
- a) Completed applications for exceptional use must be submitted at least 90 calendar days prior to the start of sowing, using the application form provided by Better Cotton. Any late submission will not be considered by the Pesticides committee.
- The application requires:
 - General information: the name and contact details of the applicants, the active ingredient concerned, the specific pest(s) that are targeted, method of application, application equipment, intended quantities and geographical scope of use.
 - Background context and current use: a description of the Integrated Pest Management approach in place, plus description of the historic extent and nature of use of the HHP
 - Evaluation of alternatives: description of alternative options (both chemical and non-chemical), including results of any previous use, trials, or research studies carried out.
 - Risk assessment and mitigation: Assessment of risks to human health and the environment associated with the specific HHP, plus an overview of specific measures to mitigate each risk.
- Long-Term Commitment to Phase-Out: Proposed phase-out plan over a period of 5 years maximum outlined, including key milestones (e.g. trials of alternatives, support needed, expected reduction of use over time).
- b) Application finalisation
 - Applications are reviewed by Better Cotton Country Teams for eligibility, accuracy, and completeness. Applications should then be submitted to Better Cotton Crop Protection global team.
 - The Better Cotton Crop Protection global team will complete the applications with available result Indicators data, and check applications for eligibility, accuracy. They should also clarify open questions or missing information with Country Teams and subsequently submit application to country specific pesticides sub-committees for review and decision makingⁱ.
- c) Application Review and Decision Making
 - 4a) Pesticides sub-committee will review the application and prepare key questions that they want to follow-up on in the country teams interviews. These questions will be shared at least 1 week before the scheduled interview call, so that the Country Teams can prepare and come with the right information to the interviews.
 - 4b) The pesticides sub-committee will have a call with the country representatives to discuss open questions and get more context. Either directly after the call, or in a separate one, in the absence of the country team representatives, recommendations for the decision will be

prepared, facilitated by Better Cotton global and following the predefined reporting structure. If further information is required before the Committee can decide, they will document this in writing and the applicant will have a defined time period (usually 15ⁱⁱ days) to provide further information as required.

- d) Based on the discussions of the sub-committee, Better Cotton global will draft a report, that is shared with the sub-committee for review, before it will be sent to the full pesticides committee for agreement on recommendations

The report shall include at least a summary of the Committee discussion and key points raised

- The final recommendation for a decision (approval or rejection) and rationale (if decided following interview debrief)
- Available Result Indicators data checked for accuracy
- In case of a recommendations for approval, specific conditions for exceptional use, including, at minimum:
 - The period for which exceptional use should be granted
 - Mandatory mitigation measures Compliance with all P&C v3.2 Crop Protection indicators and label requirements
 - Inclusion as priority in Continuous Improvement Plans
 - Specific training on risks and mitigation measures
 - Focus on steps to improve appropriate PPE Use
 - Focus on environmental risk mitigation
 - RIR Reporting on Pesticide Data
 - Recommended mitigation measures that include specific ad-hoc management practices

Exceptional use can be granted for a **maximum of five seasons**. The Committee may recommend a shorter period (e.g. one or two seasons) depending on the availability of alternatives, progress with trials, or specific risk considerations. If granted for less than five seasons, the applicant may submit a new application within the overall five-season limit, which will be subject to full review. No renewal or further exemption will be possible once the cumulative five-season maximum has been reached, except in extraordinary circumstances requiring a new justification and review.

- e) The draft report will then be submitted to the Better Cotton Director of Standard System Integrity who holds the final decision-making authority. The Committee's role is to provide a technical assessment of the application and the viability of alternatives. The Director's decision will take this assessment into account, along with any additional contextual, strategic or organisational factors and will be based on the following criteria:
- Alignment with Better Cotton standard Principle 3 (Crop Protection) and its requirements on HHP phase-out and IPM.
 - Strength and objectivity of the Committee's rationale including consideration of health, environmental, agronomic, and socio-economic factors

- Clarity and sufficiency of supporting evidence including completeness of the application, quality of the alternatives assessment, and feasibility of mitigation measures
- consistency with previous decisions to ensure a fair and coherent standard is applied across geographies and farming systems
- Risk management implications including reputational, compliance, or sustainability risks for Better Cotton
- Alignment with Better Cotton's long-term strategies on pesticide reduction and continuous improvement.

The Director will issue the final decision, which may include validation of the Committee's assessment, adjustment of conditions or other determinations as required. Where the final decision diverges from the Committee's recommendation, it will be escalated to the Better Cotton Executive Group for validation.

