

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

E



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

REP24/PR55

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

**47th Session
Geneva, Switzerland
25-30 November 2024**

REPORT OF THE 55th SESSION OF THE

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

**Chengdu, Sichuan Province, P.R. China
3-8 June 2024**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary and Conclusions	page vi
List of Abbreviations	page ix
List of Conference Room Documents	page xi
Report of the 55th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues	page 1

	Paragraphs
INTRODUCTION	1
OPENING OF THE SESSION	2 - 4
DIVISION OF COMPETENCE	5
ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)	6
APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEURS (Agenda Item 2)	7 - 8
MATTERS REFERRED TO CCPR BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda Item 3)	9 - 12
MATTERS ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda 4a)	13 - 23
• FAO	14 - 17
• WHO	18 - 20
Conclusion	23
MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (Agenda Item 4b) Joint FAO/IAEA Centre for Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture	24 - 26
REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATION ARISING FROM THE 2023 JMPR MEETING (Agenda Item 5a)	27 - 58
• Developments in dietary exposure methodology for pesticide residues in foods	29 - 42
• Development of guidance on the assessment and interpretation of nonlinear toxicokinetics	43 - 44
• The need for sponsors to provide accurate chemical structures and related information on metabolites	45 - 46
• Resolving inconsistent assessment of common metabolites	47 - 48
• The rolling submission of data	49 - 50
• Why is a residue definition sometimes not agreed when there is an ADI/AfRD?	51 - 53
• Enhancement of process	54 - 55
• Strategy and timing for JMPR re-evaluation of dithiocarbamates	56 - 58
REPORT ON RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC CONCERNS RAISED BY CCPR ARISING FROM THE 2023 JMPR MEETING (Agenda Item 5b)	59 - 60
PROPOSED MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED AT STEPS 7 AND 4 (Agenda Item 6)	61 - 222
• General remarks	61 - 65
• Inclusion of additional commodities in the <i>Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989)</i>	66 - 67
• Assignment of the ID number 333 to a new compound	68 - 69
• Consideration of Guidelines Levels	70 - 76
• Codex Maximum Residue Limits for Okra	77 - 82
• Codex Maximum Residue Limits for Milk and Milk Fat	83 - 85

	Paragraphs
• Editorial amendments to the Codex database to align with decisions of CCPR and CAC	86 - 87
• Consideration of compounds	88 - 222
DIMETHOATE (027) / OMETHOATE (055)	88 - 90
PIPERONYL BUTOXIDE (062)	91 - 94
PYRETHRINS (063)	95 - 97
CARBENDAZIM (072)	98 - 103
THIOPHANATE-METHYL (077)	104 - 107
DINOCAP (087)	108 - 109
CARBOFURAN (096)	110 - 111
CARBOSULFAN (145)	112 - 116
PHOSMET (103)	117 - 118
IPRODIONE (111)	119 - 123
CYPERMETHRIN (INCLUDING ALPHA- AND ZETA-CYPERMETHRIN) (118)	124 - 126
PERMETHRIN (120)	127 - 131
DIFLUBENZURON (130)	132 - 134
DELTAMETHRIN (135)	135
METALAXYL (138)	136
PROCHLORAZ (142)	137
PROPICONAZOLE (160)	138 - 146
BIFENTHRIN (178)	147 - 148
FIPRONIL (202)	149
INDOXACARB (216)	150 - 153
BOSCALID (221)	154
DIFENOCONAZOLE (224)	155 - 158
CLOTHIANIDIN (238)	159 - 163
THIAMETHOXAM (245)	164 - 165
FLUOPYRAM (243)	166 - 171
ACETAMIPRID (246)	172 - 174
EMAMECTIN BENZOATE (247)	175 - 177
FLUTRIAFOL (248)	178 - 179
DINOTEFURAN (255)	180 - 181
CYANTRANILIPROLE (263)	182 - 187
IMAZAPYR (267)	188
CYFLUMETOFEN (273)	189 - 191
OXATHIPIPROLIN (291)	192 - 195
FLUAZINAM (306)	196 - 198
TRIFLUMURON (317)	199

	Paragraphs
MEFENTRIFLUCONAZOLE (320)	200 - 203
TETRANILIPROLE (324)	204 - 205
BROFLANILIDE (326)	206 - 207
ISOFLUCYPRAM (330)	208 - 209
1,4-DIMETHYLNAPHTHALENE (331)	210
FLORYLPICOXAMID (332)	211 - 213
ISOCYCLOSERAM (334)	214 - 215
ISOTIANIL (335)	216 - 217
MEPIQUAT CHLORIDE (336)	218 - 220
TRICYCLAZOLE (337)	221
General conclusion	222
GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING THE PURITY AND STABILITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS AND RELATED STOCK SOLUTIONS OF PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (AT STEP 4) (Agenda Item 7)	223 - 230
MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW (Agenda Item 8)	231 - 238
NATIONAL REGISTRATION OF PESTICIDES (Agenda Item 9)	239 – 247
ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR (Agenda Item 10)	248 - 261
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2025 Schedule for JMPR evaluations 	249 - 256
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public health concerns 	257
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priority lists for 2026 and beyond 	258 - 259
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nominations for Parallel Review 	250
Conclusion	261
ENHANCEMENT OF OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF CCPR AND JMPR (Agenda Item 11)	262 - 273
COORDINATION OF WORK BETWEEN THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES AND THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS: JOINT CCPR/CCRVDF WORKING GROUP ON COMPOUNDS WITH DUAL USE – STATUS OF WORK (Agenda Item 12)	274 - 280
ANALYSIS OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS BY CCPR TO ESTABLISH MRLs FOR TOMATO AND PEPPER TO ESTABLISH CORRESPONDING MRLs IN EGGPLANT (Agenda Item 13)	281 - 293
OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 14)	294 – 297
DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 15)	298

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Pages
APPENDIX I	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 31
APPENDIX II	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES RECOMMENDED FOR ADOPTION AT STEP 5/8 42
Appendix III	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES RECOMMENDED FOR REVOCATION 51
APPENDIX IV	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES WITHDRAWN BY CCPR 55
APPENDIX V	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES RETAINED AT STEP 7 56
APPENDIX VI	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES RETAINED AT STEP 4 57
APPENDIX VII	CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE CXLs for PEPPERS GROUP/SUBGROUP: MRLs FOR OKRA 62
APPENDIX VIII	CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENT TO THE <i>CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD AND FEED</i> (CXA 4-1989): INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL COMMODITIES IN CLASS D 64
APPENDIX IX	GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING THE STABILITY AND PURITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS AND RELATED STOCK SOLUTIONS OF PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (FOR ADOPTION AT STEP 5)..... 65
APPENDIX X	PRIORITY LIST OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR 71

SUMMARY AND STATUS OF WORK

Responsible Party	Purpose	Text/Topic	Code	Step	Para(s). App.
CCEXEC87 CAC47	Critical Review Adoption	MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) proposed for adoption by CCPR.	---	5/8	App. II Para. 222(i)(a)
CCEXEC87 CAC47	Critical Review Revocation	CXLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) proposed for revocation by CCPR.	---	---	App. III Para. 222(i)(b)
CCEXEC87 CAC47	Critical Review Discontinuation	MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) withdrawn (discontinued) from the Step Procedure by CCPR.	---	4 7	App. IV Para. 222(ii)(a)
JMPR (2024) (or future sessions) Members CCPR56 (or future sessions)	Consideration Action	MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) retained by CCPR, including former guideline levels, awaiting further assessment from JMPR.	---	4 7	App(s) V & VI Paras. 222(ii)(b) 222(vi)
CCEXEC87 CAC47	Critical Review Adoption	Consequential amendments to the CXLs for peppers group/subgroup: MRLs for okra.	---	---	App. VII Para. 222(i)(c)
CCEXEC87 CAC47	Critical Review Adoption	Consequential amendment to the <i>Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989)</i> : Additional commodity for Class D – Processed Foods of Plant Origin.	---	---	App. VIII Para. 222(iv)
CCEXEC87 CAC47 EWG (India with the assistance of Canada, Iran, and Singapore) CCPR56	Critical Review Adoption Discussion Comments Consideration Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines for Monitoring the Stability and Purity of Reference Materials and Related Stock Solutions of Pesticides during Prolonged Storage. Expansion of the scope of the guidelines to cover mixtures of pesticides. 	---	5	App. IX Para. 230(i-iii)
EWG (Chile with the assistance of Australia, Ecuador, India and Kenya) CCPR56	Discussion Consideration Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review. Management of the national registration of pesticides. 	---	---	Paras. 238(i-iii) 245-246
Germany Codex Secretariat Members CCPR56	Comments Consideration Action	Survey to determine the needs and type of training materials or capacity-building activities to facilitate members' understanding and use of the national registration database.	---	---	Para. 247
CCEXEC87 CAC47 EWG (Australia) CCPR56	Critical Review Approval Discussion Comments Consideration Action	Priority list of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR.	---	---	App. X Para. 261(i-ii)
EWG (USA with the assistance of Costa Rica and Uganda CCPR56	Discussion Consideration Action	Enhancement of the operational procedure of CCPR and JMPR: Opportunities, challenges, and recommendations on next steps.	---	---	Para. 273(i-iii)

Responsible Party	Purpose	Text/Topic	Code	Step	Para(s). App.
Joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG (USA with the assistance of Brazil and New Zealand) Members CCPR56 CCRVDF27	Discussion Consideration Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue coordinating work between CCPR and CCRVDF on issues of common interest involving compounds for dual use. Encourage CCPR delegations to participate in the joint virtual meeting of the EWG and to liaise with their CCRVDF counterparts to coordinate positions and actively participate in the work of the Joint EWG, including the upcoming virtual meeting. 	---	---	Para. 280 (i-iv)
JMPR Secretariat JMPR (2024) CCPR56	Discussion Consideration Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider the procedures outlined by the Observer of the Global Pulse Confederation to support eggplant MRLs based on the MRLs already established for tomatoes and/or peppers with a view to JMPR recommending how the procedure suggested by GPC may be improved and potentially incorporated into future procedures for setting MRLs by extrapolation to minor crops. Review work undertaken by the GPC Observer regarding the dietary exposure assessments, the GAP description, the representativeness of residue trials, the definition of residues and metabolites of concern, and any other relevant aspects influencing the risk assessment. Advise whether the methodology outlined in CX/PR 24/55/12 provides an appropriate basis for extrapolation. If not, what amendments to the assessment method may be made to provide a pragmatic, science-based, and resource-efficient approach to enhancing the establishment of MRLs for minor crops. 	---	---	Para. 293 (iv-vi)
Codex Secretariat JMPR Secretariat Members	Comments Information Action	Circular letter on providing data from national dietary surveys to the CIFOcOs database.	---	---	Paras. 41-42
Codex Secretariat	Action	Editorial amendments to CXLs to align with previous decisions of CCPR and CAC.	---	---	Para. 222(iii)
JMPR Secretariat JMPR (2024)	Information Action	Retention of ID number 306 for fluazinam and assignment of ID number 333 to a new compound.	---	---	Para. 222(iv)
Codex Secretariat JMPR Secretariat CCPR56	Consideration Action	Review the CXLs for milks and milk fat in the Codex database to address CCPR40's recommendation to incorporate a footnote to these CXLs.	---	---	Para. 222(vii)

Responsible Party	Purpose	Text/Topic	Code	Step	Para(s). App.
Codex Secretariat CCPR56	Information Action	Update on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of the revised <i>Classification on Foods and Feeds</i> (CXA 4-1989) and <i>Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides to Commodity Groups</i> (CXG 84-2012). • Project to update the Codex Database for MRLs for Pesticides to adjust the CXLs to the revised Classification of Food and Feed. 	---	---	Paras. 295, 297

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACRONYM	FULL NAME
2-CE	2-chloroethanol
Add.	Addendum
App.	Appendix
ADI	Acceptable Daily Intake
AfRD	Acute Reference Dose
CAC	Codex Alimentarius Commission
CCCF	Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods
CCEXEC	Executive Committee
CCPR	Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues
CCRVDF	Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods
cGAP	Critical GAP
CIFOCos	FAO/WHO chronic individual food consumption data summary statistics
CL	Circular Letter
CRD	Conference Room Document
CXA	Codex Miscellaneous Text
CXG	Codex Guideline
CXL(s)	Codex Maximum Residue Limit(s) for Pesticide (as adopted by CAC)
EFSA	European Food Safety Authority
EMRL	Extraneous Maximum Residue Limit
EtO	Ethylene Oxide
ETU	Ethylenethiourea
EU	European Union
EWG	Electronic Working Group
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
GAP	Good Agricultural Practice (in the use of pesticides)
GECDE	Global estimate of chronic dietary exposure
GLs	Guideline Levels
GPC	Global Pulse Confederation
HBGV(s)	Health Based Guidance Value(s)
HHP(s)	Highly Hazardous Pesticide(s)
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICAMA	Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management
IEDI	International Estimated Daily Intake
ISWG	in-session Working Group
JECFA	Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives
JMPM	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pest Management
JMPR	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues
JMPS	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specification
LMICs	Low- and middle-income countries
LOQ	Limit of Quantification
ML	Maximum Level

MO	Member Organization
MRL(s)	Maximum Residue Limit(s)
NFPSs	New Food Sources and Production Systems
NRD	National Registration Database
Para.(s)	Paragraph(s)
PCA	4-chloroaniline
PTU	Propylenethiourea
SoP	Statements of principle concerning the role of science in the Codex decision-making process and the extent to which other factors are taken into account
STMR	Supervised Trial Median Residues
TDMs	Triazole Derivative Metabolites
TEF	Toxic Equivalency Factor
TOR(s)	Term(s) of Reference
TTC	Threshold of Toxicological Concern
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UK	United Kingdom
UNEA	United Nations Environment Assembly
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
USA	United States of America
VWG	Virtual Working Group
WG	Working Group
WHO	World Health Organization

LIST OF CONFERENCE ROOM DOCUMENTS

CRD No.	Agenda item	Submitted by
01	All agenda items	EU Division of competence and voting rights between EU and its Member States
02	10	Australia as Chair of the Electronic WG on Priorities (Revised Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR)
03	7	India as Chair of the EWG on Guidelines on Reference Materials, assisted by Argentina and Singapore as co-Chairs) Revised Guidelines for monitoring the purity and stability of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage)
04	7	India as Chair of the EWG on Guidelines on Reference Materials, assisted by Argentina and Singapore as co-Chairs) Report of the VWG on the revision of the revised Guidelines for monitoring the purity and stability of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage
05	6	Australia
06	1, 2, 3, 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 5(b), 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Burundi
07	6, 7, 13	China
08	7	Brazil
09	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	Philippines
10 (Rev.1)	4(a), 5(a), 5(b), 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14	European Union
11	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12	United Arab Emirates
12	5(a), 11	Croplife International
13	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Thailand
14 (Rev.1)	7, 8, 9, 12, 13	Uruguay
15	6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Indonesia
16	7, 8, 11	Japan
17	3, 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 5(b), 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Uganda
18	1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14	India
19	7, 9, 11, 12, 13	Nigeria
20	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Ghana
21	6, 9, 11, 12	Senegal
22	4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 5(b), 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13	Morocco
23	11	United States of America
24	8	Agrocare Latinoamerica
25	6, 7, 10, 13	Bangladesh

CRD No.	Agenda item	Submitted by
26	6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13	Ecuador
27	7	India as Chair of the EWG on Guidelines on Reference Materials, assisted by Argentina and Singapore as co-Chairs) Report of the ISWG on the revision of the revised Guidelines for monitoring the purity and stability of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage

INTRODUCTION

1. The 55th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) was held in Chengdu, Sichuan Province, People's Republic of China, from 3-8 June 2024 at the kind invitation of the Government of China. The Session was chaired by Dr Weili SHAN, Chairperson, and Dr Lifang DUAN, Vice-Chairperson, assisted by Chief Advisor Dr Xiongwu QIAO. The Session was attended by delegates from 47 Member countries, one Member Organization, and 9 Observer organizations. The List of Participants is attached as Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Mr Xingwang ZHANG, Vice Minister at the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China, opened the meeting and welcomed participants, commending the continuous support of international organizations and delegations to CCPR and the host country since 2006. The Vice Minister noted that China introduced a series of major food safety and production initiatives, e.g., producing more than 650 million tons of grain annually, establishing more than 10,000 pesticide MRLs, and achieving the quality and safety of over 97 percent of agricultural products. The Vice Minister highlighted the importance of strengthening the exchange and cooperation of policies and regulations, pesticide standards, and pesticide management to promote global food security and sustainable agricultural development jointly.
3. Mr Yun HU, Vice Governor of Sichuan Province of the People's Republic of China, also addressed the Committee and warmly welcomed all participants. The Vice Governor stressed the importance of science in enabling the appropriate use, development, and innovation of pesticides to achieve food safety from farm to fork. He encouraged all delegates to contribute towards the fair use and trade of pesticides.
4. Mr Zhongjiun ZHANG, Officer-in-Charge, FAO Representation in China, Mr Soren MADSEN on behalf of WHO, Mr Steve WEARNE, Chairperson of CAC, and Dr Weili SHAN, CCPR Chair, and Deputy Director General of Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA) of the People's Republic of China also addressed the Committee.

Division of Competence

5. CCPR noted the division of competence between the European Union (EU) and its Member States, according to paragraph 5, Rule II of the Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 1)

6. CCPR adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the Session and agreed to:
 - discuss the status of publication of the revised *Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989)* and the *Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides to Commodity Groups (CXG 84-2012)* including the next steps to address the impact of the revised Classification on the existing Codex Maximum Residue Limits (CXLs) in the Codex database for maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pesticides under Agenda item 14 (Other business) (requested by the European Union);
 - establish an in-session Working Group (ISWG) open to all Members and Observers, chaired by India and working in English, to review the revised Guidelines for Monitoring the Stability and Purity of Reference Materials and Related Stock Solutions of Pesticides during Prolonged Storage (Agenda item 7), as presented in CRD04, and prepare a proposal for consideration by the plenary (requested by India); and
 - advance discussion on Agenda item 13 after Agenda item 6 due to the possible impact of the discussion of the proposed MRLs for eggplant on the priority list, Agenda item 10.

APPOINTMENT OF RAPORTEURS (Agenda item 2)

7. CCPR appointed YAU Ho-pan, Michael (China), Julian CUDMORE (United Kingdom) and Sara MCGRATH (United States of America) to act as rapporteurs for this Session.
8. The Chairperson thanked China, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America for supporting the CCPR's core work establishing MRLs for pesticides. The Chairperson acknowledged the valuable assistance of rapporteurs to ensure that the discussions and decisions taken by CCPR in this regard were accurately reflected in the report of its session.

MATTERS REFERRED TO CCPR BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda item 3)¹

9. The Codex Secretariat noted that the document was presented for information only.

¹ CX/PR 24/55/2

Ethylene oxide and 2-chloroethanol

10. Regarding the consideration of ethylene oxide (EtO) and 2-chloroethanol (2-CE) at previous sessions of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF)² and CCPR³, the Codex Secretariat recalled that, following a request from CCCF16 (2023) on the use of EtO as a pesticide, CCPR54 (2023) had agreed to advise CCCF that EtO was used in some countries as a pesticide (fumigant) and/or as a sterilant and that, given no support to include EtO in the priority list for evaluation by JMPR, and due to the need to establish a limit for this compound to avoid/minimize negative trade impacts, CCPR had agreed that the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) should take the lead on the evaluation of EtO, with support from JMPR, and that this approach would expedite the establishment of a maximum level (ML) for EtO as a contaminant by CCCF due to uses other than a pesticide.
11. The Codex Secretariat informed CCPR that CCCF17 (2024)⁴ had agreed to include EtO and 2-CE in their priority list (full evaluation, toxicological and exposure assessments) and that a call for data for these compounds would be issued once the JECFA Secretariat determine when this evaluation could be carried out by JECFA, taking also into account other work priorities, resources, as well as confirmation of data availability. The Codex Secretariat further recalled the recent publication of the FAO report on *Food safety implications from the use of environmental inhibitors in agrifood*⁵ which provided an in-depth analysis of the food safety implications of using environmental inhibitors in agrifood systems.

Conclusion

12. CCPR:
- (i) noted the matters for information referred by CAC, the Executive Committee (CCEXEC), and other subsidiary bodies of the Commission;
 - (ii) noted the information provided on EtO and 2-CE; and
 - (iii) encouraged Codex Members to:
 - (a) actively engage in opportunities to contribute to the discussions in CCEXEC and CAC (e.g., sharing experience on the application of the (draft) guidance on the application of the *Statements of principle concerning the role of science in the Codex decision-making process and the extent to which other factors are taken into account* (SoP);
 - (b) provide inputs on the development of Codex Strategic Plan 2026-2031); and
 - (c) submit discussion papers or new work proposals on new food sources and production systems (NFPS) using existing mechanisms available in Codex/CCPR.

MATTERS ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda item 4a)⁶

13. The Representatives of FAO and WHO introduced the item. They highlighted key normative and capacity-building activities carried out by the parent organizations relevant to the work of CCPR since its 54th Session (June 2023).

FAO22nd Meeting of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specification (JMPS) (June 2023)

14. CCPR was informed of JMPS activities on the evaluation of FAO, WHO, and FAO/WHO specifications for pesticides and other documents related to JMPS's work. JMPS endorsed the *Manual on Development and Use of FAO and WHO Specifications for Microbial Pesticides*, which would provide guidance on establishing specifications of microbial pesticides, facilitate the development and quality control of biopesticides, and contribute to risk reduction of pesticides and sustainable crop production and protection.

16th Meeting of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management (JMPM) (November 2023)

15. CCPR was informed of JMPM activities on the development/revision of new/existing guidance documents, emerging and priority issues in pesticide management, including online sales, drone application, illegal trade, nano-pesticides, and recommendations for future directions. JMPM endorsed the *Guidance on the aerial application of pesticides* and published *Guidance on the use of pesticide regulation to prevent suicides*,⁷ and *Guidance on the monitoring and observance of the implementation of the Code of Conduct*⁸.

² REP23/CF16, paras. 121-122

³ REP23/PR54, paras. 248-254

⁴ REP24/CF17, paras. 165-168, Appendix X

⁵ Food safety implications from the use of environmental inhibitors in agrifood systems (fao.org)

⁶ CX/PR 24/55/3

⁷ <https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc5070en>

⁸ <https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc5124en>

Capacity development of risk assessment and pesticide management

16. CCPR was informed of FAO capacity-building activities related to the organization of projects, training workshops, webinars, and toolkits in different countries and regions. FAO organized two training workshops related to the lifecycle management of pesticides (September 2023) and the pesticide risk management and elaboration of MRLs (November 2023). FAO also developed a Pesticide Registration Toolkit, a web-based, comprehensive, day-to-day decision support system designed specifically for pesticide registrars in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) to evaluate and approve pesticides. In 2023, six Toolkit training courses were organized in Africa, Asia, and the Near East.

Activities on reducing the risk of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs)

17. CCPR was informed that the 5th Meeting of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) (September 2023) and the 6th session of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) (February 2024) adopted the resolution on HHPs. The resolution endorsed the formation of a global alliance on HHP. FAO would take on a leading role in addressing HHPs under the Global Framework on Chemicals. FAO supported Members in mitigating the risk of HHPs through the development of guidance on HHPs and supported Members in the African region to formulate regional and national strategies on HHPs in collaboration with WHO and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

WHO

Pesticide residues in drinking water

18. CCPR was informed of the work initiated to assess the relevance of pesticide residues in drinking water, including source waters and water after treatment. The work would be conducted in the context of WHO's *Guidelines for drinking-water quality*⁹ and informed by the JMPR monographer's guidance document¹⁰. Project progress will be published on the website of the WHO's water, sanitation, hygiene, and health unit¹¹.

Dioxin and dioxin-like compounds

19. CCPR was informed that WHO had completed its work on updating the Toxic Equivalency Factor (TEF) values for dioxin and dioxin-like compounds, which had been published in a scientific journal¹². The TEF values were used to compare the toxicities of different dioxin-like compounds, as some had higher toxicity than others, and the toxicities of these compounds need to be considered as a group.

Estimates of the burden of foodborne disease

20. CCPR was informed that WHO had begun updating its estimates of the public health burden of foodborne diseases¹³, which would be translated into economic burden estimates through a joint project by WHO and the World Bank. Over 40 chemical and microbiological hazards had been identified, but no pesticides were among them. A global source attribution study was also being conducted in conjunction with estimating the burden of foodborne disease. More details on the overall progress update can be found on the WHO website¹⁴.

Discussion

21. A Member requested that FAO consider organizing workshops on risk assessment of pesticide residues in different regions to enhance knowledge of the risk assessment process and participation in the MRL setting. The Representative of FAO indicated FAO's willingness to explore possibilities for organizing regional training workshops to increase capacity on risk assessment, pesticide risk management, and standards setting.
22. Another Member requested FAO and WHO to consider developing comprehensive guidelines on biostimulants, which could be a valuable resource for countries in developing national regulations. It was noted that biostimulants were increasingly used to enhance plant growth and productivity, but they had not been classified as pesticides or fertilizers. The Representative of FAO indicated that a proposal could be made to JMPR to initiate such work if no relevant or suitable resources were available from FAO and WHO.

⁹ (WHO, 2022) - [Water Sanitation and Health \(who.int\)](https://www.who.int/water-sanitation-and-health)

¹⁰ (WHO, 2015) - [Pesticide residues in food: guidance document for WHO monographers and reviewers](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/pesticide-residues-in-food-guidance-document-for-who-monographers-and-reviewers)

¹¹ <https://www.who.int/teams/environment-climate-change-and-health/water-sanitation-and-health>

¹² The 2022 world health organization re-evaluation of human and mammalian toxic equivalency factors for polychlorinated dioxins, dibenzofurans, and biphenyls, RTP Volume 146, January 2024, 10525.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0273230023001939>

¹³ [WHO estimates of the global burden of foodborne diseases: foodborne diseases burden epidemiology reference group 2007-2015](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/who-estimates-of-the-global-burden-of-foodborne-diseases-foodborne-diseases-burden-epidemiology-reference-group-2007-2015)

¹⁴ https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/foodborne-diseases/ferg/ferg-6th-meeting-presentation-2023.pdf?sfvrsn=165dbd0_3

Conclusion

23. CCPR:
- (i) noted the report provided by FAO and WHO;
 - (ii) expressed its appreciation to FAO and WHO for their efforts in providing technical support to Members;
 - (iii) noted the comments made by Members and clarifications provided by FAO and WHO; and
 - (iv) encouraged Members and Observers to actively engage and contribute to the activities of FAO and WHO.

MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (Agenda item 4b)¹⁵**Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture**

24. The Representative of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre introduced the item via video and:
- recalled that Member countries have been participating in a number of international research activities to support the establishment of MRLs for certain compounds, including dual-use compounds relevant to CCPR and related committees. The research findings could also benefit interests and discussions on residues in offal;
 - informed CCPR of several capacity-building projects needed to address a critical gap in food safety systems among Member countries and to establish or contribute to the setting of national, regional, and international (Codex) standards and guidelines;
 - reported that Member countries in such projects have been receiving support to build capacities required to generate reliable scientific data that would be used for setting MRLs for a range of chemical hazards, including pesticides. The beneficiaries included routine testing and research laboratories, as well as regulators that had a clear role to play in standards setting, risk assessment, and risk management;
 - informed CCPR about the recently concluded international food safety and control symposium in Vienna, Austria (May 2024). In its organization and implementation, the event was supported by the Codex Members, including the Chairperson of CAC, the Codex Secretariat, and several Member countries that actively participate in various committees, including CCPR. An important call was made for countries to actively participate in the generation of reliable scientific data to facilitate Codex standard setting and risk management decisions; and
 - informed CCPR of an initiative called Atoms4Food launched in 2023, covering a wide scope in food and agriculture, including food safety and control. This initiative would be expected to contribute to the building and strengthening of national food safety control systems from source to consumption. The Representative called on the Codex Members to support the initiative, noting its resource-intensiveness and need for partnerships.
25. Members expressed their appreciation to the IAEA for its efforts in building food safety capacities in their countries, particularly in enhancing laboratory infrastructure and competencies for monitoring and regulating pesticide residues. They also congratulated the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre on celebrating its 60th anniversary and indicated their willingness to continue working with the Joint Centre in these activities.

Conclusion

26. CCPR:
- (i) noted the information provided;
 - (ii) commended the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre for their capacity building and other activities concerning the safety of pesticides, and chemicals in general, in food and feed, using nuclear and related techniques, to strengthen capacities in developing countries;
 - (iii) noted the support of Member countries to these activities; and
 - (iv) encouraged further cooperation between Codex, Member countries, and the Joint FAO/IAEA in this regard.

¹⁵ CX/PR 24/55/4

REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ARISING FROM THE 2023 JMPR REGULAR MEETING (Agenda item 5a)¹⁶

27. The WHO JMPR Secretariat introduced the item, summarized key discussion points on general considerations arising from the 2023 Regular JMPR Meeting, and provided clarifications as appropriate.
28. CCPR noted comments made by Members and took decisions as follows:
1. Developments in dietary exposure methodology for pesticide residues in foods
29. The JMPR Secretariat summarized the key discussion points on the global estimate of chronic dietary exposure (GECDE) methodology held at JMPR (2023) and noted that the full discussion was available in the JMPR report.
30. A Member supported the JMPR's general working principles to (i) base its risk assessments on realistic exposure scenarios that consider susceptible and high-risk groups, (ii) improve the characterization of chronic risk from less than lifetime exposure, and (iii) work to harmonize JECFA and JMPR assessment methodologies. Beyond these scientific considerations, it was also critical that changes to JMPR's methodology be done transparently so that CCPR and other stakeholders understand the robustness of the proposed approach and its impact on risk management. Given that JMPR intends to further investigate the degree of conservatism in the GECDE (mean and high) in comparison with the current international estimated of dietary intake (IEDI) methodology, the Delegation believed that JMPR should coordinate more closely with CCPR to determine if it is appropriate to transition from the use of the IEDI to the use of GECDE-mean. This should be done transparently and give CCPR and other stakeholders an opportunity to provide input.
31. Another Member supported the JMPR's intention to investigate further options for using alternative deterministic models such as the GECDE-mean and GECDE-high to assess chronic and shorter-than-lifetime dietary intake but considered that thoughts of adopting the methodology are premature. The Delegation considered that the traceability and transparency of the methodology were essential. Unlike the IEDI, for which spreadsheets are available, the GECDE-mean is currently understood by only a limited number of experts. CCPR, as the risk manager, needed time to evaluate the implementation of GECDE-mean and required the calculation spreadsheets to be able to assess and review the calculations critically. Additionally, the need to change from IEDI to GECDE-mean was not clear. Information about the degree of conservatism associated with both the IEDI and GECDE-mean methodology would allow for an informed consideration of the level of protection associated with each methodology and the need to change methodologies to ensure consumer safety.
32. A Member Organization (MO) welcomed this initiative and supported the JMPR's decision to explore the transition from the IEDI to the GECDE and noted the positive potential of this change to improve the long-term dietary risk assessment methodology at the Codex level and harmonize methodologies between different food domains and to better estimate of the expected dietary exposure of the general population and of specific population groups that may have a higher exposure than the general population.
33. The MO identified several points summarized in CRD10(Rev. 1) that needed further addressing to allow an informed discussion at the risk management level. The MO would welcome more information and transparency on this initiative and commended the JMPR's intention to present the developments of this exercise to CCPR56 (2025) and to include in this presentation the outcomes of the JMPR's assessment on the degree of conservatism of IEDI and GECDE (mean and high) and its investigation of implementation options. It was noted that, at the EU level, work had been initiated on modifying the methodology used for long-term exposure, and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) was concluding a new revision of the pesticide residue intake model (PRIMo revision 4). The Annex to the aforesaid CRD included more information on the model.
34. Other Members supported these comments.
35. An Observer also supported the development of scientifically valid improvements to dietary exposure assessments. However, the evidence demonstrating that the current methodology did not protect consumer safety was still pending. Based on the 2023 JMPR report, the average change in chronic risk when using this proposed GECDE mean method compared to the current IEDI method is a 500% increase which may challenge a significant number of existing and future CXLs. The Observer proposed that a working model and user manual be made publicly available for the new method before any changes were made. In addition, a comprehensive impact assessment for all active ingredients where CXLs exist should be done, and realistic exposure levels and residue levels from food monitoring surveys should be included, which would help the discussion on levels of consumer protection. A clear future date for implementation would be required should CCPR agree to change the exposure models to establish MRLs for pesticides.

¹⁶ Report of the 2023 JMPR Meeting, Section 2
FAO: <https://www.fao.org/3/cc9755en/cc9755en.pdf>
WHO: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240090187>

36. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the comments and concerns expressed by Members and Observers and the written comments submitted to this Session will be forwarded to the JMPR Meeting in September 2024 for consideration. The outcomes of the JMPR deliberations will be brought to the attention of the next session of CCPR.
37. The JMPR Secretariat further noted that:
- there was general support for the new methodology;
 - there were some concerns about the application of the methodology and its potential impact on the setting of MRLs;
 - the JMPR Secretariat would ensure the transparency of the process leading to the application of the GECDE methodology and the transition from the IEDI to the GECDE mean methodology;
 - While the CIFOcOs database currently includes 46 national consumption data surveys, the data could be improved further to include the Middle East, the Pacific, and other regions not currently included in the database; and
 - The JMPR Secretariat would explore opportunities to make GECDE calculations available to the public and at the meeting.
38. Regarding the degree of conservatism associated with both methodologies, the JMPR Secretariat noted that the IEDI should not be considered the reference point but that we should compare the benefits and disadvantages of both methodologies. He further noted that GECDE had the potential to generate more accurate and detailed information on actual dietary consumption available for use in establishing MRLs for pesticides.
39. On the possible holding of the transition period to allow CCPR to receive more information and have further discussions at its next session, the JMPR Secretariat explained that JMPR had decided to transition from the IEDI to the GECDE mean methodology; however, the timeframe for the full application of the GECDE had not yet been decided. This provides some time for CCPR and JMPR to exchange views and concerns on applying the new methodology.
40. On whether CCPR as a risk manager must endorse the new methodology or its endorsement was independent of CCPR:
- The Codex Secretariat recalled that CCPR provides advice and takes decisions on risk management while JMPR is responsible for conducting the risk assessment; hence, each body maintains its own independence. While the ultimate decision on the adoption of a risk assessment methodology rests with JMPR, CCPR, and JMPR can engage in a consultative process by which CCPR can consider risk assessment matters, i.e., GECDE, that may impact risk management, and convey their comments and concerns for consideration and feedback by JMPR so that CCPR can decide on the level of conservatism necessary to protect consumer's health and avoid unnecessary barriers to trade.
 - The JMPR Secretariat further noted that the choice of the methodology was a scientific decision that lay with JMPR, while the choice on the level of protection was a management decision that lay with CCPR. Hence, the Committee could set an acceptable level of protection and make a risk management decision based on the agreed protection goal.
41. On the mechanism to support the continued collection of food consumption survey data, the Codex Secretariat agreed to issue a circular letter (CL) with input from the JMPR Secretariat to ensure that the data collected by Member countries is compatible with the requirements for inclusion in the CIFOcOs database and can be used in the GECDE calculations performed by JMPR.

Conclusion

42. CCPR:
- acknowledged the continuous efforts of JMPR in improving the dietary risk assessment methodology to achieve a more realistic and detailed exposure estimation that accounts for both the general population and specific population groups and harmonizing the work between CCPR and the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF);
 - noted the general support for the exploration of the transition from the use of the IEDI to the use of GECDE-mean;
 - noted the concerns raised by Members and Observers about the uncertainty associated with the degree of conservatism and transparency of the GECDE methodology by comparison to the IEDI and agreed to request JMPR to take these concerns into account by the 2024 JMPR and provide further clarification for consideration by next CCPR session;

- encouraged Members to provide data from national dietary surveys to the CIFOCCS database to further broaden the data available for GECDE calculations. To facilitate this exercise, a circular letter will be issued by the Codex Secretariat in collaboration with the JMPR Secretariat outlining the data requirements for inclusion; and
 - noted the clarification provided by the Codex and JMPR Secretariats on the risk management role of CCPR in relation to the level of protection required to establish MRLs for pesticides to protect consumers' health and ensure fair practices in trade (paragraph 40).
2. Development of guidance on the assessment and interpretation of nonlinear toxicokinetics

43. The JMPR Secretariat noted that the guidance did not aim to develop new study designs by sponsors but to assist JMPR experts when assessing data sets showing nonlinear toxicokinetics. The guidance was expected to be completed by the next session of JMPR (2024).

Conclusion

44. CCPR:

- acknowledged the efforts of JMPR to improve the scientific quality, consistency, and transparency of the assessments;
- noted the advancement made in developing the guidance for interpreting nonlinear toxicokinetics; and
- anticipated the finalization of the guidance at JMPR (2024).

3. The need for sponsors to provide accurate chemical structures and related information on metabolites

45. The JMPR Secretariat noted that JMPR increasingly relied on in silico testing and read-across methods in relation to using the threshold of toxicological concern (TTC) approach for metabolites with incomplete experimental data submissions. It was necessary to know the exact structure of the metabolites, including their isomers, to obtain reliable results. There have been cases where JMPR received inaccurate data on the chemical structure, leading to inappropriate conclusions. He stressed the responsibility of sponsors in submitting accurate information on the exact chemical structure and emphasized that, while it was the responsibility of sponsors to make the analysis, JMPR required accurate information on the chemical structure for JMPR to verify the validity of the data submissions.

Conclusion

46. CCPR emphasized the importance of accurate chemical structure information when assessing metabolites' toxicological relevance.

4. Resolving inconsistent assessment of common metabolites

47. The JMPR Secretariat noted that this matter related to different information received on the same metabolite from chemically related pesticides. He encouraged sponsors to establish a task force when they had common metabolites and to inform JMPR accordingly so that they could consistently evaluate these metabolites.

Conclusion

48. CCPR:

- noted that the consistent assessment of common metabolites is a crucial aspect that needs to be addressed in the JMPR assessment; and
- encouraged sponsors to develop joint toxicological dossiers for common metabolites from groups of related pesticides to facilitate the JMPR evaluation.

5. The rolling submission of data

49. The JMPR Secretariat noted that this issue was particularly relevant to periodic reviews where the initial data package submitted is insufficient to conduct a full re-evaluation. The Secretariat explained that there had been situations where data arrived over a period of years (e.g., 2-3 years), resulting in an expert expending multiple years evaluating the same compound that could have been done in a shorter period if all the required data/information had been timely submitted. He further noted that this was an area of improvement that should be taken up in the discussion on the enhancement of work of CCPR and JMPR to avoid wasting the limited resources of JMPR.

Conclusion

50. CCPR:
- emphasized the importance of timely submission of complete dossiers to prevent negative impacts on the efficiency of the JMPR risk assessments; and
 - agreed that this issue should be further discussed when considering the enhancement of work of CCPR and JMPR (Agenda item 11).
6. Why is a residue definition sometimes not agreed when there is an ADI/ARfD?
51. The JMPR Secretariat noted that, following a question raised at CCPR54, JMPR (2023) clarified that while an Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI)/Acute Reference Dose (ARfD) is established for a pesticide-active substance and metabolites in experimental animals, the residue present in commodities may contain metabolites that did not appear in the toxicological studies.
52. These metabolites may be plant and/or livestock-specific. Therefore, there is no direct link between having an ADI/ARfD for a pesticide-active substance and the residue definition. JMPR has produced a scheme for assessing metabolites. There might be toxicological or analytical issues that prevent the proper assessment of the safety of metabolites and, hence, prevent the finalization of the residue definition despite establishing an ADI/ARfD for the active parent compound.

Conclusion

53. CCPR noted the clarification provided by JMPR.
7. Enhancement of process
54. The JMPR Secretariat noted that JMPR had provided feedback on possible enhancements for the work of JMPR, which included, amongst others, the quality of data, especially electronic data submissions. The file name/company codes should be easily understood; complete dossiers should be submitted in a timely manner so the evaluation can be performed without undue delays, etc.

Conclusion

55. CCPR agreed that this issue should be further discussed when considering enhancing the work of CCPR and JMPR (Agenda item 11).
8. Strategy and timing for JMPR re-evaluation of dithiocarbamates
56. The JMPR Secretariat noted that this matter was related to assessing common metabolites (point 4). The Secretariat also noted that they had received a comprehensive overview of the data available for five dithiocarbamates and two major common metabolites (i.e., mancozeb and metiram (and metabolite ethylenethiourea (ETU)), propineb (and metabolite propylenethiourea (PTU)), ziram and thiram) in a coordinated submission which would assist JMPR in planning the periodic review of this group of pesticides. He further noted that the evaluation of this group might require several years/experts and hence would require significant resources from JMPR in the periodic review program.
57. The EWG Chair on Priorities requested the JMPR Secretariat provide an update on the strategy for re-evaluating dithiocarbamates and their metabolites by JMPR (2024) for consideration by CCPR56 to determine the potential impact of this review on the Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides.

Conclusion

58. CCPR:
- noted with appreciation the coordinated information provided by sponsors; and
 - requested JMPR to present a strategy for the periodic review of dithiocarbamates in CCPR 56 to facilitate the development of a strategy and timeline for the re-assessment of the 5 dithiocarbamates.

REPORT ON RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC CONCERNS RAISED BY CCPR ARISING FROM THE 2023 JMPR MEETING (Agenda item 5b)¹⁷

59. CCPR noted that specific concerns on compounds raised by the Committee at previous sessions would be addressed when discussing the relevant compounds under Agenda item 6.

¹⁷ Report of the 2023 JMPR Meeting, Section 3
 FAO: <https://www.fao.org/3/cc9755en/cc9755en.pdf>
 WHO: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240090187>

60. CCPR also noted that the following compounds were addressed under Section 3 of the report of the 2023 JMPR Meeting:
- Section 3.1: Indoxacarb (216)
 - Section 3.2: Mefentrifluconazole (320)
 - Section 3.5: Metalaxyl (138)
 - Section 3.4: Phosmet (103)

PROPOSED MRLs FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED (at Steps 7 and 4) (Agenda item 6)¹⁸

General Remarks

61. The EU advised CCPR on the adoption of CXLs, which were previously adopted by CAC46 (2023), and the EU did not express any reservations during CCPR54.
62. The EU further explained that it was its policy to include Codex MRLs into EU legislation provided that:
- the EU sets MRLs for the commodity under consideration; and
 - the current EU MRL is lower than the CXL.
63. The EU also advised CCPR that the EU would express reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs in the following situations:
- the proposed CXL is not safe for European consumers, including the assessment of the residue definition to ensure an equivalent protection level; and/or
 - toxicological data is not available at the EU level or is available but not yet assessed at the EU level; and/or
 - data do not sufficiently support the proposed CXLs as per the FAO manual or other agreed requirements; and/or
 - the CXL is not acceptable to the EU in areas such as supporting data, extrapolations, and environmental issues of a global nature, such as the decline of pollinators or the accumulation of persistent bioaccumulative and toxic substances in the environment.
64. Switzerland advised CCPR that it would support all EU reservations as its residue risk assessment approach and policies were the same as those of the EU. Switzerland also advised that its support includes EU reservations based on environmental issues of a global nature, such as the decline of pollinators or the accumulation of persistent bioaccumulative and toxic substances in the environment.
65. The United States of America (USA) indicated that considering global environmental issues is beyond the mandate of CCPR and clarified that CCPR's focus is on protecting consumer health and facilitating global trade.

Inclusion of additional commodities in the *Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989)*

66. The Codex Secretariat advised CCPR that JMPR (2023) had recommended MRLs for two commodities for which there are no Codex commodity numbers in either the old or the current (revised) Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989). The Secretariat further proposed replacing the temporary code CP 0448 Tomato ketchup with DM 3527 under Group 069 Miscellaneous derived edible products of plant origin.
67. CCPR agreed to forward this change to CAC47 as a consequential amendment to the revised Classification.

Assignment of the ID number 333 to a new compound

68. The Codex Secretariat advised CCPR that fluazinam had been assigned the numbers 306 and 333 and that, to maintain consistency, it should retain the number 306. CCPR invited JMPR to assign a new compound to ID number 333.
69. CCPR agreed to:
- retain the code 306 for fluazinam; and
 - advise JMPR to assign ID number 333 to a new compound to maintain consistency between the Codex and JMPR lists of pesticides.

Consideration of Guideline Levels (GLs)

70. The Codex Secretariat noted that there was an issue in the Codex database regarding Guideline Levels (GLs) for the pesticides methyl bromide (052) and guazatine (114). Under a previous CCPR practice, which had been discontinued in 1999, the designation of "Guideline Values" was assigned to those MRLs that had only reached Step 4 in the Codex Step Procedure. These GLs were assigned as it was not possible to establish MRLs because the full risk assessment was incomplete, often due to missing toxicological data and an established ADI.

¹⁸ CL 2024/44-PR; CX/PR 24/55/5; CX/PR 24/55/5-Add.1 (Comments of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Iraq, UAE, United Kingdom, and CropLife International)

71. The Codex Secretariat further stated that these "guideline levels" were never submitted to CAC for formal adoption as CXLs and were essentially retained at Step 4 without full adoption. In addition, there was no adopted definition in the Procedural Manual for GLs for pesticides as opposed to MRLs or EMRLs to interpret the application of such GLs. The definition found in the working document CX/PR 24/55/5 indicates that "*Guidelines levels are elaborated by the CCPR up to Step 4 of the Procedure and held there pending "acceptable daily intakes" or "temporary acceptable intakes" being estimated for the pesticides in question by the JMPR. GLs do not represent Codex recommendations.*"
72. Based on the above, the Codex Secretariat proposed either removing these GLs from the Codex database entirely or updating the database to indicate that they are retained at Step 4 and do not represent Codex recommendations.
73. The EWG Chair on Priorities advised CCPR that guazatine (114) be included on the priority list for periodic review by JMPR in 2025.
74. The EWG Chair on Priorities further noted that methyl bromide was not on the priority list and would require a nomination and data sponsor for further action and proposed that this compound be added to Table 2a to allow time for information on possible data support and could be discussed again at CCPR56.
75. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that guazatine (114) had been up for periodic review in 2021 and that insufficient data had been submitted to conclude the evaluation.
76. CCPR agreed to:
- revise the "GLs" under guazatine (114) and methyl bromide (052) to "MRLs retained at Step 4" and update the Codex database to reflect the change in practice; and
 - add methyl bromide (052) to the Priority List—Table 2A, awaiting the sponsor's data submission.

CXLs for okra

77. The Codex Secretariat recalled that at CCPR54, the Committee agreed to keep okra in Subgroup 12B (Pepper and pepper-like commodities) in the *Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989)* while awaiting the generation of data on okra and subsequent evaluation by JMPR. To implement this decision, consequential amendments were then made to the relevant CXLs for the pepper groups and subgroups.
78. The Secretariat noted that for two compounds, namely pyrethrin (063) and permethrin (120), the parenthetical qualifier statement "*MRL provisionally applies to okra, martynia, and roselle*" was not applied, and these entries in the database may need to be corrected to ensure consistency.
79. The Codex Secretariat further advised that okra, martynia, and roselle were already covered under the broader group "Fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits" (VO 0050) and that no further action was required for those commodities that already had CXLs under this group.
80. Australia expressed support for this action but requested that the data sponsor identified at CCPR54 provide an update on the commitment for data support for okra.
81. As the data sponsor, the Observer of the Global Pulse Confederation (GPC) advised CCPR that they had identified 3 pesticide compounds appropriate for field trials of pepper and eggplant and were awaiting confirmation of their field trial protocol before proceeding.
82. Based on the clarification provided by the Codex Secretariat, CCPR agreed to make consequential amendments to the CXLs for the "Peppers (subgroup)" (VO 0051) for pyrethrin (063) and permethrin (120).

CXLs for milk and milk fat

83. The Codex Secretariat informed the Committee that CCPR40 (2008) agreed that whole milk should be tested where MRLs are recommended for whole milk and milk fats for regulatory purposes. Any residue results should be compared with the MRLs for whole milk. CCPR40 also agreed to ask JMPR to insert a footnote to this effect for MRLs for whole milk in all cases where the MRLs have been established for both milk fat and whole milk.
84. The Codex Secretariat further noted that this decision had never been implemented, and the Codex database would need to be updated after all relevant CXLs at CCPR56 were considered.
85. CCPR agreed to ask JMPR to:
- add the footnote agreed in 2008 to all future MRL recommendations for whole milk where an MRL is also recommended for milk fats that reads: "*for monitoring and regulatory purposes, whole milk is to be analyzed and the result compared to the MRL for whole milk*"; and
 - advise on adopting the footnote to the compounds identified by the Codex Secretariat with MRLs for whole milk and milk fats.

Editorial amendments to the Codex database to align with decisions of CCPR and CAC

86. The Codex Secretariat informed CCPR of a number of editorial amendments to CXLs in the Codex database to align with CCPR's previous decisions, as per below. These adjustments did not require approval by CAC as they reflect decisions taken by CCPR and approved by CAC that were inadvertently not included in the Codex database.
- **008 Carbaryl:** The CXL for sorghum grain at 10 mg/kg was removed as revoked by CCPR36 (2004)
 - **087 Dinocap:** The CXL for cucumber, at 0.7 mg/kg, was corrected to 0.07 mg/kg to be consistent with the decision taken by CCPR43 (2011).
 - **095 Acephate:** The CXLs for cabbages, head at 2 mg/kg, and tomato at 1 mg/kg were removed as revoked by CCPR37 (2005)
 - **103 Phosmet:** The CXL for pome fruit at 10 mg/kg was corrected to 3 mg/kg as agreed by CCPR52 (2021).
87. CCPR acknowledged the above adjustments.

Consideration of compounds**027 DIMETHOATE/055 OMETHOATE**

88. CCPR was reminded that the dimethoate and omethoate MRLs for orange, dried pulp (AB 0004) and oranges, sweet, sour (FC 0004), were retained at Step 4, awaiting further review by JMPR.
89. The JMPR Secretariat advised CCPR that they received no additional data to review at their last meeting. The data sponsor indicated that toxicological data was available and could be submitted for review by JMPR in 2024.
90. CCPR agreed to retain the proposed MRLs at Step 4 while awaiting the JMPR review.

062 PIPERONYL BUTOXIDE

91. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR could not recommend MRLs for any commodity due to insufficient trials or limited data obtained from supervised trials. CCPR noted the EU and Switzerland's request that applicants submit complete and high-quality dossiers to make good use of JMPR resources.
92. The EWG Chair on Priorities informed CCPR that the review conducted by the 2023 JMPR was in response to a request for a new use rather than being part of a periodic review and proposed that this compound be moved from Table 2B to Table 2A for discussion at the next year's CCPR meeting and all CXLs be retained.
93. CCPR was of the view that the review carried out by the 2023 JMPR was related to the additional use of this compound and determined that the discussion on how to address this compound should be discussed under Agenda item 10.
94. CCPR agreed to maintain the CXLs of piperonyl butoxide pending confirmation of the submission of a full data package for periodic review, and if there is no commitment for data at CCPR56, agreed that this compound and all related CXLs will be deleted from the Codex Database.

063 PYRETHRINS

95. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR could not recommend MRLs for any commodity due to no trials matching the good agricultural practice (GAP) and/or insufficient data. CCPR noted the request made by the EU and Switzerland that complete and good-quality dossiers be submitted by applicants for the good use of JMPR resources
96. The EWG Chair on Priorities, supported by Ghana, suggested that all CXLs for this compound should be retained and that this compound, currently listed in Table 2B, could be considered for transfer to Table 2A to allow sponsors to evaluate their support and gather the necessary data package for the periodic review process.
97. CCPR55 decided to maintain all existing CXLs for one year, awaiting data submission from sponsors.

072 CARBENDAZIM

98. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that both carbendazim and thiophanate-methyl (077) were re-evaluated under periodic review by the 2017 JMPR. The Secretariat further noted that after two attempts to re-evaluate Carbendazim without sufficient data for toxicological assessment, the WHO Core Assessment Group decided to withdraw the existing ADI and ARfD, which were established almost 30 years ago.
99. India, supported by Iran, Singapore, Uganda, and the Observer of AGROCARE, commented that this compound was still widely used in many countries, including India, to control diseases. Withdrawing the CXLs for this compound would result in trade disruption.
100. The EU and Switzerland considered that the CXLs for this compound should be revoked as the toxicological evaluation for carbendazim was conducted more than 25 years ago, and the 2023 JMPR withdrew its health-based guidance values.
101. The Observer of AGROCARE expressed its commitment to providing data for a future JMPR evaluation.

102. The EWG Chair on Priorities suggested prioritizing this compound on the 2025 Periodic Review List to facilitate JMPR's review in 2025.
103. Noting Members' concerns, CCPR agreed to retain all CXLs for this compound while awaiting data submission from sponsors and the outcome of the 2025 JMPR. If a suitable data package was not submitted to JMPR for assessment in 2025, then CCPR56 will consider deleting this compound and all related CXLs from the Codex Database.

077 THIOPHANATE-METHYL

104. CCPR noted the conclusion by JMPR on the new residue definition and the outcome of intake estimates for thiophanate-methyl, as well as the clarification that the residue definition for thiophanate-methyl includes the metabolite carbendazim (072). The JMPR Secretariat noted that, on this basis, the presence of carbendazim as a metabolite is permitted in very small amounts under the TTC evaluation approach for non-genotoxic compounds.
105. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRL for almonds (TN 0660) as the residue definition used by JMPR was incompatible with the one that the EU adopted for enforcement.
106. Japan informed CCPR that the re-evaluation of this compound has been scheduled for 2024 in Japan. Additional uses will be proposed if enough supervised residue trials matching the GAP are identified.
107. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR while noting the reservation of the EU and Switzerland.

087 DINOCAPI

108. The Codex Secretariat noted that the CXL listed in the Codex database for fruiting vegetables, cucurbits (group, VC 0045) should have a designation indicating the exclusion of cucumbers, squash, summer, and melons, except watermelons, as these commodities are listed independently of the crop grouping.
109. CCPR agreed to add a note to the CXL indicating that the three aforesaid commodities should be excluded from the group CXL while keeping the same value and to forward the revised CXL to CAC for adoption at Step 5/8.

096 CARBOFURAN

110. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that they did not receive any data support from the sponsor to review this compound and recommended that all CXLs be revoked, and the compound be deleted from the Codex database.
111. CCPR agreed to revoke all the CXLs, with subsequent removal of this compound from the Codex pesticide list.

145 CARBOSULFAN

112. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that this compound is related to carbofuran (096). Similarly, they recommended that all CXLs be revoked, except mango and eggplant, in which MRLs were recommended and the exceedance of ARfD was identified.
113. Singapore, supported by the EU, opposed the advancement of the proposed MRLs for eggplant and mango due to the exceedances of the ARfD identified by JMPR based on the latest residue definition for dietary risk assessment.
114. The Observer of CropLife International proposed that JMPR could refine the assessment of carbosulfan based on toxicological data of several metabolites, which had not been considered in the previous assessments conducted by JMPR or other national authorities. The data sponsor committed to submit toxicological data on the metabolites by 2026.
115. The EWG Chair on Priorities informed CCPR that this compound is not currently on the priority list for future review and would need to be nominated for review along with the desired commodities for which data is available.
116. CCPR agreed to:
- retain the proposed MRLs for eggplant and mango at Step 4, awaiting the JMPR review of additional data from the data sponsor; and
 - revoke all other existing CXLs, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

103 PHOSMET

117. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the periodic review of the compound has been scheduled for 2024, considering the identification of exceedance of ARfD in new intake estimates.
118. CCPR acknowledged the clarification provided by the JMPR Secretariat and agreed to maintain all CXLs pending the periodic review of the compound by the 2024 JMPR.

111 IPRIDIONE

119. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for almonds; beans with pods; cane berries (subgroup); cherries (subgroup); onion; peaches (subgroup); and potato, as the genotoxicity of several metabolites was not sufficiently addressed. The EU and Switzerland made a reservation for cane berries due to an acute dietary intake concern for EU consumers for blackberries and raspberries.
120. The EU, supported by Singapore, opposed the advancement of the proposed MRL for broccoli due to an acute toxicity risk identified by JMPR.
121. Thailand expressed a reservation regarding advancing the proposed MRL for broccoli as a health concern was identified according to the risk assessment using Thailand's local food consumption data.
122. CCPR considered JMPR's recommendation to set a separate MRL for potato and potato culls and requested that the data sponsor provide additional information about the residue trials to JMPR for further review.
123. CCPR agreed to:
- withdraw the proposed MRL for broccoli (VB 0440);
 - advance the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption for almond hulls; almonds; bean (hay and/or straw); beans with pods (*Phaseolus* spp.); cane berries (subgroup); cherries (subgroup); onion, bulb; potato; potato, flakes/granules, and to revoke the associated CXLs, together with those for barley; bean (dry); blackberries; carrot; common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); cucumber; grapes; kiwifruit; lettuce, head; lettuce, leaf; peach; pome fruits (group); rape seed; raspberries, red, black; rice, husked; spices, roots, and rhizomes; spices, seeds; strawberry; sugar beet; sunflower seed; tomato; and witloof chicory (sprouts); and
 - maintain the proposed MRL for potato culls at Step 4, awaiting additional information from the data sponsor.

118 CYPERMETHRIN (INCLUDING ALPHA- AND ZETA-CYPERMETHRIN)

124. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the MRLs for avocado and bush berries (subgroup) as an acute health risk, and long-term health risks were identified for EU consumers with exceedances of the ARfD and the ADI.
125. Australia proposed that a designation indicating the source of the residues, such as "A" for alpha-cypermethrin, "C" for cypermethrin, and "Z" for zeta-cypermethrin, should be included in the database for the proposed MRLs. For the recommended CXLs for avocado, bulb vegetables, and bush berries, a "Z" should be listed as a source of zeta-cypermethrin. A lowercase "a" should also be included for bulb vegetables, as there was a previous CXL for bulb onion resulting from alpha-cypermethrin.
126. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, revoke associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR, and add a designation indicating the source of the residues for the proposed MRLs.

120 PERMETHRIN

127. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR could not conclude the residue definition for risk assessment for both plants and animals due to the late submission of key data for the 2023 assessment, and therefore, no MRLs were recommended, nor were levels estimated for use in long-term and acute dietary exposure assessments.
128. The JMPR Secretariat further noted that although they received additional data from the data sponsor, it was still considered insufficient for a conclusive evaluation. CCPR noted the request made by the EU and Switzerland that applicants submit complete and high-quality dossiers to make good use of JMPR resources.
129. The Observer of CropLife International informed CCPR that the data sponsor would submit additional data to allow for a complete JMPR evaluation.
130. Australia, supported by Kenya, proposed retaining all the existing CXLs while awaiting JMPR review of the new data from the data sponsor.
131. CCPR agreed to retain all CXLs while awaiting JMPR review.

130 DIFLUBENZURON

132. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for tea, green, black (fermented and dried) since the possible occurrence of the genotoxic degradation product PCA (4-chloroaniline) could not be excluded.
133. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the metabolite PCA was not included in the residue definition endorsed by JMPR. Based on the toxicological and residue data, the definition of residue and the potential inclusion of PCA will be considered in the next periodic review.
134. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

135 DELTAMETHRIN

135. CCPR55 agreed to advance the proposed MRL for papaya to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

138 METALAXYL

136. CCPR noted that the concern form pertaining to this compound was withdrawn in light of the JMPR's clarification at CCPR54.

142 PROCHLORAZ

137. CCPR noted that the review of this compound was not completed at the 2023 JMPR and would continue at the 2024 JMPR; therefore, there were no recommendations to review at this time.

160 PROPICONAZOLE

138. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations about the advancement of the proposed MRLs for avocado; edible offal (mammalian); eggs; mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; peanut; poultry fats; poultry meat; poultry, edible offal of; and rice, husked, based on the lack of data on the magnitude and toxicity of metabolites expected in plant and animal products that need to be considered in the dietary risk assessment. The EU further noted that in their assessment, the toxicological data were found to be insufficient to conclude on the genotoxic potential and overall toxicity of some of these commodities.
139. The EU noted that an assessment for the triazole derivative metabolites (TDMs) had not been carried out for propiconazole and that the MRL for avocado should be recalculated to cover the whole fruit and pit, giving an MRL of 0.01 mg/kg.
140. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR undertook such an assessment for TDMs in 2008, but that access to the data for the TDMs to cover all triazole active substances was challenging and that the assessment of the TDMs was best undertaken at a national or regional level where relevant intake data would be available. The Secretariat agreed that the MRL for avocado should be 0.01 mg/kg.
141. The United Arab Emirates (UAE) expressed a reservation about advancing the proposed MRL for rice polished (CM 1205) due to health concerns based on the risk assessment with its national data.
142. Singapore, supported by Japan, commented that the proposed MRL of 10 mg/kg for polished rice (CM 1205) appeared to be overestimated based on the processing factor for parboiled polished rice, which was not covered by the definition for polished rice in the *Classification of Food and Feed*. Given the much higher trade volume of polished rice compared to parboiled rice and the difference in the nature of these commodities, these Members suggested JMPR consider establishing separate MRLs for polished rice and parboiled polished rice.
143. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that JMPR's recommendation was based on the highest processing factor for polished rice, and the proposed MRL would be applicable to both polished and parboiled polished rice. The Secretariat further suggested that JMPR could recommend separate MRLs for polished rice and parboiled polished rice if a commodity code were to be added to the Codex database for parboiled polished rice.
144. The Codex Secretariat confirmed that a code for this commodity could be provided if deemed necessary.
145. The Codex Secretariat informed CCPR that the commodity code for meat (from mammals other than marine mammals) has recently been changed in the revised Classification to be replaced by muscle and that the 2023 JMPR has recommended an MRL for meat as JMPR has not yet considered the implications of the change of the commodity code from meat to muscle. The MRL for meat may need to consider a new recommendation at its next review of this compound.
146. CCPR agreed to:
- revise the proposed MRL for avocado to 0.01 mg/kg, and advance it to Step 5/8 for adoption;
 - retain the proposed MRL for rice, polished, at Step 4, awaiting further clarification from JMPR; and
 - advance the remaining proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, with subsequent revocation of the associated existing CXLs, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

178 BIFENTHRIN

147. The CCPR Secretariat reminded CCPR that the proposed MRL for the lettuce head was retained at Step 4, awaiting an alternative GAP from the data sponsor. The Observer of CropLife International advised CCPR that the previously identified alternative GAP for bifenthrin was no longer valid, and another alternative GAP was not provided.
148. Due to a lack of alternative GAP, CCPR agreed to withdraw the proposed MRL for the lettuce, head.

202 FIPRONIL

149. CCPR agreed to continue retaining all existing CXLs and the proposed MRLs at Step 4 under the 4-year rule while awaiting JMPR review.

216 INDOXACARB

150. The JMPR Secretariat acknowledged the concerns of the EU regarding dietary exposure exceeding the ARfD established by the EU and the toxicological concerns for the metabolite IN-JT333. In response to the concern form submitted by the EU, the 2023 JMPR advised CCPR that there was no concrete evidence to substantiate the request for reprioritization of the periodic review of indoxacarb.
151. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that dietary exposures exceeded the ARfD established by JMPR, but only slightly.
152. The EWG Chair on Priorities informed CCPR that this compound was currently listed in Table 2B and pending transfer to Table 2A, the Periodic Review List of Compounds. The EWG Chair proposed moving the compound to Table 2A to enable its future nomination for the Periodic Review List and suggested that this compound could be discussed at the 2025 CCPR meeting for possible review by JMPR in 2026 and encouraged sponsors to prepare data packages for JMPR review.
153. CCPR acknowledged the clarification made by the JMPR Secretariat and noted that JMPR would consider additional written comments from the EU. CCPR recommended that the proposal for prioritization be addressed under Agenda item 10.

221 BOSCALID

154. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for pomegranate to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

224 DIFENOCONAZOLE

155. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRLs for cane berries; mustard greens; radish; radish leaves; stone fruits; maize cereals (subgroup); and sweet potatoes, pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic review in the EU. Additionally, the EU noted that for Chinese cabbage and kale, the proposed Codex MRL could result in ARfD exceedances for EU consumers.
156. Thailand expressed a reservation regarding the advancement of the proposed MRL for mustard greens, as a health concern was identified according to the risk assessment using Thailand's local food consumption data.
157. The Observer of CropLife International informed CCPR that, as there is a recommended MRL of 1.5 mg/kg for stone fruits, the current CXLs for cherries (subgroup) of 0.2 mg/kg, nectarines of 0.5 mg/kg, peach of 0.5 mg/kg and plums (including fresh prunes) (subgroup) could be revoked. The Observer further noted that the proposed MRL of 4 mg/kg for prunes (FS 0014) should apply to prunes (dry) and not plums (including fresh prunes). The JMPR Secretariat agreed with the amendments.
158. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR, with the associated CXLs for stone fruits revoked and a correction made to the entry of prunes.

238 CLOTHIANIDIN

159. CCPR noted that the 2023 JMPR considered new uses of thiamethoxam (245), and as clothianidin is a major metabolite of thiamethoxam, and that JMPR also recommended MRLs for clothianidin.
160. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for cumin seed; fruiting vegetables other than cucurbits (group) (except goji berry); goji berry; onion bulb; stems and petioles (subgroup); and tree nuts (group), due to concerns about the impact of thiamethoxam and its metabolite clothianidin on the worldwide decline of pollinators. The EU and Switzerland reiterated that environmental issues of global concern would be considered when determining whether to accept CXLs.
161. Japan disagreed with the view of the EU and Switzerland on the impact on pollinators and suggested that MRLs are not an appropriate tool for addressing environmental issues, including the protection of pollinators, with the explanation that residue levels in food are not in proportion to their risk to pollinators.
162. JMPR Secretariat clarified that recommendations for the group of tree nuts were based on sufficient residue data on almonds and pecans and critical GAP available to the 2023 JMPR. The United Kingdom confirmed the clarification.
163. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption and to revoke associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

245 THIAMETHOXAM

164. Similar to the related compound clothianidin (238), the EU and Switzerland expressed reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for cumin seed; fruiting vegetables other than cucurbits (group) (except goji berry); goji berry; onion bulb; stems, and petioles (subgroup); tree nuts (group), due to concerns about the impact of thiamethoxam and its metabolite clothianidin on the worldwide decline of pollinators. The EU and Switzerland reiterated that environmental issues of global concern would be considered when determining whether to accept CXLs.
165. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption and to revoke associated CXLs as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

243 FLUOPYRAM

166. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRLs for barley; buckwheat; oats; rye; sorghum; triticale; wheat; edible offal (mammalian); mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); eggs; milks; poultry, edible offal of; poultry fats, and poultry meat, pending the review of the dietary burden calculations in the JMPR evaluation report, once available.
167. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the dietary burden calculations would be included as an amendment to the JMPR report.
168. Russia sought clarification on why the MRL for oats increased from 0.2 mg/kg to 0.4 mg/kg.
169. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that the recommendation was solely based on the outcome of their scientific review of the data available.
170. CCPR noted the comment from the Observer of CropLife International that the new uses evaluated by the 2023 JMPR represent critical use in the USA and Canada, which is a lower application rate than previously assessed by JMPR that is no longer registered. CropLife International further informed CCPR that they no longer have registrations on cereals outside Northern America.
171. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption and to revoke all the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

246 ACETAMIPRID

172. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations about the advancement of the proposed MRL for soya bean dry and requested that the MRL be flagged with an asterisk, indicating that residues above the limit of quantification (LOQ) are not expected.
173. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that the MRL for soya bean dry was not flagged with an asterisk due to some detectable residues identified in JMPR's evaluation.
174. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

247 EMAMECTIN BENZOATE

175. The EU informed CCPR that some of the metabolites of emamectin benzoate may have a higher toxicity than the parent compound and that JMPR may want to consider this at the next review.
176. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that data on 3 metabolites of emamectin was collected from trials with animals that are not an appropriate proxy for human dietary risk assessment and that the recommendations made by JMPR regarding the metabolites were therefore based on a TTC approach for non-genotoxic compounds, but further reduced by a factor 3 due to the low ADI for emamectin itself are appropriate.
177. CCPR noted that the 2023 JMPR reconfirmed this compound's previously established ADI and ARfD.

248 FLUTRIAFOL

178. On behalf of the data sponsor, the Observer of CropLife International advised CCPR that the compound was listed on the Priority Schedule for review by JMPR in 2026 and that data covering rice commodities would be included in the data submission.
179. CCPR agreed to retain the proposed MRLs at Step 4, awaiting JMPR review.

255 DINOTEFURAN

180. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRLs for fruiting vegetables other than cucurbits (group) (except goji berry) and goji berry, pending the assessment of an import tolerance.
181. CCPR55 agreed to advance the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption and to revoke the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

263 CYANTRANILIPROLE

182. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRLs for dry beans (subgroup); dry peas (subgroup); grapes; olives; and olives for oil production due to discrepancies in the MRL calculations and details of the residue decline studies that need to be confirmed in the JMPR report. The reservation was based on the following points:
- For soya beans in the "beans, dry" subgroup, the EU proposed establishing a lower MRL of 0.04 mg/kg.
 - For grapes, the details and rationales for excluding the first application should be contained in the JMPR evaluation report to justify the decision.
 - For table olives and olives used for oil production, the EU had established an MRL of 3 mg/kg, based on the critical GAP (cGAP) applied in the EU Member state of Malta.
183. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that the 2023 JMPR recommended MRLs for a subgroup of dry beans and the subgroup of dry peas based on the combined residue data of bean, dry; pea, dry; and soybean, dry for mutual support. Regarding the olives and olives used for oil production, the Secretariat further clarified that they established those MRLs based on the available data and suggested that the recommendation could be refined if additional data were provided.
184. The Observer of CropLife International supported the EU's established MRL of 3 mg/kg for olives and olives used for production and requested a review of the calculations by JMPR.
185. The EU proposed retaining the proposed MRLs for olives for oil production and table olives at Step 4, while awaiting the JMPR review on the calculations.
186. The JMPR Secretariat agreed to review their evaluations and would notify CCPR56 if the MRL recommendations should be revised.
187. CCPR agreed to:
- retain the proposed MRLs for table olives and olives used for oil production at Step 4, while awaiting JMPR's clarification; and
 - advance the remaining proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, with subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs.

267 IMAZAPYR

188. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

273 CYFLUMETOFEN

189. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRL for coffee beans due to the lack of metabolism studies in a representative commodity for coffee beans (classified as pulses), which should be included pursuant to the FAO manual. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that in this specific case the metabolism in coffee is sufficiently addressed by the available data based on scientific considerations.
190. The EU informed CCPR that a more cGAP for hops was submitted in the EU and that, according to the study conducted in the EU, the MRL derived from that GAP is 30 mg/kg rather than the existing proposed MRL of 15 mg/kg. The EU further encouraged the data sponsor to submit the data for the EU GAP for hops to JMPR for review.
191. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption.

291 OXATHIPIPROLIN

192. The EU noted that the advancement of the proposed MRL for avocado as the recalculation of the residue levels measured in avocados without pit to the whole fruit would yield a lower MRL of 0.07 mg/kg
193. The EU also requested that the applicant share with JMPR the EU GAP and support hop trials to align the Codex MRL with the EU MRL.
194. The JMPR Secretariat agreed with the EU's observation that the MRL for avocados should be lower when accounting for the whole commodity.
195. CCPR agreed to revise the proposed MRL for Avocado to 0.07 mg/kg and advance it with other proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption.

306 FLUAZINAM

196. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the 2023 JMPR could not accomplish the evaluation of this compound due to the late submission of data on metabolites and impurities, and the assessment would be continued at the 2024 JMPR.
197. The EU requested that the applicant submit complete and high-quality dossiers to best use JMPR resources.
198. CCPR noted the information provided and its previous decision on this compound's ID number (see paragraph 69).

317 TRIFLUMURON

199. CCPR noted that triflumuron has been included in the toxicological monograph from the 2022 JMPR meeting.

320 MEFENTRIFLUCONAZOLE

200. Singapore informed CCPR that it did not support the advancement of the proposed MRLs for lettuce, leaf, and spinach due to potential acute toxicity risks for Singapore's consumers.
201. The EU, Switzerland, and Australia supported Singapore's view and suggested that the proposed MRLs for lettuce, leaf, and spinach should be withdrawn.
202. The Observer of CropLife International informed CCPR that there was no alternative GAP for leafy greens (subgroup) at this moment, and they could not commit to the availability of an alternative GAP for risk assessment in the future.
203. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for lettuce, head to Step 5/8 for adoption, and withdraw the proposed MRLs for lettuce, leaf; leafy greens (subgroup); and spinach as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

324 TETRANILIPROLE

204. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about advancing the proposed MRL for mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup) as there was a lack of available toxicological data at the EU level.
205. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption, withdrawing the previous proposed MRL, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR, noting the EU's reservation.

326 BROFLANILIDE

206. CCPR was advised to correct the commodity code VL 0466 Chinese cabbage (type pak-choi) at 2 mg/kg by VB 0467 Chinese cabbage (type Pe-tsai) for consistency with the MRL recommendation arising from the 2022 JMPR.
207. CCPR agreed to forward the revised CXL for VB 0467 Chinese cabbage (type Pe-tsai) at 2 mg/kg to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5/8 and to revoke the CXL for VL 0466 Chinese cabbage (type pak-choi).

330 ISOFLUCYPRAM

208. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRLs for barley; edible offal (mammalian); eggs; mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; poultry, edible offal of; poultry fats; poultry meat; triticale; and wheat pending the outcome of the ongoing evaluation in the EU.
209. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

331 1,4-DIMETHYLNAPHTHALENE

210. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

332 FLORYLPICOXAMID

211. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRLs for bananas; citrus oil, edible; edible offal (mammalian); eggplants (subgroup); eggs; fruiting vegetables, cucurbits (cucumbers and summer squashes) (subgroup); fruiting vegetables, cucurbits (melons, pumpkins, and winter squashes) (subgroup); grapes; lentil; mammalian fats (except milk fats); mango; meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; peppers, chili; peppers, sweet; poultry, edible offal of; poultry fats; poultry meat; rape seed; strawberry; sugar beet; tomatoes (subgroup); and wheat awaiting the outcome of an ongoing EU assessment of import tolerance.
212. The EU further requested that the MRLs for lentils; poultry fat; meat; and edible offal be flagged with an asterisk indicating that residues above the LOQ are not expected. The JMPR Secretariat agreed with this observation.
213. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

334 ISOCYCLOSERAM

214. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for broccoli; Brussels sprouts; cabbages, head; cauliflower; cherries (subgroup); coffee beans; cotton seed; cucumber; edible offal (mammalian) eggplant; lemons and limes (including citron) (subgroup); maize; mammalian fats (except milk fats); mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); melons, except watermelon; milks; onion, bulb; oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids) (subgroup); peaches (including apricots and nectarine) (subgroup); peppers, chili; peppers, sweet (including pimento or pimienta); plums (including fresh prunes) (subgroup); pome fruits (group); potato; pummelo and grapefruits (including Shaddock-like hybrids, among others grapefruit) (subgroup); soya bean (dry); squash, summer; and tomato; due to lack of available toxicological data at EU level.
215. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

335 ISOTIANIL

216. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation about the advancement of the proposed MRLs for banana; edible offal (mammalian); lemons and limes (including citron) (subgroup); mammalian fats (except milk fats); mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids) (subgroup); poultry, edible offal of; poultry fats; poultry meat; and pummelo and grapefruits (including Shaddock-like hybrids, among others grapefruit) (subgroup), awaiting the outcome of an ongoing EU assessment of import tolerance.
217. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

336 MEPIQUAT CHLORIDE

218. Australia requested clarification for cottonseed, delinted, noting that the 2023 JMPR estimated a supervised trial median residue (STMR) for use in the risk assessment rather than an MRL recommendation.
219. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that JMPR only estimated an STMR, and there is no MRL recommendation for cotton seed delinted.
220. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

337 TRICYCLAZOLE

221. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

General conclusion

222. CCPR:
- (i) agreed to forward to CAC47 (2024):
 - (a) MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix II).
 - (b) CXLs for revocation by CAC (Appendix III).
 - (c) Consequential amendments to CXLs for peppers groups and subgroups to implement the decision taken by CCPR on MRLs for okra (Appendix VII).
 - (ii) noted that:
 - (a) MRLs in the Step Procedure that have been withdrawn (discontinuation of work) and to inform CAC accordingly (Appendix IV).
 - (b) MRLs retained at Steps 4 and 7 are attached as Appendices VI and V (for information).
 - (iii) noted alignments of CXLs in the Codex database with previous CCPR and CAC decisions that do not require further action by CAC;
 - (iv) forward a consequential amendment to Class D – Processed Foods of Plant Origin of the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) (Appendix VIII);
 - (v) request JMPR to retain ID 306 for fluazinam and to assign ID 333 to a new compound;
 - (vi) noted the conversion of GLs into MRLs retained at Step 4 (Appendix VI); and
 - (vii) noted that the Codex Secretariat, in collaboration with the JMPR Secretariat, will review the CXLs for milks and milk fat in the Codex database to address CCPR40's recommendation to incorporate a footnote to these CXLs.

GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING THE PURITY AND STABILITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS AND RELATED STOCK SOLUTIONS OF PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (At Step 4) (Agenda item 7)¹⁹

223. India, as Chair of the Electronic Working Group (EWG), the Virtual Working Group (VWG) convened prior to CCPR55, and the in-session Working Group (ISWG) convened by CCPR55, also speaking on behalf of the co-Chairs Argentina and Singapore, introduced the item and recalled the background of the work, the EWG's mandate, the work process, key points of discussions, and revisions made by the EWG, VWG, and ISWG.
224. The EWG Chair explained that to facilitate discussion, the VWG and ISWG had further revised the guidelines based on written comments submitted to the Session in reply to CL 2024/45-PR and comments made by Members participating in the VWG and ISWG. A revised document was presented in CRD27 for CCPR's consideration.
225. CCPR was invited to consider advancing the guidelines to Step 5, noting that sufficient progress had been made to advance the document in the Step Procedure while recognizing that some refinements may still be needed, including incorporating provisions to cover mixed pesticide standards solutions.
226. CCPR agreed to use CRD27 as the basis for discussions.