If Executive Group decision divergence from Committee's recommendation is confirmed, justification will be documented and shared with the Committee and applicant. It will also be shared publicly.

- f) After the director decision, the report will be shared in written form with country teams and programme partners / Large Farms, as well as the assurance team for implementation. The overall results as well as the conditions will be made publicly available.

g) Monitoring and review process

- a. For any HHP approved for exceptional use, the Programme Partner or Large Farm using the HHP in question is responsible for complying with all required conditions (including monitoring and reporting) required for exceptional use.
- b. If these conditions are not met, the exceptional use approval can be revoked (subject to review by the Better Cotton Director of Standards & Assurance and Senior Director of Programmes); and/ or specific Producers' licenses may be affected by non-compliance under Principle 3 of the P&C v.3.0.
- c. At any point, Better Cotton may request further information or an update on how the conditions of exceptional use are met.

Better Cotton staff will be responsible for reviewing the monitoring information submitted by Partners/Large Farms who have been granted exceptional use of HHPs. If exceptional use is granted for a large number of Producers or a large geographical area, the review may be based on a sample of Producers

h) Emergency case

i. Definition of "Emergency"

An "emergency" is defined as a relevant and urgent pest outbreak situation impossible to anticipate that poses a significant threat to crop health and productivity, requiring immediate action to prevent severe economic loss or irreversible damage to cotton fields. An emergency occurs when, despite proactive monitoring and best practices in pest management, a pest outbreak arises that could not have been reasonably predicted with sufficient accuracy or specificity to take effective preventive measures.

Producers are expected to maintain vigilance in monitoring potential pest risks and act proactively where indicators are present. For instance, continuous rainfall could signal the potential for a whitefly outbreak, and producers are expected to respond to such indicators to the extent possible. However, in cases where an outbreak escalates rapidly beyond the capacity for reasonable anticipation, or where preventive measures have been applied but failed to prevent a significant threat, the situation may be considered an emergency.

Such emergencies may include, but are not limited to, sudden pest or disease outbreaks, invasive species incursions, or environmental calamities (e.g., flooding, drought, or fire) that directly impact crop viability.

ii. Geographical scope of emergency derogation

Emergency derogations for the use of HHPs should be considered at the Producer Unit (PU) or farmer level for Large Farms (LF) rather than at the national or regional level, to ensure that the response is proportionate to the specific conditions faced by the producer. However, in exceptional cases where multiple PUs within the same country face a similar emergency, a country-level derogation may be considered, similarly for Large Farms where several Large Farms in a given region are impacted, provided that sufficient evidence supports the widespread nature of the threat.

iii. Conditions and step-wise approach to follow in an Emergency case

To apply for an emergency derogation for the use of HHPs, the following step-wise approach must be followed:

- Assessment and initial notification:
 - Producers facing a sudden pest outbreak may apply emergency measures immediately if thresholds are exceeded and alternatives are not viable.
 - Producers must document the situation at the time of the outbreak (e.g. photos, pest counts, weather reports, expert advice, notes of thresholds).
 - Producers should notify their Programme Partner, Certification Body and/or Better Cotton Country team as soon as reasonably possible after the outbreak is identified and treated.
 - Notification should include a short description and evidence of the problem.

- The Programme Partner plays a supporting role, but the producer (or PU) may also send the notification directly to the Country Team to avoid unnecessary delays.

- Submission of derogation request:

- If no feasible alternatives exist, the Producer must submit a formal derogation request to the Partner within a reasonable timeframe after the pesticide application, normally by the end of the same season, after an audit or after a systemic non-conformity is issued.

The request must be completed using a standardized questionnaire to ensure clarity and consistency that includes:

- A description of the emergency situation and its potential impact on crop health and productivity.
- Evidence supporting the emergency status (e.g., pest infestation data, expert assessments, weather reports).
- Justification for the use of HHPs, including an explanation of why alternative measures were not viable.
- Mitigation measures applied

- Review and decision by Project Partner:

- The Country Team forwards the request to the Better Cotton global team for review and decision (with optional PP input).
- Decision timelines remain fast-tracked, but flexibility is recognised for cases where producers notify late due to urgency of pest control.
- The decision may include conditions for mitigation, reporting, and prevention of recurrence.