Discussion

227. CCPR noted the general support for the work done so far and on expanding the scope to cover mixed pesticide standard solutions. Members acknowledged that, in advancing the guidelines to Step 5, further deliberations could still take place at CCPR56 (2025) and agreed that the document, as presented in CRD27, could be advanced in the Step Procedure for adoption by CAC47 and further consideration by CCPR56.
228. A Member highlighted the usefulness of the guidelines for its country in ensuring food safety and facilitating international trade, as the country faced challenges such as the high cost, limited shelf life, and late supply of reference materials because of supply chain constraints.
229. The Codex Secretariat indicated that procedurally, it was necessary to inform CAC and CCEXEC about expanding the scope of the guidelines to cover mixed pesticide standard solutions. As there was already general support in CCPR for extending the scope, the EWG could be re-established to incorporate relevant provisions for mixed pesticide standard solutions.

Conclusion

230. CCPR agreed to:
- (i) forward the Guidelines for Monitoring the Stability and Purity of Reference Materials and Related Stock Solutions of Pesticides during Prolonged Storage (Appendix IX) to CAC47 for adoption Step 5;
 - (ii) expand the scope of the guidelines to cover mixtures of pesticides and to inform CCEXEC and CAC accordingly; and
 - (iii) re-establish the EWG, chaired by India, and co-chaired by Canada, Iran, and Singapore, working in English to:
 - (a) include provisions for monitoring the stability and purity of mixed pesticide standard solutions;
 - (b) refine relevant sections in the document as necessary; and
 - (c) submit the revised guidelines for consideration at CCPR56.

MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW (Agenda item 8)²⁰

231. Chile, as Chair of the EWG, also speaking on behalf of the co-Chairs Ecuador, India, and Kenya, introduced the item, recalled the background of the work and the mandate, explained the work process, and summarized key points of discussion, conclusions, and recommendations of the EWG, i.e., to revoke the CXLs for bitertanol (144), fenthion (39), parathion-methyl (59), amitraz (122), dinocap (87) (except those commodities for which CXLs were set for meptyldinocap (244) until the periodic review of this compound) and methamidophos (100) (except those commodities for which CXLs were set due to residues of methamidophos arises from acephate use) as described in CX/PR 24/55/7, paragraph 21.

¹⁹ CL 2024/45-PR; CX/PR 24/55/6; CX/PR 24/55/6-Add.1 (Comments of Argentina, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Peru, Saudi Arabia, UAE, USA, and International Commission for Uniform Methods of Sugar Analysis (ICUMSA))

²⁰ CL 2024/46-PR, CX/PR 24/55/7; CX/PR 24/55/7-Add.1 (Comments of Australia, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, EU, Malawi, Peru, Sierra Leone, UAE, United Kingdom, and USA)

232. The EWG Chair recalled that most Members who submitted comments in reply to CL 2024/46-PR supported the recommendations in paragraph 21 of the working document. However, during the virtual meeting of the working group (VWG) held prior to the Session, some countries expressed concern over the revocation of the CXLs associated with these compounds and indicated that further time was needed to examine them in line with the management approach for unsupported compounds agreed by CCPR54 as described in REP23/PR54, Appendix XII, paragraph 10. In view of this, the VWG recommended that CCPR delay the decision to revoke these compounds one year to allow countries to gather relevant data to support the periodic review of these compounds.
233. The EWG Chair further clarified that the EWG was not in a position to generate data to support the periodic review of compounds that have not received support from the manufacturer. Still, it could assist countries concerned with the potential revocation of the CXLs, to seek assistance from other stakeholders who may be interested in supporting the CXLs/compounds. In that case, the four-year rule could be applied to facilitate data gathering. However, he noted that these compounds underwent periodic review more than 25 years ago; hence, they should be considered for revocation if no commitment to submitting the relevant data package could be confirmed at CCPR56 (2025).

Discussion

234. CCPR noted the general support for the recommendations of the VWG and stated the following comments:
- It was necessary to generate data, especially toxicological data, to support the periodic review of these compounds to maintain them in the Codex list of pesticides.
 - Presenting the results of the EWG's work at CCPR56 would give Members another year to consider these compounds further and seek assistance from sponsors or other stakeholders who might be able to provide the required data to support the periodic review.
 - While recognizing the high toxicity of methamidophos and the need to phase out its use as a pesticide globally, revocation of its CXLs required more careful deliberation since its residue also arises from the use of acephate. The same would apply to the revocation of CXLs for any compound whose metabolite is contained in the residue definition of another compound or which itself is the metabolite of another compound. In the case of methamidophos, other crops besides those mentioned in CX/PR 22/54/7, paragraph 21 seem to have been established based on residues arising from acephate uses. Revocation of methamidophos CXLs should be considered in conjunction with the periodic review of acephate.
 - Revoking the CXLs due to periodic review of compounds should not lead to trade disruption.
 - The residue definitions of meptyldinocap and acephate could be redefined by factoring in the more toxic metabolites dinocap and methamidophos, respectively. This could be done by following the precedence of the pesticide pairs of dimethoate and omethoate, as well as carbosulfan and carbofuran when omethoate and carbofuran were delisted.
 - The management approach for internal use by CCPR indicates that if no support is obtained according to points 5 to 10 of the management approach, the Committee will ask again for support. If there is no support, revocation will occur at the next session of the Committee.
235. A Member informed CCPR that there will be trial data for amitraz in chili pepper that can be submitted in 2025 for JMPR evaluation. It was noted that this substance is important, and Members still use it while there is trial data for evaluation, but there is no current support on toxicology data.

Conclusion

236. CCPR noted that most Members who responded to CL 2024/46-PR supported the preliminary recommendations from the EWG to revoke the CXLs for amitraz, bitertanol, fenthion, parathion methyl, dinocap, and methamidophos as presented in CX/PR 24/55/7, paragraph 21.
237. CCPR agreed that, in accordance with the Management approach for internal use by CCPR (REP23/PR54, Appendix XII), if no support is obtained according to points 5-10 of the Management approach, the Committee will ask again for support and submission of the suitable data package for the JMPR periodic review of bitertanol, fenthion and parathion-methyl, amitraz, dinocap, and methamidophos. If there is no support by submitting a suitable data package, CCPR56 (2025) will recommend revocation of the CXLs by CAC48 (2025).
238. CCPR also agreed to re-establish an EWG on the Management of Unsupported Compounds without Public Health Concerns scheduled for Periodic Review to implement the internal approach chaired by Chile and co-chaired by Australia, Ecuador, Kenya, and India, working in English with the following terms of reference (ToRs):

- (i) to further examine amitraz, dinocap/meptyldinocap, methamidophos/acephate, bitertanol, fenthion, and parathion-methyl according to the management approach;
- (ii) to coordinate with EWG Chair on Priorities in accordance with the management approach; and
- (iii) based on the above, present the results for consideration by CCPR56.

NATIONAL REGISTRATION OF PESTICIDES (Agenda item 9)²¹

239. Germany, as Chair of the EWG, also speaking on behalf of the co-Chair Australia, introduced the item, recalled the background of the work and the mandate, explained the work process, and summarized key points of discussion, conclusions, and recommendations of the EWG on advancing work on the national registration database (NRD). The EWG Chair explained that the overall number of responding countries on the status of their national registration of pesticides remains low and mainly accounts for countries of the EU region; based on the replies, it was possible to identify those pesticides within the respective groups (1, 2, 3) that were more relevant in these countries.
240. The EWG Chair further explained that there were some compounds for which support by data sponsors would be expected. If this support could not be provided, it would be possible to identify recent evaluations that could be used to support these compounds. Other compounds were important in countries outside the EU, and the EWG could discuss the next steps on Unsupported Compounds as they are reaching the time for periodic review (i.e., 15 years). The decision-making would become more difficult for substances that were not often used and would unlikely receive support from the data sponsor. This might raise further questions on how to grade the importance of substances and how to find data and data supporters.
241. The EWG Chair further indicated that comments submitted in reply to CL 2024/47-PR were constructive and would allow further improvements to the NRD.

Discussion

242. A Member sought clarification on the list of compounds recorded in Table 2B and how this would impact the work on the NRD. Australia, speaking as Chair of the EWG on Priorities, noted that Table 2B listed compounds that have been evaluated 15 years ago or more but have not yet been scheduled or listed for periodic review and hence have yet to move to Table 2A scheduling compounds for evaluation by JMPR (including periodic reviews). Australia further noted that the focus of the work would not be on the entire list of compounds in Table 2B but on those entering the list in Table 2B, which are not expected to be that extensive (more or less 10 compounds depending on the year), and this should be a manageable workload to continue building the NRD.
243. Chile, as Chair of the EWG on Unsupported Compounds, sought clarification on the proposed work that should be carried out if the work of the EWG on NRD would be transferred to the EWG on Unsupported Compounds. The Codex Secretariat explained that the work that Germany has carried out as EWG Chair would become part of the tasks of the EWG on Unsupported Compounds. In addition, the EWG on Unsupported Compounds should consider the compounds included in Group 3 (compounds that reach 15 - 19 years since their last periodic review in 2023) to seek support for a future periodic review. Noting the explanation, Chile agreed to undertake work on the NRD in the EWG on Unsupported Compounds.
244. CCPR noted that Dr Karsten Hohgardt (Germany) would soon retire. The Committee acknowledged and thanked Dr Hohgardt for his long-standing contribution to the Committee's work, which extended to more than 30 years of service, including his leadership and contribution to the work on the database on national registration of pesticides.

Conclusion

245. CCPR agreed to transfer the work on NRD to the EWG on Unsupported Compounds. The EWG on Unsupported Compounds should uptake the following additional tasks:
- (i) Continue developing the NRD with compounds that will go to Table 2B of the priority list each year.
 - (ii) Consider the compounds listed in Group 3 from this year's exercise to seek support for their periodic review.
246. CCPR accepted Germany's offer to assist the EWG Chair on Unsupported Compounds to ensure a smooth transition of tasks from the EWG on NRD to the EWG on Unsupported Compounds.
247. CCPR also agreed that Germany and the Codex Secretariat will work on a survey to determine the needs and type of training materials or capacity-building activities that would facilitate Member countries' understanding and use of the NRD.

²¹ CL 2024/47; CX/PR 24/55/8; CX/PR 24/55/8-Add.1 (Comments of Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, EU, India, Peru, Sierra Leone, and UAE)

ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR (Agenda item 10)²²

248. Australia, as Chair of the EWG on the Priority List, introduced the item on Codex Schedules and Priorities and the revised Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides. The EWG Chair explained that he had prepared CRD02 to facilitate discussion, which contained the Schedules and Priority Lists for 2025, 2026, and beyond.

2025 Schedule for JMPR Evaluations

249. The EWG Chair noted that, for the proposed Schedule for evaluation by JMPR in 2025, which was presented in Appendix A of CRD 02, there were six compounds (with two reserve compounds) nominated on the “new compound” list and 20 compounds (with three reserve compounds) nominated on the “new use – other” list.
250. The EWG Chair further noted that following the discussion of Agenda item 13, *Analysis of previous decisions by CCPR to establish MRLs for tomato and pepper to establish corresponding MRLs in eggplant* (CX/PR 24/55/12), CCPR agreed that, to enable JMPR to consider recommending MRLs for eggplants based on extrapolation without introducing new compound nominations to the priority list, an additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) would be added to compounds that were both addressed in CX/PR 24/55/12 and were already included on the priority list for other commodities.
251. The EWG Chair further explained that nominations for the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) were consequently added for five compounds, namely pyriproxyfen (200), pyraclostrobin (210), fludioxonil (211), metaflumizone (236), and flubendiamide (242) which were already included on the 2025 new use list. Additionally, nominations were also added for the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) for three compounds, i.e., buprofezin (173), spinetoram (233), and flupyradifurone (285), tentatively listed on the priority list for JMPR evaluation in 2026 or 2027.

Discussion

252. CCPR noted general support for adding the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) to the nominations for pyriproxyfen, fludioxonil, flubendiamide, metaflumizone, and pyraclostrobin. Following interventions from Members and an Observer regarding the importance of spinetoram in the African region, CCPR also noted support for moving the nominations for spinetoram from the 2026 priority list to the 2025 priority list as a reserve compound.
253. Ten compounds were proposed for the 2025 periodic review evaluations. Seven of these compounds were under the four-year rule, while carbendazim was added following discussion at CCPR55. Sponsors were requested to submit a complete dossier for the periodic reviews by JMPR following the JMPR data call-in expected in December 2024. Depending on available resources, approximately six compounds with complete dossiers were expected to be selected from this list for JMPR consideration.
254. A Member Organization noted that all Members and Observers should be aware of the year of the last evaluation of the compounds and recalled that for all substances that meet the 25 years since the last review or periodic review, full toxicological evaluations are then considered outdated; hence, these substances may be of public health concern. Therefore, the MO considers that these substances should be immediately reviewed within a period of four years (if the four-year rule is requested), or all CXLs should be withdrawn.
255. Iran requested clarification on the MRL proposed for tree nuts (group) for clothianidin (238) and suggested that, as residues in pistachios can be higher, the proposed MRL for tree nuts should exclude pistachios. Iran committed to providing data on pistachio for a future evaluation by JMPR.
256. The Schedule for JMPR evaluation 2025, as presented in CRD02, was supported by CCPR with a few amendments:
- Spinetoram was shifted to the 2025 priority list as a reserve compound.
 - A Member requested that the additional commodity of Thai eggplant be added to the existing nomination for indoxacarb (216) and that the additional commodity of Chinese broccoli be added to the existing nomination for spinetoram.
 - At the request of the manufacturer of ipflufenquin, the commodities for that existing new compound nomination were updated to apple, pear, almond, macadamia nut, and tea.

Public Health Concerns

257. CCPR was advised that Members submitted no new Public Health Concerns to CCPR55.

²² CX/PR 24/55/9

Priority lists for 2026 and beyond

258. The EWG Chair noted that the tentative priority list for new compounds, new uses, and periodic reviews for 2026 and beyond was provided for awareness in Appendix B of CRD02. CCPR noted that the number of new use and other evaluation nominations tentatively scheduled for 2026 (29) exceeded the number of assessments typically conducted by the JMPR in any given year (approximately 20). India referred to CRD18, in which they nominated additional compounds for new uses in spices. Thailand also referred to CRD13, in which they nominated an additional new use for Thai eggplant.
259. The EWG Chair noted that, for future periodic reviews, 22 compounds were listed in Table 2A of the priority list and tentatively scheduled for periodic review in 2026, 2027, or 2028. Indoxacarb (216), piperonyl butoxide (062), pyrethrins (063), and methyl bromide (052) were added to this list following discussion at CCPR55. The EWG Chair further highlighted that it was important for Members and Observers to indicate if there was support for these compounds and that it was, therefore, necessary to provide advice on support and the availability of contemporary toxicology and residue trials dossiers to the EWG on priorities prior to CCPR56 (2025).

Nominations for Parallel Review

260. The EWG Chair advised CCPR that no nominations had been received for a compound for Parallel Review.

Conclusion

261. CCPR agreed to:
- (i) endorse the proposed priority list of Pesticides for evaluation by the 2025 JMPR and submitted it to CAC47 for approval (Appendix X); and
 - (ii) re-establish the EWG on Schedules and Priorities, chaired by Australia, working in English, to provide a report on the Schedules and Priority Lists for consideration at the next meeting of CCPR.

ENHANCEMENT OF THE OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF CCPR AND JMPR (Agenda item 11)²³

262. The United States of America, as Chair of the EWG, also speaking on behalf of the Co-Chairs Costa Rica and Uganda, introduced the item, recalled the background to the work and the mandate, explained the work process, and summarized key points of discussion, conclusions, and recommendations of the EWG.
263. The EWG Chair recalled that identifying an approach to enhance the operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR would require balancing the shorter-term needs of stakeholders to reduce the backlog of scheduled evaluations with longer-term strategic efforts to increase JMPR's review capacity. The EWG Chair further recalled that the discussion paper proposed that CCPR adopt a multiprong approach, with short-term work for a period of three years (2024-2026) and long-term work over three or five years (2026-2028).
264. The EWG Chair also presented the results of the virtual meeting of the working group (VWG) held prior to the Session and highlighted that the VWG had agreed that the EWG had completed its ToR, agreed on the considerations made for the short- and long-term approaches as described in CX/PR 24/55/10, Appendix I and that, the EWG should be re-established with a ToR that focused on the short-term approaches. In making such a recommendation, the VWG had considered comments submitted in reply to CL 2024/48-PR and those provided by the FAO and WHO JMPR Secretariats during the virtual meeting.

Discussion

265. The JMPR Secretariat, recalling previous discussion on this matter and the issues raised by JMPR (2023), in particular points 2.5 (rolling of submission of data) and 2.7 (enhancement of JMPR processes) of the general considerations in the 2023 JMPR Report, requested CCPR to consider adding in the ToR of the EWG for its work on short-term approaches, another mechanism to ensure JMPR's resources would be used efficiently to reduce the backlog of the evaluations.
266. A Member stated that in the case of the short-term approach, CCPR could increase its level of ambition for both CCPR and JMPR and establish a program of targeted projects to improve JMPR's evaluation process, with the first of such projects to be completed in the period 2024-2026. The Member also noted that having a compliance or admissibility check would allow to immediately reject dossiers that did not meet the requested benchmarks, resulting in better management of time and resources. The Member further clarified that for long-term approaches and the proposed organizational review by FAO/WHO, this should be informed by wider perspectives on current and future pest management, including the work of JMPM. After all, the use of pesticides may not always be the optimum, balanced solution to address issues of food safety, food security, and sustainability of food systems.

²³ CL 2024/48-PR; CX/PR 24/55/10; CX/PR 24/55/10-Add.1 (Comments of Canada, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Iraq, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, UAE, and United Kingdom)

267. Another Member stated that having more resources was essential to allow JMPR to continue doing its work.
268. A Member Organization noted that, while more compounds needed to be considered and periodic reviews scheduled, the quality and timeliness of dossiers submitted by data sponsors were not satisfactory for proceeding with the work correctly, and this had become a recurring problem that should be addressed as part of the short-term approach.
269. An Observer, recalling the challenges related to JMPR's resources, acknowledged that data submitters could further improve the overall quality of the dossiers submitted for consideration by JMPR; however, other actions could also be taken to improve the efficiency of the work of both CCPR and JMPR. The Observer indicated that considering the 12 compounds' yearly evaluations and the approximate number of 225 compounds in the Codex database for MRLs for pesticides, JMPR could consider taking 21 evaluations each year, divided into six new compounds and 15 reevaluations to reduce the backlog of the evaluations.
270. Australia, speaking as the EWG Chair on Priorities, noted that the EWG could support the priority list development should there be agreement and resources available for an extraordinary meeting.
271. The EWG Chair informed CCPR that the USA was exploring how to improve financial and other types of support for JMPR's work and that it would develop and submit a detailed proposal for discussion at CCPR56 (2025).

Conclusion

272. CCPR agreed with the short and long-term approaches as presented in CX/PR 24/55/10, Appendix I, and that, as a first step, the work would focus on the short-term approaches that could constitute the new mandate of the EWG. The feedback provided by JMPR (2023) and comments provided by Members and Observers in reply to CL 2024/48-PR and during the VWG could further inform the work of the EWG on the short-term approaches.
273. CCPR thus agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by the USA and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Uganda, working in English and Spanish, to support work on the proposed short-term approaches, with the following ToR:
- (i) Facilitate collaboration with Codex Members and stakeholders to determine if support and resources are available to convene an extraordinary meeting of JMPR. If support is identified, the EWG will collaborate with the EWG on the schedule/priority list to determine the timeline and nomination process. If support is not available, the EWG will seek input on other approaches that CCPR and JMPR could adopt to reduce the backlog of evaluations.
 - (ii) Solicit input from Codex Members and stakeholders to get recommendations on targeted projects that may enhance CCPR and JMPR's current evaluation process. As part of this effort, the EWG will seek input on mechanisms to ensure current JMPR resources are used efficiently.
 - (iii) Based on (i) and (ii), provide a status update at CCPR56 (2025) and make recommendations on future activities.

COORDINATION OF WORK BETWEEN CCPR AND CCRVDF: JOINT CCPR/CCRVDF WORKING GROUP ON COMPOUNDS FOR DUAL USE – STATUS OF WORK (Agenda item 12)²⁴

274. New Zealand, as Co-Chair of the Joint EWG, also speaking on behalf of the USA (Chair) and Brazil (Co-Chair), provided background information on the establishment of the Joint EWG and a status update on efforts to coordinate work between CCPR and CCRVDF.
275. The Joint EWG Co-Chair recalled that the ToR of the Joint EWG covered work to:
- identify and prioritize issues affecting both committees and recommend ways to address the issues and inform CAC accordingly;
 - develop a list of compounds with dual use as a pesticide and veterinary drug for which no or only one Codex MRL has been established, with Member countries providing the information to populate this list;
 - identify dual-use compounds that have different Codex MRLs for a similar edible commodity of animal origin and recommend, on a case-by-case basis, a single, harmonized MRL(s) for the compound(s) and affected commodity(ies). The Joint EWG might recommend that CCPR/CCRVDF consider selecting the higher MRL value; and
 - consider the matter related to harmonized food descriptors to be used by JECFA and JMPR.

²⁴ CX/PR 24/55/11

276. CCPR was informed of the challenges faced by the Joint EWG to obtain feedback on proposals to harmonize MRLs according to the terms of reference of the Joint EWG. Notably, the Joint EWG received limited comments, some of which diverged from conclusions made previously by CCRVDF26 (2022) and CCPR54 (2023). To address these challenges, the Joint EWG recommended convening a Joint Virtual Session of the Joint WG. The proposed virtual meeting would most likely be scheduled for August 2024 as it may need to be held before the next CCRVDF meeting in October 2024.
277. The USA, as Chair of the Joint EWG, added that it was important for Members to participate and be engaged in the Joint Virtual Session of the WG to facilitate discussion and coordination of views between CCPR and CCRVDF delegates to progress work on issues related to the establishment of harmonized MRLs for pesticides and veterinary drugs for compounds with dual use.

Discussion

278. The JMPR Secretariat indicated JMPR's support for the harmonization agenda of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF working group on compounds for dual use. However, when it concerned harmonizing health-based guidance values (ADI and ARfD), further consideration would be required (e.g., dose-spacing in underlying experimental data when the setting of individual health-based guidance values (HBGVs) took place and intake considerations applied at the time). Therefore, the possible harmonization of relevant HBGVs should be done as part of a risk assessment process by JMPR and JECFA (veterinary drugs) in support of CCPR and CCRVDF, and it would not be possible just to choose the higher HBGV. In response, the Joint EWG Co-Chair clarified that the primary focus of the Joint EWG was to harmonize MRLs, and it would defer to JECFA and JMPR on scientific assessments and not make recommendations on HBGVs.
279. A Member requested that CCPR delegates from Member countries contact their CCRVDF counterparts to coordinate their positions and that both CCPR and CCRVDF delegates be encouraged to attend the virtual meeting of the Joint EWG.

Conclusion

280. CCPR:
- (i) indicated their continued support for the work of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG;
 - (ii) endorsed the scheduling of a joint virtual meeting of the EWG;
 - (iii) encouraged CCPR delegations to participate in the joint virtual meeting of the EWG; and
 - (iv) encouraged CCPR delegations to liaise with their CCRVDF counterparts to coordinate positions and actively participate in the work of the Joint EWG, including the upcoming virtual meeting of the Joint EWG.

ANALYSIS OF PREVIOUS DECISIONS BY CCPR TO ESTABLISH MRLs FOR TOMATO AND PEPPER TO ESTABLISH CORRESPONDING MRLs IN EGGPLANT (Agenda item 13)²⁵

281. The Observer of the Global Pulse Confederation (GPC), as the author of the discussion paper, introduced the item, recalling that CCPR54 had agreed that GPC would prepare a discussion paper to assess previous decisions by CCPR to establish tomato and pepper MRLs to derive corresponding MRLs for eggplant for consideration by CCPR55. The Observer summarized the work process concerning the selection of compounds to extrapolate MRLs (i.e. compounds not scheduled for evaluation by JMPR to cover eggplants or having already CXLs addressing this commodity), how the extrapolation was performed (i.e. based on the guidance provided by JMPR and CCPR in their relevant documents), and the data/information use to make the calculations (i.e. those available from the JMPR report that was used to conduct the evaluations of tomato and pepper and other available information from official recognized sites).
282. Based on the work process described in the working paper, the Observer indicated that MRLs extrapolated for the 19 compounds listed in Appendix I to CX/PR 24/55/12 did not pose any threat to consumers' health. He also noted that fruits and vegetables represented the largest export value in traded commodities globally, comprising more than 100 individual commodities, and that eggplant was an important commodity for international trade and economic growth. In particular, minor or specialty crops were important culturally, in diet, agricultural diversity, and economically to many countries and their communities, although due to their small footprint, minor crops, individually, often lacked support in pursuing product registrations and Codex MRLs.
283. The Observer recalled that this item was considered in a virtual meeting held prior to the Session, where countries had an opportunity to comment on the work process and the proposed MRLs. The feedback and comments received during the VWG included questions related to four different points, namely: whether the assessment reviewed the original data with respect to accommodating small and large varieties; if the work had been done in line with the JMPR procedures; if there were opportunities to apply the same work to other crops groups; and how JMPR could review the results.

²⁵ CL 2024/49-PR; CX/PR 24/55/12; CX/PR 24/55/12-Add.1 (Comments of Bangladesh, Canada, Chile, EU, Iraq, United Kingdom, and UAE)

284. The Observer, in providing answers to these questions, explained, inter alia, that the work carried out by the entity, based on the comments received during the virtual meeting by the JMPR Secretariat, was not perfectly in line with the procedures of JMPR as some information was not included in their proposal, in particular that GAP details were not expressed, residue definitions were not mentioned, that chronic dietary exposure calculations were prepared for all commodities and that JMPR would review the original data to ensure that it would meet the necessary requirements such as number of trials, treatment intervals.
285. In concluding its intervention, GPC presented an analysis of comments received in reply to CL 2024/49-PR, which showed a balance between the two options given in the CL to i.e. (i) advance the proposed MRLs in the Step Procedure for adoption by CAC, based on the information described in the discussion paper, or (ii) postpone decisions to CCPR56 (2025) following the advice of JMPR on the assessment of the process followed and data/information used in the extrapolation of the proposed MRLs. The Observer further proposed two options to move forward with the work, i.e. under the JMPR schedule for additional/new evaluations or under the general consideration.

Discussion

286. CCPR noted general support for the work presented in CX/PR 24/55/12 and agreed that the work process and MRL proposals presented in the paper should be referred to JMPR for review and further consideration by the Committee at its next session.
287. CCPR noted the following comments:
- Noting the high JMPR workload, this should be balanced against over-assessing the paper by JMPR to preserve JMPR resourcing for assessing new compounds, additional uses, and periodic reviews.
 - JMPR could advise CCPR on the best way forward so that the Committee would then be able to decide at its next session.
 - It would be important for JMPR to conduct a peer review of the work presented in the document and to discuss the results of the analysis of JMPR at the next session of CCPR, also noting that this would constitute a precedent for CCPR.
 - Trade disruption related to minor crops due to missing MRLs had been a lingering issue hindering international food trade.
 - Given that the availability of equivalent or comparable GAP labels between representative crops and crops intended for extrapolation was a critical consideration for MRL extrapolation, it was suggested that the eggplant GAP label authorized by national authorities be submitted to JMPR for necessary verification and assessment.
 - Eggplant was an important crop for small farmers, so it was important to set MRLs for it.
 - A JMPR analysis of the discussion paper was necessary for two reasons: (i) the assessment for selecting supervised field trials with similar GAPs had changed recently, and therefore, JMPR would need to re-evaluate previous field trials according to the new existing procedure; (ii) an assessment by JMPR on whether the compounds were evaluated using TTC would be important, and an update of the TTC calculation would also be necessary.
 - The assessment proposed in the discussion document could also be used as a potential mechanism to help free up time for JMPR so that the expert body could focus on other priorities rather than doing extrapolations to arrange existing minor uses. JMPR could also consider whether this could be a valid approach, expressing any potential concerns, and that this mechanism could enhance CCPR procedures and support minor uses without overloading JMPR work, protecting the same time consumer health, which remained a priority.
 - The JMPR review would need to focus not only on the dietary risk assessment but also on other aspects of the approach presented in GPC's discussion paper. If JMPR envisaged amending the procedure, this would need to be carefully noted when considering future points of a similar nature.
 - If CCPR validated a procedure, it would then be incorporated into the Procedural Manual.
 - CCPR should include in their request to JMPR to carefully consider the information contained in the discussion paper and to indicate if, e.g., inappropriate procedures had been followed and how to further support the work on minor use while giving proper consideration to consumer health. JMPR had already evaluated the data, and another re-evaluation was outside the current procedures.

288. The JMPR Secretariat, while noting the trade value of establishing MRLs for minor crops, highlighted the importance of protecting consumer health, as risks deriving from incorrect uses could not be neglected nor underestimated. The Secretariat clarified that the JMPR review was an evolving process that considered available up-to-date data and information for every evaluation, including new use, periodic review, and new compounds. He noted that JMPR would respect the decisions coming from CCPR as a risk manager while recalling that, should CCPR trust JMPR with the assessment, JMPR would do so according to its procedures and requirements.
289. In response to a question on whether the option of a JMPR peer review could be taken under general consideration or if would have implications for the priority list, the JMPR Secretariat clarified that it would be preferable to request the data submitter, in collaboration with the EWG Chair on Priorities, to look into the opportunity to schedule the compounds listed in Appendix I of CX/PR 24/55/12 for additional/new use in the coming years.
290. In response to a request for clarification on whether this proposed mechanism was in line with the Procedural Manual, the Codex Secretariat clarified that CCPR was not taking any decisions at this time, neither on the proposed extrapolated MRLs nor on the process that had been followed to make those proposals. The Secretariat further clarified that CCPR was requesting advice and/or clarification from JMPR on the procedure that had been followed for the establishment of these proposals and to highlight if there were any gaps or improvements to be made to make an informed decision on the work process at its next session.
291. Australia, speaking as Chair of the EWG on Priorities, noted that by comparing the list of compounds presented by the Observer and the list that would be discussed by CCPR55 for new use nominations for assessment by JMPR in 2025, five compounds appeared to be present in both lists. As pyriproxyfen (200), pyraclostrobin (210), fludioxonil (211), metaflumizone (236), and flubendiamide (242) appeared in both lists, the Delegation proposed that a new commodity of eggplant subgroup be added to the existing list of commodities, and based on the decision of CCPR, those five compounds, the discussion paper, the appropriate GAPS, and other supporting information be included on the data calling for JMPR. He noted that this proposal could be considered under Agenda item 10.
292. Based on comments made by Members, the Observer noted that:
- JMPR already extrapolated data based on the existing guidance material developed to enhance more CXLs in minor crops. He further explained that their request sought clear guidance from JMPR on what information was required to extrapolate existing CXLs in representative crops to minor crops of the same crop group or subgroup. Such advice could be based on reflecting on what GPC had provided in its paper on establishing CXLs in the subgroup eggplants based on existing CXLs from tomato and/or pepper, and this may include advice from JMPR on the need for additional supporting information to that provided for eggplants and/or presented in a different format with the view of assisting JMPR in its efficient assessment of such requests.
 - The Observer could offer to conduct an analysis of existing CXLs and report back to CCPR56 on what the potential extent of extrapolations could look like across several crop groups and/or all crop groups to assist in developing an efficient procedure for extrapolation. He further noted that such information could provide an insight into the potential scope for the number of CXLs that could be possible through extrapolation and provide an insight into the benefit this information could provide for minor crops.

Conclusion

293. CCPR:
- (i) remained committed to exploring pragmatic, science-based, and resource-efficient approaches to enhance the establishment of MRLs for minor crops while ensuring the robustness of risk assessment and consumer protection;
 - (ii) thanked the Observer of GPC for its analysis of previous decisions by CCPR to establish MRLs for tomatoes and peppers in order to establish MRLs for eggplant (CX/PR 24/55/12);
 - (iii) recalled the provisions of the Procedural Manual for JMPR to be the risk assessor for CCPR;
 - (iv) requested that JMPR consider the procedures outlined by the Observer of GPC to support eggplant MRLs based on the MRLs already established for tomatoes and/or peppers. This would be carried out with a view to JMPR recommending how the procedure suggested by GPC may be improved and potentially incorporated into future procedures for setting MRLs by extrapolation to minor crops.

- (v) requested that JMPR review work undertaken by the Observer of GPC regarding:
- (a) The dietary exposure assessments.
 - (b) The GAP description.
 - (c) The representativeness of residue trials.
 - (d) The definition of residues and metabolites of concern.
 - (e) Any other relevant aspects influencing the risk assessment.
- (vi) requested that JMPR advise whether, in JMPR's view, the methodology outlined in CX/PR 24/55/12 provided an appropriate basis for extrapolation. If not, what amendments to the method for assessment may be made to meet the objective of providing a pragmatic, science-based, and resource-efficient approach to enhance the establishment of MRLs for minor crops.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 14)

Publication of the revised *Classification on Foods and Feeds (CXA 4-1989)* and *Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides to Commodity Groups (CXG 84-2012)*

294. The European Union requested clarification on:

- The publication of the updated full version of the Classification and Principles and Guidelines, as adopted by CAC, on the Codex webpage. The Delegation further requested the Codex Secretariat to remove the old versions of these documents from the Codex webpage. Singapore further supported this point.
- The implementing plan to adjust the existing CXLs in the Codex database for MRLs for pesticides to the new/revised commodities/groups for plant and animal products arising from the revision of the Classification e.g. whether the existing CXLs for meat (from mammals other than marine mammals) would be reconsidered and replaced by the new commodity code "muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)" and whether this change would impact on the policy of setting Codex MRLs for fat-soluble compounds.
- Whether the existing CXLs with old commodity codes would remain unchanged or whether these codes would be replaced with the new codes. The Delegation highlighted that it would be necessary to check the impact of the new commodity classification on those CXLs set for commodity groups that would have a different composition compared to the old commodity groups.

295. The Codex Secretariat:

- recalled that the Classification and accompanying Principles and Guidelines took several years to be revised/developed due to their length and complexity. For this reason, it was decided to await the completion of these texts to publish a single comprehensive version of both documents on the Codex webpage. This was part of the projects to overhaul the Codex website and to rebuild the database on MRLs for pesticides to reflect the revised Classification. However, in view of the delay in launching the new Codex website, and project on the database, the Codex Secretariat is in the process of finalizing the publication of the revised Classification, as well as the Principles and Guidelines, which should be published on the Codex webpage by no later than the end of 2024;
- explained that the Codex database is regularly updated as per the outcomes of JMPR meetings and decisions taken by CAC on CCPR recommendations for adoption of MRLs. She acknowledged the valuable assistance of the CCPR Secretariat to keep the Codex database updated following the adoption of MRLs by CAC;
- explained that the adjustments of CXLs in the Codex database would require extensive work by a consultant with the necessary background on CCPR and JMPR matters in order to assign new codes to existing CXLs or separate commodities from existing group CXLs in order not to lose CXLs until such a time JMPR conduct the evaluation of the relevant compounds, and to advise on potential impacts on the MRL setting policies that may arise from the adjustments of the CXLs. The Secretariat had started the search for a consultant to run this project, but due to the availability of budget, age limitations related to employment policies, and the required necessary CCPR/JMPR knowledge and experience, finding a consultant that would meet these requirements was rather challenging; and
- noted that the Secretariat would provide an update on the above-mentioned matters to CCPR56 (2025). Should the project to update the Codex database start this year, CCPR would have a specific item on its agenda to report on the findings of this exercise for consideration by the Committee.

296. The JMPR Secretariat noted that JMPR used the revised Classification when proposing MRL recommendations for consideration by CCPR and that if, during the evaluation, JMPR found issues between the new and old coding systems, JMPR would provide the required justification for transitioning from the old code to the new one. The Codex Secretariat noted that JMPR used the new coding system from the revised Classification and that the only time this procedure was not applied was in the case of the commodity code for meat and muscle.

Conclusion

297. CCPR noted the comments and clarifications provided by the Codex and JMPR Secretariats.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda item 15)

298. CCPR was informed that its 56th Session was tentatively scheduled to be held in the second half of May 2025, the final arrangements being subject to confirmation by the Host Country and the Codex Secretariats.

APPENDIX I

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES**

CHAIRPERSON - PRÉSIDENTE - PRESIDENTA

Dr Weili Shan
Deputy Director General/Professor
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

**ASSISTANT TO THE CHAIRPERSON – ASSISTANTE DE LA PRÉSIDENTE –
ASISTENTE DE LA PRESIDENTA**

Lifang Duan
Division Director/Senior Agronomist
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

CHIEF ADVISOR - CONSEILLER PRINCIPAL - ASESOR PRINCIPAL

Prof Xiongwu Qiao
Professor
Shanxi Academy of Agricultural Sciences
Shanxi

MEMBER COUNTRIES

PAYS MEMBRES

PAÍSES MIEMBROS

AUSTRALIA - AUSTRALIE

Mr Kevin Bodnaruk
Consultant
Horticulture Innovation Australia
West Pymble NSW

Mr James Deller
Director
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Mr Daniel Poflowski
Director
Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines
Authority

AUSTRIA - AUTRICHE

Mr Ingo Grosssteiner
Institute for Plant Protection Products
Austrian Agency for Health and Food Safety (AGES)
Vienna

BANGLADESH

Mr Subrata Kumar Das
Additional Deputy Director
Department of Agricultural Extension
Dhaka

Dr Mohammad Dalower Hossain Prodhon
Senior Scientific Officer
Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute (BARI)
Dhaka

BRAZIL - BRÉSIL - BRASIL

Mr Rogério Pereira Da Silva
Head of Minor Crops Service
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Brasília

Mr Antonio Batista Sanches
Health Regulation Expert
Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency - Anvisa
Brasília

Mr Danilo Tadashi Tagami Kamimura
Agricultural Federal Inspector
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock – MAPA
Brasília

Ms Adriana Torres De Sousa
Monitoring and Risk Assessment Manager
Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency - Anvisa
Brasília

CAMEROON - CAMEROUN - CAMERÚN

Mr Nya Edouard
Inspecteur phytosanitaire
Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement Rural
Yaoundé

Mr Tabi Kpama Gregoire
Membre du comité national du codex
Ministère des Mines, de l'Industrie et du
Développement Technologique
Yaoundé

Mr Mpondo Ekon Hiskia Dit Papa Prince
Expert en protection des droits des consommateurs
Coalition des consommateurs camerounais Conseil
national de la consommation
Yaoundé

CANADA - CANADÁ

Ms Monique Thomas
Section Head
Health Canada
Ottawa

Ms Ranna Bernard
Acting Senior Trade Policy Analyst
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
Ottawa

CHILE - CHILI

Mr Eduardo Aylwin Herman
Asesor
Agencia Chilena para la Inocuidad y Calidad
Alimentaria (ACHIPIA)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Ms Roxana Vera Muñoz
Jefa del Subdepartamento de Acuerdos
Internacionales
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

CHINA - CHINE

Mr Keli Zhao
Director General Deputy
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA), P.R.China
Beijing

Ms Bei Chen
Staff
Standard and Quality Center of National Food and
Strategic Reserves Administration
Beijing

Dr Wing Kin Chu
Agricultural Officer (Risk Assessment)
Centre for Food Safety, Food and Environmental
Hygiene Department, HKSAR Government
Hong Kong

Ms Hao Ding
Associate Professor
China National Centre for Food Safety Risk Assessment
Beijing

Mrs Fang Gao
Division Director
Center of Agro-product Safety and Quality, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs, P.R.C
Beijing

Mrs Xin Hao
Senior Engineer
Science and Technology Research Center of China
Customs
Beijing

Ms Chin Man Ku
Technician
Municipal Affairs Bureau
Macao SAR

Mr Xianbin Li
Director of Residue Division
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA) P.R.China
Beijing

Prof Fengmao Liu
Professor
China Agricultural University
Beijing

Mr Peng In Ng
Senior Technician
Municipal Affairs Bureau
Macao SAR

Prof Canping Pan
Professor
College of Science, China Agricultural University
Beijing

Mrs Lingmei Tao
Professor
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA), P.R.China
Beijing

Ms Jing Tian
Professor
China National Center for Food Safety Risk Assessment
Beijing

Mrs Qianrui Wang
Assistant Professor
China National Center for Food Safety Risk Assessment
(CFSA)
Beijing

Ms Jinhua Wang
Research professor
Science and Technology Research Center of China
Customs
Beijing

Prof Yongning Wu
Chief Scientist
China National Center for Food Safety Risk Assessment
Beijing

Dr Ho Pan Michael Yau
Chemist
Government Laboratory of HKSAR
Hong Kong

Mrs Yujie Zhang
Senior Veterinarian
China Institute of Veterinary Drug Control (Center for
Veterinary Evaluation, MARA)
Beijing

Mrs Guangyan Zhu
Professor
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

Ms Xiuying Piao
Senior Agronomist/Deputy Director
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA), P.R.China
Beijing

Ms Yujie Wu
Professor
Chinese Academy of Inspection and Quarantine
Beijing

CUBA

Mrs Yunaidis Alvarez Martínez
Jefa del Registro Central de Plaguicidas
Ministerio de la Agricultura
La Habana

ECUADOR - ÉQUATEUR

Mr Lenin Moreno
Secretaría del Comité Coordinador FAO/OMS para
América Latina y El Caribe CCLAC
Agencia de Regulación y Control Fito y Zoonosaria-
AGROCALIDAD
Quito

EUROPEAN UNION - UNION EUROPÉENNE - UNIÓN EUROPEA

Mr Gaspar Avendano Perez
Policy Officer
European Commission
Brussels

Ms Hermine Reich
Administrator
European Food Safety Authority
Parma

Ms Siret Surva
Policy Officer
European Commission
Brussels

Ms Maria Taberero
Administrator
European Commission
Brussels

FINLAND - FINLANDE - FINLANDIA

Ms Tiia Mäkinen-Töykkä
Senior Officer
Finnish Safety and Chemicals Agency (Tukes)
Helsinki

FRANCE - FRANCIA

Ms Florence Gérault
Experte résidus de pesticides
Ministère de l'agriculture et de la souveraineté
alimentaire
Angers

Ms Gaelle Vial
Cheffe adjointe de l'Unité résidus et sécurité des
aliments
Agence nationale de sécurité sanitaire de
l'alimentation, de l'environnement et du travail
(Anses)
Maisons-Alfort

GERMANY - ALLEMAGNE - ALEMANIA

Dr Karsten Hohgardt
Director and Professor
Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food
Safety
Braunschweig

Ms Mona Lepadatu
Political Administrator
Council of the European Union
Brussels

Ms Monika Schumacher
Desk Officer
Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Bonn

GHANA

Dr William Azalekor
Research Manager
Quality Control Company Ltd (Ghana Cocoa Board)
Accra

Mr Ebenezer Kofi Essel
Director, Industrial Support Services Directorate
Food and Drugs Authority
Accra

Dr Paul Osei-fosu
Head, Food and Agriculture Department
Ghana Standards Authority
Accra

Dr Ebenezer Owusu
Deputy Chief Executive (A&QC)
COCOBOD
Accra

Dr Ebenezer Owusu
Deputy Chief Executive (A&QC)
COCOBOD
Accra

Mr Samuel Boateng Saka
Managing Director (QCC)
Quality Control Company Ltd (COCOBOD)
Accra

INDIA - INDE

Dr Vandana Tripathy
Principal Scientist & Network Coordinator
ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute
New Delhi

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF) – IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D') – IRÁN (REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA DEL)

Dr Seyed Yousef Fazaeli Hosseinezhad
Advisor, Member of CCPR in Iran
Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI)
Karaj

Dr Mohammadkazem Ramezani
Chair of CCPR in Iran
Iranian Research Institute of Plant Protection (IRIPP),
Ministry of Agriculture, Jihad
Tehran

JAPAN - JAPON - JAPÓN

Mr Masashi Kusakawa
Director
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Tokyo

Ms Kanako Sasaki
Deputy Director
Consumer Affairs Agency
Tokyo

Dr Takeyuki Sugiura
Technical Officer
Consumer Affairs Agency
Tokyo

Mr Ken Takahashi
Section Chief
Consumer Affairs Agency
Tokyo

Ms Maki Terawaki
Assistant Director
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Tokyo

Dr Takahiro Watanabe
Section Chief
National Institute of Health Sciences
Kawasaki

Ms Yukie Yamauchi
Deputy Director
Consumer Affairs Agency
Tokyo

JORDAN - JORDANIE - JORDANIA

Dr Ghaith Gharaiebeh
chair of committee
JFDA
Amman

KENYA

Ms Grace Muchemi
Head of Department
Pest Control Products Board
Nairobi

MALAYSIA - MALAISIE - MALASIA

Mr Mohammad Nazrul Fahmi Abdul Rahim
Deputy Director
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
Kuala Lumpur

Mrs Nurhayati Kamyon
Assistant Director
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
Kuala Lumpur

Mrs Shazlina Mohd Zaini
Principal Assistant Director
Ministry of Health Malaysia
Putrajaya

MOROCCO - MAROC - MARRUECOS

Mr Ahmed JAAFARI
Chef de la Division des Intrants Chimiques
Direction des Intrants et des Laboratoires
Office National de la Sécurité Sanitaire des Produits
Alimentaires (ONSSA)
Rabat

Mrs Najat Aboulhouda
Responsable
Laboratoire Officiel d'Analyses et de Recherches
Chimiques
Casablanca

NETHERLANDS - PAYS-BAS – PAÍSES BAJOS

Mrs Judith Hulst
Senior Policy Officer
Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport
Hague

NEW ZEALAND - NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE - NUEVA ZELANDIA

Mr Warren Hughes
Principal Adviser ACVM
Ministry for Primary Industries
Wellington

Dr Sophie Geyrhofer
Senior Adviser
Ministry for Primary Industries

Ms Sarah Lester
Specialist Adviser
Ministry for Primary Industries
Wellington

Ms Michelle Li
Agriculture Counsellor
Ministry for Primary Industries
Wellington

Ms Rachelle Linwood
Regulatory Strategy Manager
AgriZero

Mr Raj Rajasekar
Senior Programme Manager
Ministry for Primary Industries
Wellington

NIGERIA - NIGÉRIA

Mr Danlami Aliyu Chafe
Deputy Director
Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Abuja

Mrs Idayat Adeola Mudashir
Deputy Director
National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and
Control (NAFDAC)
Abuja

Mr Boniface Chibueze Oguobi Nwaeze
Assistant Director
National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and
Control
Lagos

Dr Stephene Joseph Ubandawaki
Deputy Director
Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Abuja

OMAN - OMÁN

Eng Yusra Said Ahmed Al Rawahi
Assistant General Manager
Atyab International Services

Ms Aliya Alghazali
Assistant Director of the Central Laboratory for Food
Safety
Food Safety and Quality Center
Muscat

Eng Mohammed Isasam Ahmed Abu Draz
Agricultural Pesticide Specialist
MAFWR

PAKISTAN - PAKISTÁN

Dr Noor Abid Saeed
Principal Scientist
Nuclear Institute for Agriculture & Biology (NIAB)
Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission (PAEC)
Faisalabad

Mr Imtiaz Hussain
Deputy Director (Quarantine/Surveillance)
Ministry of National Food Security & Research
Faisalabad

PHILIPPINES - FILIPINAS

Ms Rochelle Parangan
Co-Chairperson, Sub-Committee on Pesticide Residue
National Codex Organization

Ms Jerolet Sahagun
Chairperson, National Codex Organization Sub-
Committee on Pesticide Residues (SCPR)
National Codex Organization

POLAND - POLOGNE - POLONIA

Ms Magdalena Kowalska
Main expert
Agricultural and Food Quality Inspection
Warsaw

Mrs Anna Janasik
Expert
Agricultural and Food Quality Inspection
Warsaw

QATAR

Mr Mabu Sharief
Laboratory Specialist
Ministry of Public Health
Doha

REPUBLIC OF KOREA – RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE – REPÚBLICA DE COREA

Dr Eunjeong Kim
Deputy Director
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Prof Moo-Hyeog Im
Professor
Daegu University

Mr Junhyun Kim
Scientific Officer
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Dr Hyoyoung Kim
Scientific Officer
National Agricultural Products Quality Management
Service

Prof Mi-Gyung Lee
Professor
Andong National University

Dr Jung Mi Lee
Scientific Officer
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Dr Tae Woong Na
Scientific Officer
National Agricultural Products Quality Management Service

Dr Minseok Oh
Scientific Officer
Rural Development Administration

Ms Yoona Park
Researcher
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION –
FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE –
FEDERACIÓN DE RUSIA**

Ms Natalia Dobрева
Senior Researcher
F.F. Erisman Federal Scientific Center for Hygiene of the Rospotrebnadzor Moscow Region
Moscow

Mr Gleb Masaltsev
Head of department
F.F. Erisman Federal Scientific Center for Hygiene of the Rospotrebnadzor

**SAUDI ARABIA - ARABIE SAOUDITE -
ARABIA SAUDITA**

Mr Khalid Alzahrani
Head of the international communication department for specifications
Saudi Food and Drug Authority
Riyadh

Prof Fatmah Alasmay
Senior expert in specifications and regulations
Saudi Food and Drug Authority
Riyadh

Mrs Najla Alharbi
Senior Risk Assessment Expert
Saudi Food and Drug Authority
Riyadh

Mr Khalid Naif Almesfair
Director of the Multi-International Affairs Department
Saudi Food and Drug Authority
Riyadh

SENEGAL - SÉNÉGAL

Mrs Marie Ndao Sarr
Responsable Unité Chimie Environnementale
Centre Ceres Locustox
Dakar

Prof Amadou Diop
Enseignant Chercheur
Université Cheikh Anta Diop
Dakar

Mrs Kounady Diop
Assistante PCN
Comite National Du Codex
Dakar

Mrs Waly Bintou Fall
Chef De Bureau
Direction Protection Des Vegetaux
Dakar

Mr El Hadji Abdou Aziz Ly
Cadre De Gestion
Direction Agriculture
Dakar

Mrs Aita Ndiaye Sylla
Suivi -Evaluation
Centre Anti-Poison
Dakar

SINGAPORE - SINGAPOUR - SINGAPUR

Dr Yuansheng Wu
Director
Singapore Food Agency
Singapore

Dr Sheena Wee
Specialist Team Lead
Singapore Food Agency
Singapore

SOUTH AFRICA - AFRIQUE DU SUD - SUDÁFRICA

Ms Aluwani Madzivhandila
Assistant Director: Food Control
Department of Health
Pretoria

SPAIN - ESPAGNE - ESPAÑA

María Noelia Loro Martín-Gil
Senior Technician
Spanish Agency for Food Safety and Nutrition (AESAN O.A.)
Ministry of Social Rights, Consumer Affairs and 2030 Agenda
Madrid

SRI LANKA

Dr B Ruchika Fernando
Professor/Head
University of Peradeniya
Peradeniya

SWEDEN - SUÈDE - SUECIA

Mr Niklas Montell
Principal Regulatory Officer
Swedish Food Agency
Uppsala

SWITZERLAND - SUISSE - SUIZA

Mr Emanuel Hänggi
Scientific Officer
Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office FSVO
Bern

**SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC –
SYRIENNE, RÉP ARABE –
SIRIA, REPÚBLICA ARABE**

Dr Hour Krajian
Head of Qualitative Analysis Office
Atomic Energy Commission of Syria
Damascus

Dr Lima Hafez Ajeeb
Head of Spectroscopy Laboratory
Scientific Study and Research Center
Damascus

THAILAND - THAÏLANDE - TAILANDIA

Mr Phatchayaphon Meunchang
Deputy Director General
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of agriculture and cooperatives
Bangkok

Ms Namaporn Attaviroj
Standards Officer, Senior Professional level
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food
Standards (ACFS), Ministry of Agriculture and
Cooperatives
Bangkok

Mr Wittaya Buasri
Senior Professional Scientist
Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and
Cooperatives
Bangkok

Mr Sarawut Chookrachun
Scientist
Department of Livestock Development, Ministry of
Agriculture and Cooperatives
Bangkok

Mrs Sudarat Chuachan
Senior Veterinary Officer
Department of Livestock Development, Ministry of
Agriculture and Cooperatives
Pathum Thani

Mrs Kangsadan Inthong
Food and drug technical officer, Professional level
Food and Drug Administration, Ministry of Public
Health
Nonthaburi

Mr Charoen Kaowsuksai
chairman of Food and Beverage Industry Club
The Federation of Thai Industries
Bangkok

Ms Nitzachon Khacharin
Trade and Technical Manager of Fisheries Products
Thai Food Processors' Association
Bangkok

Ms Chonnipa Pawasut
Standard officer
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food
Standards, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Bangkok

Mr Prachathipat Pongpinyo
Director of Pesticide Research Group
Department of Agriculture,
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives Bangkok