- Approval, conditional approval, or rejection:

- Better Cotton team panel³ may approve or reject the derogation request possibly after consulting the Pesticides committee if needed. Conditions may include specific restrictions on the type and amount of HHPs used, requirements for monitoring and reporting, and follow-up actions to prevent future emergencies.
- The HHP in question is added to the published list of approved exceptional use
- In case of rejection, the Producer will no longer be able to use the HHP in question in the future during the ongoing year

- Post-application monitoring and reporting:

- Producers must submit a brief post-application monitoring report by the end of the season, documenting impacts and steps to reduce future reliance on HHPs. This template must be completed and submitted at the end of the ongoing season. The report should include detailed observations on environmental and human health impacts, mitigation measures taken, and any

³ Panel includes Director of Std, Cert and MEL, Director of Programmes, country director, and global Crop Protection manager

follow-up actions planned. The collected data will be analysed to assess the broader implications of HHP use, and compliance will be verified during field visits.

- The Producer must also submit reflect any measures to prevent future reliance on the HHP in question in its IPM plan, including measures to strengthen IPM practices and explore alternative methods.
- The Partner should share the monitoring outcomes and the plan with Better Cotton team at the end of the season (or at the beginning of the following season if the derogation is needed late in the ongoing season)
- Failure to comply with the requirements of the emergency derogation process (e.g. timely notification, submission of request, provision of documentation, or monitoring report) will be treated as non-conformity under Principle 3 of the P&C v3.0. In such cases:
 - The derogation may be revoked.
 - The Certification Body will be notified and required to treat the case as a systemic non-conformity
 - Better Cotton may request an additional audit or targeted verification to assess the scale of non-compliance.
 - Repeated or serious breaches may lead to suspension or withdrawal of Producer licenses.
- Where emergency HHP use is observed during an audit before derogation approval is complete:
 - The Producer should immediately inform and share the application with the CB
 - The Certification Body must check whether an emergency request has been submitted.
 - If yes, the CB will hold finalisation of the audit report and suspend decision on certification until Better Cotton confirms the derogation outcome.
 - If the derogation is approved, the CB records compliance under emergency conditions.
 - If the derogation is denied, the CB treats the HHP use as a systemic non-conformity.
- Better Cotton must ensure CBs are promptly informed whenever an emergency request is under review.

Annex 1: Better Cotton Pesticide Committee Terms of Reference v.2.0

To be used with the Better Cotton Principles and Criteria v.3.0

Issue date	15 September 2024
Effective date	1 October 2024
Version	2.0
Contact	Ownership of this document is with the Better Cotton Standards and Assurance Team. For any enquiries, please contact: standards@bettercotton.org .

1. Background and Purpose:

Aligned with the [Better Cotton Principles and Criteria \(P&C\)](#), Better Cotton farmers are expected to commit to phasing out Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) in the context of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategy. However, in some cases, viable alternatives may not yet exist for **specific HHPs** targeted for phase out. In these circumstances, phasing out HHPs without better alternatives can lead to adverse impacts, such as greater use of broad-spectrum insecticides, pesticide resistance and/or negative impacts on yields and livelihoods. To address this challenge, Better Cotton has set up a specific exceptional use process for HHPs.

The Better Cotton Pesticides Committee ('the Committee') will review applications on behalf of Better Cotton Producers or Programme Partners to request exceptional use of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs). The process will consist in carefully evaluating each application, taking into consideration the consequences of continued HHP use, impacts on farmers (e.g., livelihoods as well as health and safety), and the technical and/or financial tradeoffs of alternatives.

The Committee will assess each application based on specific, defined conditions as outlined in the application process, including consideration of the monitoring and reporting

process, use of mitigation measures, and other factors. As a result the committee will provide recommendations to approve or reject applications.

2. Composition of the Committee

The Committee will comprise 5-8 members selected by the Director of Standards & Assurance and Senior Director of Programmes based on an application and interview process. The composition must ensure a balance of expertise, perspectives, and geographical representation, including:

- At least one representative from a Large Farm (LF) context
- at least one representative with Smallholder (SH) production experience
- a mix of members with both academic/scientific expertise (e.g. entomology, toxicology, environmental health) and practical field experience (e.g. extension agents, producer representatives, national experts)
- geographic diversity aligned with regions where HHP use is most relevant in Better Cotton
- A Better Cotton Standard System Integrity Standard function representative to ensure strategic alignment or operational input (interview process not applying for this member).

Terms on the Committee will be set for two years with option to extend. Additional ad-hoc participants such as country representatives, program partners or Better Cotton staff may be asked to join on a temporary basis to evaluate specific exceptional use applications – for example if specific country or pest expertise is required for a thorough evaluation.

For each specific application received, a minimum of 3 core Committee members (called subcommittee), excluding any ad-hoc members will be appointed to review and decide on the application.