Ms Wiphada Sirisomphobchai
Scientist, Expert Level
Department of Livestock Development, Ministry of
Agriculture and Cooperatives
Pathum Thani

Ms Chanita Thongsam
Scientist, Senior Professional Level
Agricultural Production Science Research and
Development Division
Bangkok

Ms Witchulada Yungyuen
standard officer
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and food
standards, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Bangkok

UGANDA - OUGANDA

Mr Geoffrey Onen
Assistant Commissioner
Directorate of Government Analytical laboratories
Kampala

**UNITED ARAB EMIRATES –
ÉMIRATS ARABES UNIS –
EMIRATOS ARABES UNIDOS**

Dr Moza Al Muhairi
Executive Director
ADAFSA

Eng Ohoud Alali
ENG
ADFSA

Eng Sonia Garbi
ENG
ADFSA

**UNITED KINGDOM - ROYAUME-UNI –
REINO UNIDO**

Dr Julian Cudmore
MRL technical lead and consumer exposure specialist
Health and Safety Executive
York

Mr Steve Wearne
Director of Global Affairs
Food Standards Agency
London

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA -
RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE -
REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE TANZANÍA**

Mr Raphael John Mwezi
Senior Laboratory Scientist
Tanzania Plant Health and Pesticides Authority

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA –
ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE –
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA**

Mr Aaron Niman
Environmental Health Scientist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC

Mr Alexander Domesle
Senior Advisor for Chemistry, Toxicology, and Related
Sciences
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, DC

Ms Heidi Irrig
MRL Manager North America
Syngenta
Greensboro, NC

Ms Amy Latham
Global Registration and MRL Strategy Leader
Corteva
Indianapolis, IN

Dr Barakat Mahmoud
Senior Science Advisor
Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of
Agriculture
Washington, DC

Ms Marie Maratos Bhat
International Issues Analyst
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Dr Sara Mcgrath
Chemist
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN),
U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
College Park, MD

Ms Alinne Oliveira
Deputy Director
Bryant Christie, Inc.
Seattle, WA

URUGUAY

Mrs Leticia Bettucci
Analista de Residuos de Plaguicidas-Dirección General
de Servicios Agrícolas
Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca
Montevideo

**OBSERVERS
OBSERVATEURS
OBSERVADORES**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERGUBERNAMENTALES**

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE (IICA)

Mr Eric Bolaños Ledezma
Especialista, Sanidad Agropecuaria e Inocuidad de
Alimentos
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA)
San José

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS –
ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES
ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES**

AGRO-CARE A.I.U.S.BL (AGRO)

Ms Yue Wang
project manager
AgroCare

**ASOCIACION AGROCARE LATINOAMERICA
(AGROCARE LATAM)**

Prof Karen Gatica
Codex Group Coordinator
AgroCare Latin America
Guatemala

Prof Cristián Rossi
Asesor Técnico
AgroCare Latinoamérica
Guatemala

CROPLIFE INTERNATIONAL (CROPLIFE)

Mr Steve Bäseler
Global Regulatory Manager
Bayer AG
Monheim am Rhein

Ms Dianbao Cao
Principle of Registration in China
Adama China

Mr Craig Dunlop
Head of Regulatory Policy and Trade
Syngenta Crop Protection AG
Basel

Mr Yu Fan
Head of Regulatory
Syngenta China

Mr Atsushi Fujii
Manager
SUMITOMO CHEMICAL Co., Ltd.
Tokyo

Dr Weijia Gan
Regional Regulatory Science Lead, APA
BASF (China) Ltd. Co.
Beijing

Mr Masaki Hiraki
Director
Mitsui Chemical Crop & Life Solutions Inc.
Tokyo

Mr Ricky Ho
Director – Science & Regulatory Affairs
CropLife Asia
Singapore

Mr Kohei Hosono
Domestic Registration Section
Nippon Soda Co., Ltd.
Tokyo

Ms Nevena Hristozova
Regulatory Affairs Manager
CropLife International
Bruxelles

Ms Cindy Jiang
Reg Manager
UPL

Mr Sun Jianpeng
Dietary safety expert
Bayer CropScience China

Ms Naoko Kobayashi
Assistant Manager
NIHON NOHAYAKU CO., LTD
Osaka

Mrs Akari Kubota
Chief
Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha, Ltd.
Kusatsu, Shiga

Mr Kei Kusakari
Nissan Chemical Corporation
Agricultural Chemicals Division
Tokyo

Mr Ting Li
Registration Manager
Syngenta China

Mr Neil John Lister
Global Strategic Science
Syngenta
Bracknell

Ms Yilia Liu
Regulatory Manager
Corteva
Beijing

Mr Yanqiu Liu
Registration Director
Adama China

Ms Yaping Liu
Chief Representation
Croplife China

Mr Keita Matsushima
Manager
SDS BIOTECH K.K.
Tokyo

Mr Zhang Nan
Senior Toxicology and Health Risk Assessment Expert
Bayer CropScience China
Beijing

Mr Wang Qiong
Reg Manager
ISK Shanghai

Ms Monika Richter
Global MRL & Trade Manager
BASF
Limburgerhof

Mr Taku Saito
Regulatory consultant
AGRO-KANESHO CO., LTD.
Saitama

Mrs Natalie Shevchuk
Global Regulatory Affairs Director
FMC Corporation
Philadelphia, PA

Mr Atsushi Shibata
Manager
Sumitomo Chemical Company

Ms Guo Shuhua
Regulatory Manager
Sumitomo Chemical (Shanghai)

Dr Jane Stewart
Team Leader - RTP Consumer Safety
BASF
Research Triangle Park

Mr Jun Suzuki
Regulatory Manager (Ph. D.)
Arysta LifeScience Corporation
Tokyo

Mr Jun Tanaka
Senior Manager
Nippon Soda Co.,Ltd
Tokyo

Mr Shogo Tasaki
Manager
Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha, Ltd.
Kusatsu, Shiga

Mrs Sachiko Tobina
Assistant Manager
NIHON NOHYAKU CO., LTD
Tokyo

Ms Linda Wang
Regulatory Manager
Corteva
Beijing

Mr Sun Xinyou
Senior Reg Manager
Croplife China

Mr Tokunori Yokota
General manager
Japan Crop Protection Association
Tokyo

Mr Yun Zhang
Dietary safety expert
BASF China

Mr Li Zhang
Head of Regulatory Science Greater China

Yingna Zhang
General Manager
ISK Shanghai

Mr Xuguang Zhang
Manager
Sumitomo Chemical (Shanghai)

GLOBAL PULSE CONFEDERATION (CICILS)

Mr Alan Norden
Board Member
Global Pulse Confederation
Raleigh

GRAIN AND FEED TRADE ASSOCIATION (GAFTA)

Mr Alan Ding
Chief Representative
The Grain and Feed Trade Association Beijing Office
BEIJING

INTERNATIONAL NUT AND DRIED FRUIT COUNCIL FOUNDATION (INC)

Dr Gabriele Ludwig
Sustainability and Environmental Affairs
INC International Nut and Dried Fruit Council
Reus

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF CITRICULTURE (ISC)

Mr James Cranney
ISC Representative
International Society of Citriculture
Auburn

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF PURE AND APPLIED CHEMISTRY (IUPAC)

Dr Elvira Keller
Senior managing scientist
IUPAC
Mannheim

Dr Gary Williams
Managing scientist
IUPAC
HARROGATE

FAO

Prof Guibiao Ye
Agricultural Officer
Plant Production and Protection Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
Rome

WHO

Mr Soren Madsen
Technical Officer
Department of Nutrition and Food Safety
World Health Organization
Geneva

CCPR SECRETARIAT

Ms Qiu JIAN
Professor
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

Ms Mengmeng QU
Division Director
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

Mr Zuntao ZHENG
Senior Agronomist/Deputy Director
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

Dr Fengzu Zhang
Deputy Division Director/Senior Agronomist
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals of Ministry
of Agriculture and Rural Affairs
Beijing

Dr Ran LIU
Senior Agronomist/Deputy Director
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

Ms Lan HUANG
Agronomist
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

Mr Huiqian Zhuang
Agronomist
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

Mr Ercheng Zhao
Associate professor
Beijing Academy of Agriculture and Forestry Science
Beijing

Mr Enyu Zhang
Student
China Agricultural University

CODEX SECRETARIAT

Ms Gracia Brisco
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
Geneva

Mr Giuseppe Di Chiera
Public Information Specialist
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
Rome

Mr Chun Yin Johnny Yeung
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
Rome

APPENDIX II

MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(At Step 5/8)
(For adoption by CAC)

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
77 Thiophanate-Methyl			
TN 0660 Almonds	0.15 (*)	5/8	
87 Dinocap			
VC 0424 Cucumber	0.07	5/8	
VC 0045 Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits (group)	0.05 (*)	5/8	(excluding cucumber, squash, summer and melons, except watermelon)
103 Phosmet			
FP 0009 Pome fruits (group)	3	5/8	
111 Iprodione			
AM 0660 Almond hulls	50 (dw)	5/8	
TN 0660 Almonds	0.3	5/8	
AL 0061 Bean, hay and/or straw	20 (dw)	5/8	
VP 0061 Beans with pods (Phaseolus spp.) (immature pods and succulent seeds)	1.5	5/8	
FB 2005 Cane berries (subgroup)	50	5/8	
FS 0013 Cherries (subgroup)	0.3	5/8	
VA 0385 Onion, bulb	0.15	5/8	
FS 2001 Peaches (including apricots and nectarine) (subgroup)	0.05 (*)	5/8	
VR 0589 Potato	0.05 (*)	5/8	
DV 0589 Potato, flakes/granules	0.05 (*)	5/8	
118 Cypermethrins (including alpha- and zeta- cypermethrin)			
FI 0326 Avocado	0.5	5/8	Z
VA 2031 Bulb onions (subgroup)	0.05 (*)	5/8	Za
FB 2006 Bush berries (subgroup)	1.5	5/8	Z
130 Diflubenzuron			
DT 1114 Tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried)	40	5/8	
135 Deltamethrin			
FI 0350 Papaya	0.2	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
160	Propiconazole			
	FI 0326 Avocado	0.01		5/8
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.2		5/8
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.01 (*)		5/8
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.05		5/8
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01 (*)		5/8
	ML 0106 Milks	0.01 (*)		5/8
	SO 0697 Peanut	0.03		5/8
	AL 0697 Peanut, hay and/or straw	50 (dw)		5/8
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.01 (*)		5/8
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)		5/8
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)		5/8
	GC 0649 Rice	30		5/8
	CF 0649 Rice bran, processed	80		5/8
	AS 3570 Rice, hulls	80		5/8
	CM 0649 Rice, husked	4		5/8
221	Boscalid			
	FI 0355 Pomegranate	2		5/8
224	Difenoconazole			
	FB 2005 Cane berries (subgroup)	3		5/8
	GC 2091 Maize cereals (subgroup)	0.015		5/8
	CF 1255 Maize flour	0.015		5/8
	CF 3517 Maize gluten	0.05		5/8
	OC 0645 Maize oil, crude	0.02		5/8
	AS 3557 Maize, hay and/or straw	15 (dw)		5/8
	VL 0485 Mustard greens	8		5/8
	DF 0014 Prunes	4		5/8
	VR 0494 Radish	0.7		5/8
	VL 0494 Radish leaves (including radish tops)	8		5/8
	FS 0012 Stone fruits (group)	1.5		5/8
	VR 0508 Sweet potato	4	Po	5/8

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
238	Clothianidin			
	AM 0660 Almond hulls	0.1 (dw)	5/8	
	HS 0780 Cumin seed	1	5/8	
	VO 0050 Fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits (group)	0.05	5/8	(except goji berry)
	VO 2704 Goji berry	0.06	5/8	
	DV 2704 Goji berry, dried	0.3	5/8	
	VA 0385 Onion, bulb	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	VS 2080 Stems and petioles (subgroup)	0.04	5/8	
	TN 0085 Tree nuts (group)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
243	Fluopyram			
	GC 0640 Barley	0.4	5/8	
	AS 0640 Barley, hay and/or straw	6 (dw)	5/8	
	GC 0641 Buckwheat	0.4	5/8	
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	8	5/8	
	PE 0112 Eggs	2	5/8	
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	1.5	5/8	
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	1.5	5/8	
	ML 0106 Milks	0.8	5/8	
	AS 3559 Oat, hay and/or straw	6 (dw)	5/8	
	GC 0647 Oats	0.4	5/8	
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	1	5/8	
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	1.5	5/8	
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	4	5/8	
	GC 0650 Rye	0.2	5/8	
	AS 3560 Rye, hay and/or straw	6 (dw)	5/8	
	GC 0651 Sorghum grain	0.6	5/8	
	AS 3561 Sorghum, stover	3 (dw)	5/8	
	GC 0653 Triticale	0.2	5/8	
	AS 0653 Triticale, hay and/or straw	6	5/8	
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.2	5/8	
	CF 0654 Wheat bran, processed	0.6	5/8	
	CF 1210 Wheat germ	0.5	5/8	
	AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	6 (dw)	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
245	Thiamethoxam			
	AM 0660 Almond hulls	2 (dw)	5/8	
	HS 0780 Cumin seed	1	5/8	
	VO 0050 Fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits (group)	0.7	5/8	(except goji berry)
	VO 2704 Goji berry	1.5	5/8	
	DV 2704 Goji berry, dried	5	5/8	
	VA 0385 Onion, bulb	0.02	5/8	
	VS 2080 Stems and petioles (subgroup)	0.8	5/8	
	TN 0085 Tree nuts (group)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
246	Acetamiprid			
	VD 0541 Soya bean (dry)	0.01	5/8	
255	Dinotefuran			
	VO 0050 Fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits (group)	0.5	5/8	(except goji berry)
	VO 2704 Goji berry	0.6	5/8	
	DV 2704 Goji berry, dried	2	5/8	
263	Cyantraniliprole			
	FI 0326 Avocado	0.4	5/8	
	FB 2005 Cane berries (subgroup)	4	5/8	
	VD 2065 Dry beans (subgroup)	0.6	5/8	
	VD 2066 Dry peas (subgroup)	0.6	5/8	
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.3	5/8	
	VO 0050 Fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits (group)	0.5	5/8	
	AB 0269 Grape pomace, dried	15	5/8	
	DF 0269 Grape, dried (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas)	3	5/8	
	FB 0269 Grapes	2	5/8	
	DT 1114 Tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried)	50	5/8	
267	Imazapyr			
	GC 0649 Rice	0.06	5/8	
	CM 1206 Rice bran, unprocessed	0.2	5/8	
	AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	0.015	5/8	
	CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.07	5/8	
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	0.05	5/8	
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.6	5/8	
	CM 0654 Wheat bran, unprocessed	1	5/8	
	CF 1210 Wheat germ	1	5/8	
	AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	1 (dw)	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
273	Cyflumetofen			
	FS 0013 Cherries (subgroup)	0.4	5/8	
	SB 0716 Coffee beans	0.08	5/8	
	VC 0424 Cucumber	0.5	5/8	
	MU 1100 Hops, dried	15	5/8	
	DF 0245 Nectarine, dried	2	5/8	
	DF 0247 Peach, dried	2	5/8	
	FS 2001 Peaches (including apricots and nectarine) (subgroup)	0.3	5/8	
291	Oxathiapiprolin			
	AM 0660 Almond hulls	0.05	5/8	
	FI 0326 Avocado	0.07	5/8	
	FB 2006 Bush berries (subgroup)	0.5	5/8	
	MU 1100 Hops, dried	5	5/8	
	TN 0085 Tree nuts (group)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
320	Mefentrifluconazole			
	VL 0482 Lettuce, head	5	5/8	
324	Tetraniliprole			
	FC 0003 Mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup)	1.5	5/8	
326	Broflanilide			
	VL 0467 Chinese cabbage (type pe-tsai)	2	5/8	
330	Isoflucypram			
	GC 0640 Barley	0.1	5/8	
	CM 3510 Barley bran, unprocessed	0.05	5/8	
	CF 3511 Barley, flour	0.02	5/8	
	AS 0640 Barley, hay and/or straw	5	5/8	
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	FM 0183 Milk fats	0.005 (*)	5/8	
	ML 0106 Milks	0.005 (*)	5/8	
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	GC 0653 Triticale	0.05	5/8	
	AS 0653 Triticale, hay and/or straw	5	5/8	
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.05	5/8	
	CM 0654 Wheat bran, unprocessed	0.015	5/8	
	CF 1210 Wheat germ	0.015	5/8	
	AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	5	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
331	1,4-Dimethylnaphthalene			
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.5		5/8
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.03		5/8
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.03		5/8
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.03	(fat)	5/8
	ML 0106 Milks	0.03		5/8
	VR 0589 Potato	15	(Po)	5/8
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.3		5/8
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.3	(fat)	5/8
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.2		5/8
332	Florypicoxamid			
	FI 0327 Banana	0.4		5/8
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.09		5/8
	VO 2046 Eggplants (subgroup)	0.9		5/8
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.02 (*)		5/8
	VC 2039 Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits - cucumbers and summer squashes (subgroup)	0.3		5/8
	VC 2040 Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits – melons, pumpkins, and winter squashes (subgroup)	0.4		5/8
	DF 0269 Grape, dried (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas)	7		5/8
	FB 0269 Grapes	3		5/8
	VD 0533 Lentil (dry)	0.02 (*)		5/8
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.15		5/8
	FI 0345 Mango	0.5		5/8
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.15		5/8
	ML 0106 Milks	0.03		5/8
	VO 0444 Peppers chili	0.8		5/8
	HS 0444 Peppers chili, dried	8		5/8
	VO 0445 Peppers, sweet (including pimento or pimiento)	0.8		5/8
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.02 (*)		5/8
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.02 (*)		5/8
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.02 (*)		5/8
	SO 0495 Rape seed	0.15		5/8
	FB 0275 Strawberry	1.5		5/8
	VR 0596 Sugar beet	0.05		5/8
	DV 0448 Tomato, dried	6		5/8
	VO 2045 Tomatoes (subgroup)	0.9		5/8
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.03		5/8
	CM 0654 Wheat bran, unprocessed	0.07		5/8
	CF 3522 Wheat gluten meal	0.04		5/8
	AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	2	(dw)	5/8

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
334	Isocycloseram			
	AB 1230 Apple pomace, wet	1	5/8	
	VB 0400 Broccoli	0.7	5/8	
	VB 0402 Brussels sprouts	2	5/8	
	VB 0041 Cabbages, head	4	5/8	
	VB 0404 Cauliflower	0.5	5/8	
	FS 0013 Cherries (subgroup)	1	5/8	
	OR 0001 Citrus oil, edible	80	5/8	
	SB 0716 Coffee beans	0.04	5/8	
	SO 0691 Cotton seed	0.5	5/8	
	VC 0424 Cucumber	0.1	5/8	
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.3	5/8	
	VO 0440 Eggplant	0.3	5/8	
	FC 0002 Lemons and limes (including citron) (subgroup)	0.5	5/8	
	GC 0645 Maize	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	AS 3558 Maize, stover	1.5	5/8	
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.4	5/8	
	FC 0003 Mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.4	5/8	
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.02	5/8	
	VC 0046 Melons (except watermelon)	0.15	5/8	
	ML 0106 Milks	0.05	5/8	
	VA 0385 Onion, bulb	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	AB 0004 Orange, dried pulp	3	5/8	
	FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.4	5/8	
	FS 2001 Peaches (including apricots and nectarine) (subgroup)	0.3	5/8	
	VO 0444 Peppers chili	0.6	5/8	
	HS 0444 Peppers chili, dried	4.2	5/8	
	VO 0445 Peppers, sweet (including pimento or pimiento)	0.3	5/8	
	FS 0014 Plums (including fresh prunes) (subgroup)	0.4	5/8	
	FP 0009 Pome fruits (group)	0.4	5/8	
	VR 0589 Potato	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	DF 0014 Prunes	1.5	5/8	
	FC 0005 Pummelo and grapefruits (including Shaddock-like hybrids, among others Grapefruit) (subgroup)	0.3	5/8	
	VD 0541 Soya bean (dry)	0.15	5/8	
	AL 0541 Soya bean, hay and/or straw	20	5/8	
	AL 3538 Soya bean, hulls	1	5/8	
	VC 0431 Squash, summer	0.09	5/8	
	VO 0448 Tomato	0.5	5/8	
	DV 0448 Tomato, dried	2	5/8	
	DM 3525 Tomato, pomace	8	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
335	Isotianil			
	FI 0327 Banana	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	OR 0001 Citrus oil, edible	40	5/8	
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	FC 0002 Lemons and limes (including citron) (subgroup)	0.5	5/8	
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	FC 0003 Mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.4	5/8	
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	ML 0106 Milks	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.4	5/8	
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	FC 0005 Pummelo and grapefruits (including Shaddock-like hybrids, among others Grapefruit) (subgroup)	0.2	5/8	
336	Mepiquat Chloride			
	SO 0691 Cotton seed	4	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	AB 1203 Cotton seed, meal	8	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.04	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.008 (*)	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	AB 0269 Grape pomace, dried	15	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	DF 0269 Grape, dried (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas)	20	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	FB 0269 Grapes	4	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.01	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	ML 0106 Milks	0.008 (*)	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.008 (*)	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.008 (*)	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.008 (*)	5/8	(expressed as mepiquat cation)

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
337	Tricyclazole			
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.1		5/8
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.01 (*)		5/8
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.01 (*)		5/8
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01 (*)		5/8
	ML 0106 Milks	0.01 (*)		5/8
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.01 (*)		5/8
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)		5/8
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)		5/8
	GC 0649 Rice	5		5/8
	AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	5 (dw)		5/8
	AS 3570 Rice, hulls	15 (dw)		5/8
	CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.3		5/8
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	0.3		5/8

APPENDIX III

MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(For revocation)
(For approval by CAC)

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)		Step	Note
8 Carbaryl					
GC 0651	Sorghum grain	10	Po	CXL-D	
87 Dinocap					
VC 0424	Cucumber	0.7		CXL-D	
VC 0045	Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits (group)	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
96 Carbofuran					
FI 0327	Banana	0.01 (*)		CXL-D	
MF 0812	Cattle fat	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
AB 0001	Citrus pulp, dried	2		CXL-D	Based on the use of carbosulfan
SB 0716	Coffee beans	1		CXL-D	
SO 0691	Cotton seed	0.1		CXL-D	
MO 0096	Edible offal of cattle, goats, horses, pigs & sheep	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
MF 0814	Goat fat	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
MF 0816	Horse fat	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
GC 0645	Maize	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	Based on the use of carbosulfan
FC 0206	Mandarin	0.5		CXL-D	Based on the use of carbosulfan
MM 0096	Meat of cattle, goats, horses, pigs & sheep	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
FC 0004	Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.5		CXL-D	
MF 0818	Pig fat	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
SO 0495	Rape seed	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
AS 0649	Rice, hay and/or straw	1		CXL-D	
CM 0649	Rice, husked	0.1		CXL-D	
MF 0822	Sheep fat	0.05 (*)		CXL-D	
GC 0651	Sorghum grain	0.1 (*)		CXL-D	
AS 0651	Sorghum straw and fodder, dry	0.5		CXL-D	
HS 0193	Spices, roots, and rhizomes	0.1		CXL-D	
VR 0596	Sugar beet	0.2		CXL-D	Based on the use of carbosulfan
GS 0659	Sugar cane	0.1 (*)		CXL-D	
SO 0702	Sunflower seed	0.1 (*)		CXL-D	
103 Phosmet					
FP 0009	Pome fruits (group)	10		CXL-D	

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
111 Iprodione				
TN 0660	Almonds	0.2		CXL-D
GC 0640	Barley	2		CXL-D
VD 0071	Bean (dry)	0.1		CXL-D
FB 0264	Blackberries	30		CXL-D
VB 0400	Broccoli	25		CXL-D
VR 0577	Carrot	10	Po	CXL-D
FS 0013	Cherries (subgroup)	10		CXL-D
VP 0526	Common bean (pods and/or immature seeds)	2		CXL-D
VC 0424	Cucumber	2		CXL-D
FB 0269	Grapes	10		CXL-D
FI 0341	Kiwifruit	5		CXL-D
VL 0482	Lettuce, head	10		CXL-D
VL 0483	Lettuce, leaf	25		CXL-D
VA 0385	Onion, bulb	0.2		CXL-D
FS 0247	Peach	10		CXL-D
FP 0009	Pome fruits (group)	5	Po	CXL-D
SO 0495	Rape seed	0.5		CXL-D
FB 0272	Raspberries, red, black	30		CXL-D
CM 0649	Rice, husked	10		CXL-D
HS 0193	Spices, roots, and rhizomes	0.1		CXL-D
HS 0190	Spices, seeds	0.05 (*)		CXL-D
FB 0275	Strawberry	10		CXL-D
VR 0596	Sugar beet	0.1 (*)		CXL-D
SO 0702	Sunflower seed	0.5		CXL-D
VO 0448	Tomato	5		CXL-D
VL 2832	Witloof chicory (sprouts)	1		CXL-D
118 Cypermethrins (including alpha- and zeta- cypermethrin)				
VA 0385	Onion, bulb	0.01 (*)		CXL-D

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
145 Carbosulfan				
AB 0001	Citrus pulp, dried	0.1		CXL-D
SO 0691	Cotton seed	0.05		CXL-D
MO 0105	Edible offal (mammalian)	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
PE 0112	Eggs	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
GC 0645	Maize	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
FC 0206	Mandarin	0.1		CXL-D
MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05	(*) (fat)	CXL-D
FC 0004	Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.1		CXL-D
PM 0110	Poultry meat	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
PO 0111	Poultry, edible offal of	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
AS 0649	Rice, hay and/or straw	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
HS 0191	Spices, fruits, and berries	0.07		CXL-D
HS 0193	Spices, roots, and rhizomes	0.1		CXL-D
VR 0596	Sugar beet	0.3		CXL-D
160 Propiconazole				
MO 0105	Edible offal (mammalian)	0.5		CXL-D
PE 0112	Eggs	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
MF 0100	Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01	(*) (fat)	CXL-D
ML 0106	Milks	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
PM 0110	Poultry meat	0.01	(*) (fat)	CXL-D
224 Difenoconazole				
FS 0013	Cherries (subgroup)	0.2		CXL-D
FS 0245	Nectarine	0.5		CXL-D
FS 0247	Peach	0.5		CXL-D
FS 0014	Plums (including fresh prunes) (subgroup)	0.2		CXL-D
238 Clothianidin				
VS 0624	Celery	0.04		CXL-D
VO 0050	Fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits (group)	0.05		CXL-D (except sweet corn)
TN 0672	Pecan	0.01	(*)	CXL-D

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
243	Fluopyram			
	GC 0640 Barley	0.2		CXL-D
	AS 0640 Barley, hay and/or straw	2		CXL-D
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	8		CXL-D
	PE 0112 Eggs	2		CXL-D
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	1.5		CXL-D
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	1.5		CXL-D
	ML 0106 Milks	0.8		CXL-D
	AS 0647 Oat straw and fodder, dry	2		CXL-D
	GC 0647 Oats	0.2		CXL-D
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	1		CXL-D
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	1.5		CXL-D
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	5		CXL-D
	GC 0650 Rye	0.9		CXL-D
	AS 0650 Rye straw and fodder, dry	23		CXL-D
	GC 0653 Triticale	0.9		CXL-D
	AS 0653 Triticale, hay and/or straw	23		CXL-D
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.9		CXL-D
	AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	23		CXL-D
245	Thiamethoxam			
	VS 0624 Celery	1		CXL-D
	VO 0050 Fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits (group)	0.7		CXL-D
	TN 0672 Pecan	0.01 (*)		CXL-D
255	Dinotefuran			
	VO 0050 Fruiting vegetables, other than corn and cucurbits (group)	0.5		CXL-D (except mushrooms and sweet corn)
263	Cyantraniliprole			
	VD 0071 Bean (dry)	0.3		CXL-D
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.15		CXL-D
	VO 0050 Fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits (group)	0.5		CXL-D (except mushrooms and sweet corn)
	VD 0541 Soya bean (dry)	0.4		CXL-D
	FB 1236 Wine-grapes	1		CXL-D
267	Imazapyr			
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.05 (*)		CXL-D
	AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	0.05 (*)		CXL-D
326	Broflanilide			
	VL 0466 Chinese cabbage (type pack-choi)	2		CXL-D

APPENDIX IV

**MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(Withdrawn by CCPR)
(For information)**

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
111 Iprodione			
VB 0400 Broccoli	40	MRL-W	
178 Bifenthrin			
VL 0482 Lettuce, head	4	MRL-W	
320 Mefentrifluconazole			
VL 2050 Leafy greens (subgroup)	30	MRL-W	
VL 0483 Lettuce, leaf	15	MRL-W	
VL 0502 Spinach	30	MRL-W	
324 Tetraniliprole			
FC 0003 Mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup)	1	MRL-W	

APPENDIX V**MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(Retained at Step 7)
(For information)**

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
138 Metalaxyl			
VO 0445 Peppers, sweet (including pimento or pimiento)	0.5	7	

APPENDIX VI**Part I**

**MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(Retained at Step 4)
(For information)**

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
27 Dimethoate			
AB 0004 Orange, dried pulp	5	4	Dimethoate(027)/Omethoate(055)
FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	2	4	Dimethoate(027)/Omethoate(055)
55 Omethoate			
AB 0004 Orange, dried pulp	0.04	4	
FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.02	4	
111 Iprodione			
AM 3604 Potato, culls	0.15	4	
138 Metalaxyl			
OR 0004 Orange oil, edible	7	4	
FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.7	(M) 4	(Residue data that was the basis for the estimation: Metalaxyl (M))
145 Carbosulfan			
VO 0440 Eggplant	0.15	4	
FI 0345 Mango	0.1	4	
160 Propiconazole			
CM 1205 Rice, polished	10	4	

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
202 Fipronil			
FI 0327 Banana	0.004 (*)	4	
AS 0640 Barley, hay and/or straw	0.07	4	
GC 2087 Barley, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks (subgroup)	0.004 (*)	4	
HH 0722 Basil, leaves	0.8	4	
VP 2060 Beans with pods (subgroup)	0.01	4	
SO 0691 Cotton seed	0.01	4	
VD 2065 Dry beans (subgroup)	0.01	4	(except soya beans)
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.1	4	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.04	4	
VL 0053 Leafy vegetables (group)	0.01	4	(residues resulting from rotational cropping)
GC 2091 Maize cereals (subgroup)	0.01	4	
MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.4	4	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.03	4	
FM 0183 Milk fats	0.3	4	
ML 0106 Milks	0.03	4	
AS 3559 Oat, hay and/or straw	0.07 (dw)	4	
VA 0385 Onion, bulb	0.03	4	
VR 0589 Potato	0.05	4	
PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.07	4	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.07	4	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.03	4	
CM 1206 Rice bran, unprocessed	2	4	
GC 2088 Rice cereals (subgroup)	0.4	4	
AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	0.6 (dw)	4	
AS 3570 Rice, hulls	2	4	
CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.4	4	
CM 1205 Rice, polished	0.15	4	
VR 0075 Root and tuber vegetables (group)	0.002	4	(except potato and sugar beet) (residues resulting from rotational cropping)
AS 3560 Rye, hay and/or straw	0.05 (dw)	4	
VD 0541 Soya bean (dry)	0.01	4	
OC 0541 Soya bean oil, crude	0.05	4	
AL 3538 Soya bean, hulls	0.06	4	
AS 0081 Straw and hay of cereal grains (excluding pseudocereals) (subgroup)	0.03 (dw)	4	(except of barley, oats, rice, rye, triticale, and wheat) (residues resulting from rotational cropping)
VR 0596 Sugar beet	0.01	4	
GS 0659 Sugar cane	0.01	4	
SO 2091 Sunflower seeds (subgroup)	0.004 (*)	4	
VO 2045 Tomatoes (subgroup)	0.01 (*)	4	
AS 0653 Triticale, hay and/or straw	0.05 (dw)	4	
AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	0.05 (dw)	4	
GC 2086 Wheat, similar grains, and pseudocereals without husks (subgroup)	0.004 (*)	4	

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
248 Flutriafol			
GC 0649 Rice	4	4	
AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	6 (dw)	4	
AS 3570 Rice, hulls	20 (dw)	4	(husks)
CM 0649 Rice, husked	1	4	
CM 1205 Rice, polished	1.5	4	
263 Cyantraniliprole			
SO 0305 Olives for oil production	1	4	
FT 0305 Table olives	1	4	

Part II

**GUIDELINE LEVELS FOR PESTICIDES CONVERTED INTO MRLs AT STEP 4
(Retained at Step 4)
(For information)**

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
52 Methyl Bromide			
CP 0179 Bread and other cooked cereal	0.01 (*)	4	To apply to commodity at point of products retail sale or when offered for consumption
SB 0715 Cacao beans	5 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
GC 0080 Cereal grains (group)	5 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
AO6 Cocoa products	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption
DF 0167 Dried fruits	2 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
DF 0167 Dried fruits	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption
AO4 Milled cereals products	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption
AO4 Milled cereals products	1 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
SO 0697 Peanut	10 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
SO 0697 Peanut	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption
TN 0085 Tree nuts (group)	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)		Step	Note
TN 0085	Tree nuts (group)	10	Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
114 Guazatine					
GC 0080	Cereal grains (group)	0.05 (*)		4	
FC 0001	Citrus fruits (group)	5	Po	4	

**CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE CXLs FOR PEPPERS GROUP/SUBGROUP:
MRLs FOR OKRA
(For adoption by CAC)**

63 Pyrethrins

Main Uses: Insecticide

ADI: 0-0.04 mg/kg bw (1972); confirmed (1999, 2005)

ARfD: 0.2 mg/kg bw (1999)

Residue: For compliance with MRLs and estimation of dietary intake for plant and animal commodities: Total pyrethrins, calculated as the sum of pyrethrins 1 and 2, cinerins 1 and 2, and jasmolins 1 and 2, determined after calibration with the World Standard pyrethum extract.

Note: Based on the data obtained from supervised trials, JMPR (2023) did not recommend establishing MRLs and IEDI assessments. This was because no trial matched the GAP and/or insufficient data.

Commodity code	Name	MRL (mg/kg)	Source	Note CXL	Step	JMPR	CCPR	Prior CCPR	CAC	Note CCPR
VO 0051	Peppers (subgroup)	0.05 (*)		<u>MRL provisionally applies to okra, martynia, and roselle.</u>	CXL	00	34		2003	Pending submission of residue trial data to clarify the suitable classification and representative commodity for okra, martynia, and roselle.

120 Permethrin

Main Uses: Insecticide

ADI: 0.05 mg/kg bw (1987), confirmed (1999)

ARfD: Unnecessary (1999)

Residue: For plant and animal commodities (for compliance with the MRL): Permethrin (sum of cis and trans isomers).

For plants and animals for dietary risk assessment: JMPR (2023) could not conclude on a residue definition for risk assessment.

Note: JMPR (2023) could not conclude on a residue definition for risk assessment. No MRLs are recommended, nor are levels estimated for use in long-term and acute dietary exposure assessments as the Meeting could not conclude the residue definition for risk assessment for plants and animals, and due to late submission of the relevant key data.

Commodity code	Name	MRL (mg/kg)	Source	Note CXL	Step	JMPR	CCPR	Prior CCPR	CAC	Note CCPR
VO 0051	Peppers (subgroup)	1		<u>MRL provisionally applies to okra, martynia, and roselle.</u>	CXL					Pending submission of residue trial data to clarify the suitable classification and representative commodity for okra, martynia, and roselle.

APPENDIX VIII

**CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENT TO THE
CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD AND FEED (CXA 4-1989)**

**INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL COMMODITIES
IN CLASS D**

(For adoption by CAC)

CLASS D - PROCESSED FOODS OF PLANT ORIGIN

Group 069: Miscellaneous derived edible products of plant origin	DM 3527 Tomato, ketchup
---	--------------------------------

APPENDIX IX**GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING THE STABILITY AND PURITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS AND RELATED STOCK SOLUTIONS OF PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE**

**(At Step 5)
(For adoption by CAC)**

INTRODUCTION

1. Pesticide residues in food commodities have become a worldwide agricultural trade-concern, which has led to enforcement of strict pesticide regulations. More than 1200 pesticides are available globally to control the pests on different food commodities. Analyses of pesticides at trace levels in the food chain require the use of specific Reference Materials (RMs) of known chemical purity manufactured by the Reference Material Producers (RMPs) to ensure the reliability of the test results. Accurate determination of pesticide residues in food commodities is important for food safety control and fixation of pesticide MRLs, thereby overcoming the related trade barriers. RMs with specified purity are also required for accurate qualitative and quantitative analysis of pesticide active ingredient(s) in technical products, formulations, and stock solutions.
2. Limited shelf life, diminishing purity, and high recurring cost of RMs act as major impediments to performing regular pesticide residue analysis. These problems are magnified for multi-pesticide residue analysis by testing laboratories in developing countries as they are required to allocate a large part of their funds for frequent procurement of expensive RMs. Furthermore, the use of RMs is restricted by the expiry dates specified by the RMPs in the reference material document (e.g., certificate of analysis (CoA) or product information sheet), which provides the value for purity, expiry date, and measurement uncertainty of the RMs. Many times, laboratories cannot afford the frequent purchase of high-cost RMs for their pesticide residue control work.
3. Moreover, due to supply chain constraints, some laboratories may receive RMs close to their expiry date, as mentioned in the reference material document. In such situations, the laboratories are forced to buy new standards and prepare new stock solutions more frequently than necessary. This leads to insurmountable extra work and increased laboratory costs, especially for compounds for which stability is well understood. Additionally, shipping RMs by the suppliers to laboratories increases the acquisition time for procurement (a few weeks to months), creating hurdles in sustainable pesticide residue control programs.
4. There are RMs that remain stable even after the expiry dates stated in the reference material document with no significant change in purity. Some studies^{1,2,3} have also reported that if RMs are stored at better storage conditions than recommended by the manufacturer, provided that these conditions do not contradict those indicated by the RMP in the reference material document, the RMs are stable for much longer than the expiry dates indicated by the RMPs. Such RMs may technically be allowed to be used beyond their expiry dates if laboratory checks are in place to demonstrate that they are stable and continue meeting the purity requirements. However, the lack of data on the stability and purity of RMs during prolonged storage and the absence of guidance procedures for monitoring prevents their use beyond the expiry dates.
5. This document represents a crucial step towards developing comprehensive harmonized guidance enabling the laboratories to monitor the stability and purity of the pesticide RMs and their stock solutions during prolonged storage. The document aims to guide the laboratories in monitoring the stability and purity of RMs for their possible use beyond their expiry dates and for continued use of stock solutions that retain their stability and purity.

¹ de Kok, A., de Kroon, M. and Kiedrowska, B. (PO 005 pdf, 2019). Stability of pesticides reference standards and stock solutions Part 1. GC-pesticides NVWA - Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority, Laboratory of Food and Feed Safety-Chemistry Laboratory, National Reference Laboratory (NRL) for Pesticide Residues in Food and Feed, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

² de Kok, A., de Kroon, M. and Scholten, J. (PO 006 pdf, 2019). Stability of pesticides reference standards and stock solutions Part 2. LC-pesticides NVWA - Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority, Laboratory of Food and Feed Safety-Chemistry Laboratory, National Reference Laboratory (NRL) for Pesticide Residues in Food and Feed, Wageningen, The Netherlands.

³ Sharma, K. K., Tripathy, V., Gautam, R., Gupta, R., Tayade, A., Sharma, K., Yadav, R., Shukla, P., Devi, S., Pandey, P., Singh, G., Kalra, S., Walia, S. (2020). Monitoring of purity of CRMs of multi-class pesticides during prolonged storage before and after expiration. Accreditation Qual. Assur., 25 (10), 89-97. 10.1007/s00769-019-01411-w.

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

6. The purpose of this document is to furnish a framework that would assist the laboratories in monitoring the stability and purity of individual reference material (RM) of pesticides during prolonged storage and identify expired RMs with continued stability and purity. The general criterion of the proposed new work is to monitor and verify the stability and purity of individual RMs before and after expiration through robust analytical protocols so that such materials that retain their purity as per the reference material document even after expiry can continue to be used as valid RMs. Another aspect of the proposed work is to monitor the stability of the stock solutions used for pesticide residue analysis so that those solutions that continue to be valid can be used for the accurate and reliable determination of pesticide residue levels.
7. This document applies to reference materials (RMs) of pesticides and their individual stock standard solutions of known purity specified by a reference material producer (RMP).
8. These guidelines will enable the pesticide residue laboratories to overcome the constraints associated with short expiry periods of RMs and use them beyond their expiry dates mentioned in the reference material document. After the expiration date, the RMs retaining the purity specified in the reference material document can be used as RMs or as quality control materials (QCM) for the analysis of pesticides, provided that these are stored under conditions specified in the guidelines and according to the manufacturer's instructions. RMs that do not remain stable and do not show acceptable purity during prolonged storage shall not be used by laboratories for pesticide residue testing/quantitative purposes, as accurate results may not be obtained.
9. The guidelines cover the storage conditions that shall be maintained and quantitative measurements that shall be performed to monitor the stability and purity of RMs and their stock solutions before and beyond their expiration period.

GENERAL CRITERIA

10. The analysis shall be conducted in laboratories in compliance with the general criteria for testing laboratories laid down in ISO/IEC 17025:2017, with the scope relevant to the measurement concerned.
11. The RMs shall be procured from an RMP accredited as per ISO 17034 to ensure analytical traceability or from a National Metrology Institute recognized by peers or designated by countries.
12. To ensure metrological traceability, the analytical balances used shall be calibrated with weights traceable to the national/international standards.
13. calibrated class A glassware or appropriate electronic pipettes traceable to national/international standards shall be used for volumetric measurements.
14. The instrumentation used in purity tests should have comparable or greater sensitivity/specificity to those used in the reference material document of the RM.
15. According to the reference material document, the equipment used for storing and monitoring RMs should be traceable to national/international standards.
16. In case a laboratory is predicting the shelf-life of an RM, the current ISO Guide⁴ may be referred.

CRITERIA FOR STORAGE CONDITIONS FOR PESTICIDE REFERENCE MATERIALS AND THEIR STOCK SOLUTIONS

17. The storage conditions of RMs are specified by RMPs in the reference material documents, as these are susceptible to degradation at high temperatures and other unfavorable environmental conditions. Environmental conditions (temperature and humidity, as appropriate) shall be recorded, monitored and controlled by the laboratory.

⁴ ISO 33405:2024 -Reference materials — Approaches for characterization and assessment of homogeneity and stability

18. If a laboratory maintains the RMs at better storage conditions, i.e., more protective than those recommended by the RMPs (i.e., temperature lower than recommended without exposure to light and moisture, etc.), the rate of degradation of the RMs is significantly minimized as long as these conditions do not contradict those indicated in the reference material document by the RMP. Under such conditions, the expiry date as recommended by the RMPs may be extended as appropriate for an RM by a date allowing for storage of up to 10 years or as long as the purity mentioned in the reference material document holds good ($\leq \pm 10\%$) (SANTE⁵, 2024). Another study revealed the stability of pesticide reference standards for up to 15 years or in-stock solutions for up to 10 years^{1,2}.
19. To avoid any cross-contamination or degradation of RMs, the vials can be placed in an airtight capped tube/sealed pouch (made of suitable polypropylene or high-quality plastic material) and immediately stored in the freezer/refrigerator at conditions more protective than those recommended by RMPs, preferably at subzero temperature. The stock solutions must also be stored in airtight capped glassware. Storage conditions shall be monitored with appropriately calibrated equipment and controlled and recorded. Exposing glassware to extreme temperatures should be avoided.

ANALYTICAL PROTOCOL FOR MONITORING THE STABILITY AND PURITY OF PESTICIDE REFERENCE MATERIALS AND INDIVIDUAL STOCK SOLUTIONS

20. Two analytical approaches may be considered for monitoring the stability and purity of RMs and their stock solutions and extending their use beyond the expiry date, provided their purity is proven acceptable.
21. In Approach 1, the stability of new (or unexpired) and old (or expired) RMs is determined simultaneously, and it is applicable for neat standards and their related stock solutions. The comparisons of peak area or concentration shall be run under repeatable conditions and mitigate other sources of variation in instrument response, such as using internal standards, if applicable. If the deviation (in peak area/purity) after expiration is found within 10%, the analyte in the RM is acceptable and, therefore, can be considered for continued use as an RM. For neat standards and stock solutions, monitoring of stability & purity may be continued regularly up to a maximum of 10 years (SANTE) provided the purity remains acceptable^{1,2,6}. Here, new (or unexpired) RM would be required for comparison.
22. As per Approach 2, whenever a new (or unexpired) RM is procured by any laboratory, its purity is monitored periodically before and after expiry using the same analytical conditions as mentioned in the reference material document. Here, new (or unexpired) RM need not be procured. An unexpired internal standard is to be used to account for any change in the response of the equipment. This approach applies only to neat RMs accompanied by reference material documents.

Approach 1: Comparing the stability of old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) pesticide reference standards; applicable to neat standards of reference materials and related stock solutions

23. Prepare a fresh stock solution of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RM standard of the appropriate concentration. Appropriate concentration will depend on the response of the RM in the detector. Generally, for HPLC-DAD/GC-FID, a good response is obtained between 10 mg L⁻¹ to 100 mg L⁻¹. For single quadrupole GC-MS or LC-MS, the appropriate concentration typically ranges from 1 to 5 mg L⁻¹, while for triple quadrupole GC-MS/MS or LC-MS/MS, 0.1 to 0.5 mg L⁻¹ or lower concentration may be more appropriate to avoid signal saturation.
24. Analyze the standard solution of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RM prepared from the stock solution at an appropriate concentration on a proper instrument (HPLC⁷-DAD⁸, HPLC-UV⁹, GC¹⁰-FID¹¹, LC¹²-MS¹³ or GC-MS, LC-MS/MS, GC-MS/MS or qNMR¹⁴) and record the peak area. An internal standard may be used to reduce measurement variation. Two methods described below can be employed.

⁵ SANTE/11312/2021 V2, Implemented by 01/01/2024, European Commission Directorate General for Health and Food Safety.

⁶ EURL DataPool, <https://www.eurl-pesticides-datapool.eu/>

⁷ High-performance liquid chromatography

⁸ Diode-Array Detection

⁹ Ultra-violet spectroscopy

¹⁰ Gas chromatography

¹¹ Flame ionization Detector

¹² Liquid Chromatography

¹³ Mass Spectrometry

¹⁴ Quantitative Nuclear Magnetic Resonance

25. Method 1 (Peak Area Comparison): Inject standard solutions of the old (expired) and new (unexpired) RMs prepared from the stock solution at approximately the same concentration into the instrument and record the peak area. It is recommended that the injection sequence of the five replicates of new (or unexpired) and old (or expired) standards should be randomized to minimize the drifting of signal response in the course of measurement. Calculate the mean value of the peak area for the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RM of the five replicates. The %RSD of the replicate measurements should be $\leq 10\%$.
26. Method 2 (Peak Area Ratio Comparison): Spike a different RM (unexpired) as an internal standard into the standard solutions of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RMs. Inject the solutions and record the peak area of the RM and the internal standard, perform a minimum of five replicate measurements, and calculate the average ratio of RM area to internal standard area for the old and new RMs with %RSD $\leq 10\%$. The internal standard peak should have a similar abundance to the RM being verified, and it should not interfere with the analysis of the target RM in terms of either retention time or molecular weight (m/z).
27. If the means from at least five replicate measurements for each of two standard solutions, old (or expired) and new (or unexpired), show a deviation of no more than 10%, the old (or expired) standard may be considered suitable for continuing use. The mean value from the new (or unexpired) solution is taken to be 100% and is also used as a basis for calculating the percentage difference.

28. The % deviation can be calculated using the formula:

$$\% \text{ deviation} = \frac{|(\text{Mean peak area for old (or expired) standard} - \text{Mean peak area for new (or unexpired) standard})|}{\text{Mean peak area for new (or unexpired) standard}} \times 100$$

29. The old (or expired) standard shall be compared with the new (or unexpired) standard at regular intervals of at least once a year, provided the recommended storage conditions are maintained.
30. To monitor the stability of the RM over time, a plot of the measured purity/concentration vs. time of monitoring may be made, which would help identify the deviation in stability with time.
31. To ensure the validity of the above-described stability and purity testing protocols, the gravimetric records shall be maintained for RMs (opened or unopened), both solid and liquid, and their respective stock solutions during storage before and after use at each time. Before recording the weight, the container should attain room temperature/ambient temperature and be wiped to remove any adhering moisture. The exposure of RM and stock solutions to ambient temperatures and light must be kept as short as absolutely necessary.
32. The record of the storage conditions (e.g., temperature and humidity) as well as the date of use of the RM and their stock solutions shall be maintained. Also, the temperature at which the RMs and their stock solutions are opened for use shall be recorded.

Approach 2: Verification of purity of neat standards of pesticide reference materials during prolonged storage (not suitable for verification of stock solutions)

33. To verify the purity of the RM, a chromatographic assay shall be performed, preferably as per the analytical conditions mentioned in the reference material document by the RMP. RM purity is verified by considering the purity (in terms of percent peak area) mentioned in the reference material document as the reference value.
34. Prepare a fresh stock solution of the new (or unexpired) neat standards of RMs and internal standard (a different unexpired RM) of appropriate concentration in a suitable solvent. For proper concentration, which will depend on the response of the RM in the detector, paragraph 22 of Approach I may be referred.
35. The standard solution of the RM prepared at an appropriate concentration from the stock solution is analyzed by the instrument (HPLC-DAD, HPLC-UV, GC-FID, LC-MS, GC-MS in full scan mode, or qNMR) as per the analytical conditions mentioned in the reference material document and the percent peak area so obtained is recorded as percent purity. Inject a blank solution of the same solvent in which the stock solution is prepared prior to this to consider any background interference that may be present. A minimum of five replicate measurements shall be performed to obtain a mean value of percent purity, and the %RSD of the replicates should be $\leq 10\%$. The instrument shall be calibrated as per the conditions recommended by the manufacturer.
36. Compare the mean value of verified purity obtained from the laboratory analysis with the reference value of purity provided in the reference material document. The % purity mentioned in the reference material document is considered as the purity reference value while calculating % deviation in purity.

37. Spike a different RM (unexpired) as an internal standard into the standard solution of the RM. Inject the solution and record the peak area of the RM and the internal standard and calculate the average ratio of the RM area to the internal standard area. The internal standard peak should have a similar abundance to the RM being verified, and it should not interfere with the analysis of the target RM in terms of either retention time or molecular weight (m/z).
38. Repeat the same procedure at regular intervals of at least once a year using a new stock solution of the RM, particularly before and after the RM's expiry, to monitor its stability and purity during prolonged storage.
39. After the expiry of the RM, if the mean value of percent purity in terms of percent peak area obtained for the RM and the reference value (as obtained from reference material document) do not differ by more than 10% (% deviation of less than or equal to 10%) and the ratio of peak area for the RM compared to the internal standard is $\leq 10\%$, the RM may be considered suitable for continuing use in the laboratory.

40. The % deviation in percent purity can be calculated as:

$$\% \text{ deviation} = \frac{|(\text{Mean peak percent area for neat standard} - \text{Purity reference value})|}{\text{Purity reference value}} \times 100$$

41. To ensure the validity of the above-described stability and purity testing protocols, the gravimetric records shall be maintained for RMs (opened or unopened), both solid and liquid, during storage before and after use. Before recording the weight, the container must attain room temperature/ambient temperature and be wiped to remove any adhering moisture. The exposure of RM and stock solutions to room temperatures and light must be kept as short as absolutely necessary.
42. The record of the storage conditions (e.g., temperature and humidity) as well as the date of use of the RMs shall be maintained. Also, the temperature at which the RMs are opened for use shall be recorded.

ANNEX

DEFINITIONS

Certified Reference Material (CRM): Reference material (RM) characterized by a metrologically valid procedure for one or more specified properties, accompanied by an RM certificate that provides the value of the specified property, its associated uncertainty, and a statement of metrological traceability.

Internal standard: A chemical added at a known amount to samples and/or standards in chemical analysis, including the blank and calibration standards. This substance can then be used for calibration by plotting the ratio of the analyte signal to the internal standard signal as a function of the concentrations. This ratio for the samples is then used to obtain the analyte concentrations. The internal standard used needs to provide a signal that is similar to the analyte signal in most ways but sufficiently different so that the two signals are readily distinguishable from each other.

Reference Material Document: A document that provides the relevant information about certified purity, concentration, date of expiry, and measurement uncertainty of an RM, which is in compliance with the requirement in the ISO 17034 and ISO Guide 31. Reference material documents can be in the form of a Product Information Sheet or Certificate of Analysis (CoA).