3. Responsibilities of the Committee

The Pesticide Committee will assume the following responsibilities:

- **Review and Evaluate Applications:** Committee members shall do an independent review of the application and submit initial comments/any request for further information. The Committee should then gather, facilitated by Better Cotton or a neutral facilitator to review the application and discuss the considerations around permitting exceptional use. If additional information is required to evaluate the application, this will be documented in writing and requested from the applicant.

- **Assess Risk and Trade-offs:** The Committee will assess the risks associated with the use of the specific HHP and evaluate the trade-offs between the impact of continued use and any alternatives available. They will consider social, economic, and environmental factors, including impacts on farmer yields and livelihoods.
- **Mitigation measures and ongoing monitoring:** Where relevant, the Committee will identify reasonable mitigation measures that reduce the risks associated with the exceptional use of HHPs. They will consider the feasibility, practicality, and potential impacts of these measures. They will also advise on the nature of ongoing monitoring and reporting (where applicable, e.g., if exceptional use is to be granted)
- **Recommendation:** The appointed Committee members will make a final recommendation (approval or rejection) for the application to Better Cotton directors of Standard System Integrity, Programmes and Impact and Development. The Committee will make informed recommendations based on collective expertise, scientific knowledge, and regional considerations. They will document their recommendations, justifications, and any recommended conditions for approval.

The Committee shall strive to reach agreements by consensus on granting exceptional use of HHPs with the objective of recommending a decision to Better Cotton. Consensus is defined here as general agreement in favour of an application, plus the absence of a sustained objection to the proposal. If the Committee is unable to agree on a recommendation, it will outline its opposing views and submit the options for a final decision by the Director of S&A and Sr Director of Programmes.

If there is an agreement to recommend an approval, the Better Cotton Pesticides Committee will list conditions in the evaluation report that shall include at least:

- Mandatory mitigation measures
- Reporting requirements
- The period for which exceptional use should be granted (maximum two seasons)

4. Engagement modalities

- Pesticide committee members should commit **sufficient time and resource to the work of the Committee to ensure thorough and timely decisions on each application.** This includes keeping Better Cotton informed of any significant periods of leave (or other non-availability). Eligible Committee members will first be contacted with a request to handle a specific application and will be able to confirm their availability.
- **Time commitment for each Committee member** is estimated to be approximately 4-5 hours for each application. For each application accepted by a Committee member, the process will typically include 1-2 hours to review the application (including consulting with relevant Better Cotton staff) and sharing notes ahead of the Committee meeting; 1.5 hours to attend the meeting, and 1 hour to assist with or

review the write-up of the final decision. This can vary as it is difficult to predict the back and forth resulting from requested additional information.

- **Any conflicts of interest must be transparently declared** to Better Cotton ahead of joining the Committee, and any new conflicts of interest declared promptly in writing.
- **Follow agreed timelines to review each application, including preparation work, participation in scheduled meetings, and finalization of the decision.** Each application must be decided within 35 calendar days of receipt, and the schedules of multiple Committee members must be coordinated during this process. Therefore, it is critical that all members of the Committee deliver on their agreed responsibilities and deadlines (barring exceptional circumstances).
- **Maintain full confidentiality for all information related to an application.** All information and evidence provided by Producers, experts, Better Cotton, or Programme Partners to support an application or decision must be considered confidential and shall not be shared outside of the Better Cotton team and members of the Committee.

Better Cotton is a not-for-profit membership organization with limited funding. However, if partial reimbursement is required, Better Cotton may be able to offer Pesticides Committee members a reimbursement for their time depending on the budget available. Standard and Assurance will have to approve the request at an agreed flat rate.

Should an in-person meeting be scheduled, Better Cotton will seek to sponsor reasonable travel costs for those unable to cover these expenses, upon request.

5. Appointment of Committee Members

Members will be appointed to the Committee in line with the following process:

- **Request for proposal:** Better Cotton will issue a request for proposal for the Pesticide Committee, inviting interested individuals with relevant expertise and experience to apply.
- **Nomination review:** Nominations will be reviewed and candidates will be shortlisted based on their relevant qualifications, experience, and expertise, as well as geographic representation. Interviews with shortlisted candidates may be conducted to assess their suitability for the role.
- **Appointment of committee members:** Better Cotton will appoint Pesticide Committee members based on the shortlist and any additional criteria specified.
- **Committee members induction:** Better Cotton shall provide induction for the members, covering the relevant policies, procedures, and guidelines for reviewing applications for exceptional use of highly hazardous pesticide

ⁱ Sub-committees are composed of a selection of 3 Pesticides committee members undertaking the technical analysis of applications and generating draft decisions to be reviewed by the full committee.