Purity: Characteristic of a reference material which indicates the proportion of the stated component of interest in relation to the total substance. Purity is typically expressed in percentages and should be considered when preparing standard solutions.

Quality Control Material (QCM): Reference material used for quality control of a measurement.

Reference Material (RM): Material sufficiently homogeneous and stable with respect to one or more specified properties, which has been established to be fit for its intended use in a measurement process.

Reference Material Producer (RMP): Body (organization or company, public or private) that is fully responsible for project planning and management; assignment of, and decision on property values and relevant uncertainties; authorization of property values; and issuance of a reference material certificate or other statements for the reference materials it produces.

Relative Standard Deviation (%RSD): It is expressed as the sample standard deviation divided by the sample mean multiplied by 100.

Stability: Characteristic of a reference material, when stored under specified conditions, to maintain a specified property value within specified limits for a specified period of time.

Standard solution: A chemical solution that has a precisely known concentration. Standard solutions are generally prepared by dissolving a solute of known mass into a solvent to a precise volume or by diluting a solution of known concentration with more solvent.

Stock Solution: A solution of a reference material or standard of high concentration from which appropriate dilutions can be made at the time of use.

APPENDIX X

**PRIORITY LIST OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR
(For approval by CAC)**

2025 - NEW COMPOUND EVALUATIONS										
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA			COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ	FAO NOMINATION FORM RECEIVED?				
2025	30/11/2020	Proquinazid	Proquinazid	Yes	Yes	Yes	APPLES, CEREALS, GRAPES (TABLE & WINE), STRAWBERRIES	Apples (9), Grapes (table & wine, min 18 trials), Wheat/rye (18), Barley/oat (27), Strawberries (8)	USA/Corteva	Fungicide. Nomination received 30 November 2020. On 30 April 2022 manufacturer requested deferral to 2024.
2025	10/12/2022	Dimpropyridaz (BAS 550 I)	Dimpropyridaz (BAS 550 I)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits Leafy vegetables (including brassica leafy vegetables) Fruiting vegetables other than cucurbits Brassica vegetables Cotton	5 trials melon (BR), 6 trials rock melon (field) (AU), 4 cucumber (field crop) (AU), 4 zucchini (field crop) (AU), 6 Leafy Lettuce (AU), 4 spinach (AU), 4 chinese cabbage (AU), 5 trials tomato (BR), 6 trials tomato (AU), 6 trials capsicum (AU), 2 trials broccoli (AU), 2 trials cauliflower (AU), 6 trials cabbage (AU), 4 trials brussel sprouts (AU), 4 trials cotton (AU), 5 trials cotton seed (BR)	Australia/BASF	JMPR submission envisaged for Q4 2023. On 10 December 2022, manufacturer provided proof of registration in Australia.
2025	23/12/2022	Acequinocyl	Acequinocyl	Yes	Yes		TREE NUTS, HOPS, STRAWBERRY, GRAPES, CITRUS, BANANA	Tree Nuts (10), Hops (11), Strawberry (8), Grapes (12), Citrus (23), Banana (5)	UPL/Agro-Kanesho	All uses currently registered. Proof of registration submitted to the eWG on 23 December 2022.
2025	31/01/2023	Ipflufenquin	Ipflufenquin	Yes	Yes		APPLE, PEAR, ALMOND, MACADAMIA, TEA	Apple (6), Pear (6), Almonds (5), Macadamia (6), Tea (8)	USA/ Nippon Soda/UPL	All proposed or current tolerances are >LOQ for all crops except Tree Nuts. Current registered US uses are Pome Fruit and Almonds. Approval of additional crops in the US is anticipated in Quarter 2 of 2023.
2025	28/02/2023	Spidoxamat	Preliminary residue definition for enforcement: sum of Spidoxamat and Spidoxamat-cyclohydroxy (cis), expressed as Spidoxamat.	Yes	Yes	Yes	SOYBEAN, GRAPES, POME FRUITS, CITRUS, STONE FRUITS, TREE NUTS, TOMATO, PEPPER, MELON, BROCCOLI, CAULIFLOWER, CUCUMBER, ONION, HOPS, STRAWBERRY, CABBAGE, LETTUCE, POTATO	Soybean: 8 Trials, Grapes: 16 Trials + 2 proc, Pome fruits: 24 Trials + 2 proc, Citrus: 30 Trials + 2 proc, Stone fruits: 34 Trials + 2 proc, Tree nuts: 14 Trials, Tomato: 24 Trials, Pepper: 24 Trials, Melon: 8 Trials, Broccoli: 8 Trials, Cauliflower: 8 Trials, Cucumber: 8 Trials, Onion: 13 Trials, Hops: 4 Trials, Strawberry: 8 Trials, Cabbage: 8 Trials, Lettuce: 26 Trials, Potato: 16 Trials	Bayer AG CropScience Division	Insecticide; Proof of registration in Cambodia provided on portal 28 February 2023.
2025	1/12/2020 (date stamp should be updated when proof of registration provided)	Tiafenacil	Tiafenacil	Approval expected on Q2 2023	Yes	No	Corn (Subgroup 20E, 20F), Wheat (20A), Barley (20B), Cotton, Grape, Tree nuts (022), Citrus (001), Pome fruit (002), Stone fruit (003), Pulses (15A, Dry Pea, Dry Beans, Soybean) Oilseed Rape (023A)	Corn (31), Cotton (18), Grape (15), Soybean (21), Wheat (53), Barley (18), Dry pea (9), Dry Bean (13), Citrus (23), Tree nuts (10), Oilseed Rape (14), Pome fruit (17), Stone fruit (36)	USA / ISK Biosciences; Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha; Farm Hannong	Request nomination in JMPR 2024 after the registration in US in 2023.
2025 RESERVE	30/11/2023	1-Octanol	1-Octanol	Yes	No		Potato	Potato (Exemption proposed)	1,4GROUP, Inc	Nominated by manufacturer on 30 November 2023. MRL exemption in US and Canada.
2025 RESERVE	Pending (expected June 2024)	XDE-747 (Haviza)	XDE-747 (Haviza)	No (Expected June 2024)	No	Yes	Soybeans	Soybeans (12 trials, 6 Brazil + 6 Argentina)	Corteva AgriSciences/Argentina	Fungicide for 2023 schedule. On 10 January 2023, manufacturer requested move to 2025 review. On 2 June 2024, manufacturer advised that label approval was expected in June 2024.

2025 - NEW USES AND OTHER EVALUATIONS									
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA		COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ				
2025	28/11/2017	NA	Fluopyram (243)	Yes	Yes	MELON, PINEAPPLE, PAPAYA, MINT, GINSENG,-BULB ONION< SUMMER SQUASH, RADISH	Melon (16), pineapple (10), papaya (4), bulb onion (8), summer squash (4), radish (4)	Bayer AG	Moved from 2020 to 2022 on request; Morocco proposed carrot; Bayer requested to move coffee to May 2021; Bayer requested to move cereals from 2020 to 2022; Bayer added avocado 26 November 2020; On 10 June 2021 company requested move of all commodities except cereals and carrots to 2024. On 29 April 2023, commodities and residue trials updated by manufacturer. On 29 April Bayer requested that pomegranate, guava, avocado, dragon fruit and kiwi be moved to 2026 but bulb onion, summer squash and radish be added to 2025.
2025	20/03/2019	NA	Mefentrifluconazole (320)	Yes (CHERRY, TABLE GRAPES, SUGARBEET, PINEAPPLE) Expected 2023/4 (all others)	Yes	CHERRIES, TABLE GRAPES, SUGARBEET, PINEAPPLE, broccoli, cauliflower, hops, olives, Brussels sprout, brassicas, minor tropical crops	Cherries (9), table grapes (12), pineapple (5), broccoli (8), cauliflower (8), sugarbeets (16), hops (7), olives (8), brussels sprout (4), brassica (15)	BASF	
2025	27/11/2019	NA	Dinotefuran (255)	Yes	Yes	SOYBEAN, GREEN TEA, PERSIMMON, PEAR, edible offal (mammalian), eggs, meat (from mammals other than marine mammals), milks, poultry meat, poultry, edible offal of, Durian (FI 0334) (Thailand)	soybean (25: USA, Brazil, Argentina, Japan), green tea (10: Japan), persimmon (5: Japan), pear (6 or more: Japan, Korea), edible offal (mammalian), eggs, meat (from mammals other than marine mammals), milks, poultry meat, poultry, edible offal of, durian (6 trials-Thailand)	Mitsui Chemicals Crop & Life Solutions/Thailand	On 08 December 2020, Mitsui requested deferral to 2022. Commodities also updated. On 22 December 2020 updates made to commodities and residue trials. On 23 July 2021 requested to defer to 2023. Durian commodity added in CRD 21 CCPRS5 by Thailand. At CCPRS5, company requested deferral to 2025.
2025	26/11/2020	NA	Trifloxystrobin (213)	Yes	Yes	AVOCADO, MANGO, CITRUS under the 4-year rule	Avocado (4), Mango (4 trials), Citrus (8 trials)	Australia/Bayer A	Australian label provided 26 November 2020. On 10 June 2021 company requested move to 2024. On 27 April 2023, commodities and residue trials updated by manufacturer.
2025	8/04/2022	NA	Pyriproxyfen (200)	Yes	Yes	010 BRASSICA EXCEPT LEAFY VEGETABLES CROP GROUP; 014 LEGUME VEGETABLES CROP GROUP; 009 BULB VEGETABLES CROP GROUP; 002 POME FRUITS CROP GROUP; 003 STONE FRUITS CROP GROUP; 004 BERRIES AND OTHER SMALL FRUITS CROP GROUP EXCEPT GRAPE; GRAPE; MUSTARD GREENS; CELERY	Cabbage (7), Cauliflower (6), Mustard green & stem (6); Snap beans (8), Peas (4); Onion (9); Apple (12), Pear (6); Sour cherries & sweet cherries (each 6), peach (9), Plum (7); Strawberry (8), Blueberries (5), Kiwi fruit (3); Grapes (8); Mustard green (6); Celery (6)	USA/Valent	Advised by US on 8 April 2022
2025	6/06/2024	NA	Pyriproxyfen (200)	YES	YES	Eggplant (subgroup)	Extrapolation	Minor Use Foundation	Following the discussion of Agenda Item 13 and CX/PR 24/55/12 which was presented by GCP at CCPRS5, the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) was added to the existing nomination for this compound.
2025	8/04/2022	NA	Etoxazole (241)	Yes	Yes	002 POME FRUITS; CHERRY (SWEET & TART); PEACH (& NECTARINE); PLUM (& APRICOT); 004E LOW GROWING BERRIES, SUBGROUP 004D; 004A CANE BERRIES, SUBGROUP 004A; CORN, FIELD, GRAIN; CORN, POP, GRAIN; CORN, SWEET, FORAGE; CORN, SWEET, STOVER; AVOCADO	Apple (8), Pear (8); Cherries (8); Peach (8); Plum (6); Strawberries (8), Cranberries (8); Raspberries, blackberries (6); Field (& pop) corn (20); Field (& pop) corn (20); Sweet corn (forage) (8); Sweet corn (stover) (8); Avocado (5)	USA/Valent	Advised by US on 8 April 2022
2025	8/04/2022	NA	Indoxacarb (216)	Yes	Yes	RICE (Thailand), WELSH ONION (ROK)	Welsh onion (6+5 processing), Rice (6)	Thailand, Republic of Korea	Advised by US on 8 April 2022. ROK advised on 27 April of ROK nomination. Rice commodity added in CRD 21 CCPRS5 by Thailand. Updated information provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2025	6/06/2024	NA	Indoxacarb (216)	YES	YES	THAI EGGPLANT	Thai eggplant (6)	Thailand	Nominated by Thailand at CCPRS5 with reference to CRD13
2025	27/04/2022	NA	Thiamethoxam (245)	Yes	Yes	WELSH ONION	Welsh onion (6+5 processing)	Republic of Korea	Nominated by ROK to eWG portal on 27 April 2022. Updated information provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2025	27/04/2022	NA	Boscalid (221)	Yes	Yes	WELSH ONION	Welsh onion (6+5 processing)	Republic of Korea	Nominated by ROK to eWG portal on 27 April 2022. Updated information provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2025	22/12/2022	NA YES	Isocloseram	Yes	Yes	Almond (TN 0660), pecan (TN 0672), AVOCADO (FI 0326), peanuts (SO 0697), Barley (GC 0640), Oat (GC 0647), Oilseed rape (SO 0495), Sugarcane (GS 0659)	Almond (5), Pecan (5), Avocado (5), Peanut (14), Barley & oat (20), oilseed rape (12), sugarcane (16)	Syngenta	Proof of registration submitted via EWG on 22/12/2022 (brassica leafy). On 27 April 2023, commodities and residue trials updated by manufacturer. On 7 March 2024, manufacturer updated commodity, trial information.
2025	22/12/2022	NA YES	Cyprodinil	Yes	Yes	MANGO (FI0345), PAPAYA (FI0350)	Mango (5), papaya (9)	Syngenta	Proof of registration submitted via EWG on 22/12/2022 for mango and papaya. On 27 April 2023, commodities and residue trials updated by manufacturer. On 7 March 2024, manufacturer updated commodity, trial information.
2025	22/12/2022	NA YES	Fludioxonil	Yes	Yes	MELON (VC 0046), WATERMELON (VC 0432), CRANBERRY (FB 0265)	Melon (8), cranberry (5)	Syngenta	Proof of registration submitted via EWG on 22/12/2022 for melon and watermelon. On 27 April 2023, commodities and residue trials updated by manufacturer. On 7 March 2024, manufacturer updated commodity, trial information.
2025	6/06/2024	NA	Fludioxonil	YES	YES	Eggplant (subgroup)	Extrapolation	Minor Use Foundation	Following the discussion of Agenda Item 13 and CX/PR 24/55/12 which was presented by GCP at CCPRS5, the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) was added to the existing nomination for this compound.

2025 - NEW USES AND OTHER EVALUATIONS									
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA		COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ				
2025	9/05/2023	NA	Cyantraniliprole (263)	Yes	Yes	WELSH ONION	Welsh onion (4 processing)	Republic of Korea	On 9 May 2023, ROK submitted request via portal. Updated information provided on EWG portal on 21 May 2024. The number of welsh onion trials was revised from 6+5 processing to 4 processing).
2025		NA	Cyantraniliprole (263)	No	Yes	Hops, Papaya, Basil, Mint, Dill	Hops (6), Papaya (5), Basil (6), Mint (5), Dill (6)	USA/FMC	Advised by US on 8 April 2022
2025	9/05/2023	NA	Flubendiamide (242)	Yes	Yes	WELSH ONION	Welsh onion (6+8 processing)	Republic of Korea	On 9 May 2023, ROK submitted request via portal. Updated information provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2025	6/06/2024	NA	Flubendiamide (242)	YES	YES	Eggplant (subgroup)	Extrapolation	Minor Use Foundation	Following the discussion of Agenda Item 13 and CX/PR 24/55/12 which was presented by GCP at CCPR55, the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) was added to the existing nomination for this compound.
2025	9/05/2023	NA	Metaflumizone (236)	Yes	Yes	WELSH ONION	Welsh onion (6+8 processing)	Republic of Korea	On 9 May 2023, ROK submitted request via portal. Updated information provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2025	6/06/2024	NA	Metaflumizone (236)	YES	YES	Eggplant (subgroup)	Extrapolation	Minor Use Foundation	Following the discussion of Agenda Item 13 and CX/PR 24/55/12 which was presented by GCP at CCPR55, the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) was added to the existing nomination for this compound.
2025	9/05/2023	NA	Metconazole (313)	Yes	Yes	WELSH ONION	Welsh onion (6+8 processing)	Republic of Korea	On 9 May 2023, ROK submitted request via portal. Updated information provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2025	17/05/2023	NA	Difenoconazole (224)	Yes	MRL not available	CUMIN, CARDAMOM	Monitoring data	India	On 17 May 2023, India submitted request via email in response to CL.
2025	17/05/2023	NA	Pyraclostrobin (210)	Yes	MRL not available	CUMIN, CARDAMOM	Monitoring data	India	On 17 May 2023, India submitted request via email in response to CL.
2025	6/06/2024	NA	Pyraclostrobin (210)	YES	YES	Eggplant (subgroup)	Extrapolation	Minor Use Foundation	Following the discussion of Agenda Item 13 and CX/PR 24/55/12 which was presented by GCP at CCPR55, the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) was added to the existing nomination for this compound.
2025	45138	Yes	Bifenthrin (178)	Yes	Yes	CITRUS FRUITS	Orange (17)	USA/FMC	On 31 July 2023, USA advised of nomination from FMC. Registration in Brazil, USA. On 22 March 2024, manufacturer requested move to 2026 for kiwi, clover, coffee, safflower, date. On 31 May 2024, FMC confirmed that they plan to submit additional toxicological information in addition to residues data.
2025	5/09/2023	NA	Pyriofenone (310)	Yes	Yes	Strawberry, fruiting vegetables other than cucurbits	strawberry (8), Tomato (23), Bell pepper (9), Non-bell pepper (3)	Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha (ISK)	On 5 September 2023, manufacturer advised of new request via EWG portal.
2025 RESERVE	12/10/2023	NA	Beta-cyfluthrin (157)	Yes	Yes	GRAPE, WHEAT	Grape (8 + 2 processing), Wheat (12 trials)	Bayer AG	On 27 April 2023, nominated by manufacturer for new uses via portal. On 12 October 2023, manufacturer provided US label for wheat and grapes.
2025 RESERVE	25/10/2023	NA	Broflanilide (326)	Yes	Yes	Brassica vegetables, fruiting vegetables, leafy vegetables, soybean, celery, animal products	Brassica vegetables flowering brassica (min. 10 trials), fruiting vegetables (min. 30 trials, processing study), leafy vegetables (min. 30 trials), soybean (20 trials, processing study), celery (9 trials), feeding studies in cow and hen	BASF/Mitsui	On 25 October 2023, manufacturer nominated via portal new uses and provided approved label from Canada.
2025 RESERVE	14/11/2023	NA	Mepiquat chloride (999)	Yes	Yes	COTTON	Cotton (5)	BASF	On 14 November 2023, manufacturer nominated via portal new uses and provided approved label from Brazil.
2025 RESERVE	18/12/2023	NA	Spinetoram (233)	Yes	Yes (MRLs not >LOQ for coffee, sugarcane)	ASPARAGUS, COFFEE, SUGARCANE	Asparagus (7), coffee (8), sugarcane (4)	Corteva Agriscience	Nominated by Corteva to eWG portal on 28 April 2022. On 18 December 2023, manufacturer provided label.
2025 RESERVE	6/06/2024	NA	Spinetoram (233)	YES	YES	CHINESE BROCCOLI	Chinese broccoli (6)	Thailand	Nominated by Thailand at CCPR55 with reference to CRD13
2025 RESERVE	6/06/2024	NA	Spinetoram (233)	YES	YES	Eggplant (subgroup)	Extrapolation	Minor Use Foundation	Following the discussion of Agenda Item 13 and CX/PR 24/55/12 which was presented by GCP at CCPR55, the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) was added to the existing nomination for this compound.

2025 - PERIODIC REVIEW						
PRIORITY	YEAR	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMODITIES	COMMENTS
2025	2025	Carbendazim (72)	Carbendazim (72)			JMPR review in 2023 recommended withdrawal of the ADI and ARfD as the toxicological dossier was insufficient. CCRP55 agreed to retain the CXLs pending the submission of additional toxicological data for JMPR assessment in 2025.
2025 (4 YEAR RULE AGREED AT CCRP54 2023, COMPANY REQUESTED SCHEDULING IN 2025)	2025	2-Phenylphenol (56)	2-Phenylphenol (56)	LANXESS Deutschland GmbH	Citrus	Moved from Unsupported table to 2024 periodic review as manufacturer support has been identified. On 13 June 2023, manufacturer requested scheduling of periodic review in 2025.
2025 (4 YEAR RULE AGREED AT CCRP54 2023, COMPANY REQUESTED SCHEDULING IN 2025)	2025	Fenbutatin oxide (109)	Fenbutatin oxide (109)	UPL		Moved from Table 5 to Table 2A as UPL indicated support on 1 June 2023.
2025 (moved from 2022 on request of FMC); On 2 April 2022, FMC requested deferral to 2025.	2025	Malathion (49)	Malathion (49)	FMC/USA	Advised by FMC on 16 September 2023: Blueberries (6), cherries (8), citrus fruits (8), cotton seed (7 + 1 processing), grapes (8), maize (12), sorghum (8), strawberry (8), wheat (16 + 2 processing), maize storage grains (4), walnuts (4), cane berries (5), rice (6)	October 2020-FMC requested deferral to 2023, awaiting reviews in US and Europe in 2022. On 2 April 2022, FMC requested postponement of periodic review of malathion, pending 2024 review in EU and 2024/25 review in US. In 2023, FMC is developing new residue data to support these reviews. JMPR confirmed that tox was reviewed in 2016, but residues last full review was 1999. On 31 May 2024, FMC confirmed that they plan to submit toxicological data in addition to residues data in support of the periodic review.
2025 (DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCRP52 2021 UNDER 4-YEAR RULE TO 2025)	2025	Pirimicarb (101)	Pirimicarb (101)	Syngenta & Collaborators	Supported by the manufacturer -Nov18. Collaborators needed for residue data package. Public health concerns - acute dietary risk- Netherlands – check uses for peach and lettuce based on existing residue data and labels¶Moved from 2017 New use and other evaluations.	Moved from 2022 Periodic Review schedule to 2025 on decision of CCRP52 in 2021.
2025 (DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCRP52 2021 UNDER 4-YEAR RULE TO 2025)	2025	Hydrogen phosphide, (zinc and aluminium salts) (46)	Hydrogen phosphide (46)	Degesch	Cereal grains, citrus, almonds	Additional preparation time requested. Moved from 2022 Periodic Review schedule to 2025 on decision of CCRP52 in 2021.
2025 (DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCRP52 2021 UNDER 4-YEAR RULE TO 2025)	2025	Clethodim (187)	Clethodim (187)	UPL	Crops reviewed by JMPR in 2019: Artichoke, globe, broccoli, cabbage, head, carrot, VD 0071 Beans, dry, VP 0061 Beans, except broad bean and soya bean, AL 0061 Bean fodder, Bean, forage, VD 0561 Field pea (dry), Pea, fodder, Pea, vining, Hops, dry SO 0495, Rape seed, OC 0495 Rape seed oil, Crude OR 0495 Rape seed oil, Edible, VA 0381 Garlic, VA 0385 Onions, bulb, Strawberries Crops with CXLs withdrawn and not reviewed by JMPR in 2019: AL 1020 Alfalfa fodder, VD 0541 Soya bean (dry), OC 0541 Soya bean oil, crude, OR 0541 Soya bean oil, refine, VR 0596 Sugar beet, SO 0702 Sunflower seed, OC 0702 Sunflower seed oil, crude, VO 0448 Tomato, AM 1051 Fodder beet, SO 0697 Peanut, VR 0589 Potato, SO 0691 Cotton seed, OC 0691 Cotton seed oil, Crude, OR 0691 Cotton seed oil, Edible, MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian), PE 0112 Eggs, MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine animals), ML 0105 Milks, PM 0110 Poultry meat, PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	JMPR review in 2019. Additional data generated to address identified gaps. 22062021 company requested commencement of 4 year rule. If agreed, term should commence 2021 and expire 2025. Moved from 2022 Periodic Review schedule to 2025 on decision of CCRP52 in 2021.
2025 (DEFERRED BY DECISION OF CCRP52 2021 UNDER 4-YEAR RULE TO 2025)	2025	Guazatine (114)	Guazatine (114)	ICA (Adama)	Supported by the manufacturer	Guazatine appears to be a special case. In 1978 an ADI was derived, which was withdrawn in 1997 since "The Meeting concluded that it could not establish an ADI for guazatine owing to the inadequate information on its composition and concerns about the production of rare malignant tumours in mice". "The Meeting estimated the maximum residue level shown in Annex I.As the Meeting withdrew the ADI for guazatine this is recorded only as a Guideline Level". As such no CXLs are supposed to be available. However, a CXL for cereal grains (0.05* mg/kg G = guideline value) and citrus fruit (5 mg/kg Po = post harvest use) can still be found in the Codex Alimentarius. ¶Annex 1 and Annex 2 of the JMPR 1997 evaluation, show that the CXL for Citrus fruits of 5 mg/kg Po is withdrawn, but that for cereals a maximum residue level of0.05* mg/kg is proposed. The CXL of 5 mg/kg has been adopted by the CCPR in 1999. It is unclear which discussion is behind this. The problem is that this specific MRL-crop combination gives rise to a human health risk. Only "guideline levels" (5 mg/kg) for citrus exist since the ADI was withdrawn in 1997. It was recommended that these guideline levels would remain until a new ADI is recommended. It is proposed either to delete the guideline level or request sponsors to support a re-evaluation of guazatine. There are no CXLs in place in CX/PR 14/46/5 – instead guideline levels are set – clarification from Codex Secretariat is sought. Moved from 2022 Periodic Review schedule to 2025 on decision of CCRP52 in 2021. Advised by JMPR on 9 February 2022 that a data package had been delivered to JMPR, assessed as inadequate basis on which to estimate health based guidance values.
2025	2025	Captan (07)	Captan (07)	Adama / UPL (co-sponsors)	Tree nuts, berries and other small fruits (blueberries, currants, gooseberries, raspberries, blackberries, dewberries, loganberries), strawberries, grapes, stone fruits (apricot, cherries, peach, nectarine, plums), pome fruits, citrus fruits, persimmon, potato, carrots, cucurbits edible peel, cucurbits inedible peel, chili peppers, sweet peppers, tomatoes, eggplant, bulb onion, garlic, maize, cotton, cereal grains, rice, rapeseed, soybean, root and rhizome spices	Moved from Table 3 to Table 2A under 25 year rule. Existing CXLs plus additional global uses/MRLs proposed. Periodic re-evaluation with additional supporting residues trials data for new commodities and updated data where available. An update on the number of studies can be provided in due course. Update provided by sponsor 27112020.
2025	2025	Dimethoate (27)		FMC	Oranges	During CCRP54, WHO agreed to evaluate new dimethoate toxicology data to support oranges.