

## 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 XX Member countries, one Member Organization, and XX 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 initiatives in food safety and production, e.g. producing more than 650 million tons of grain a year, 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, in order to jointly promote global food security and sustainable agricultural development.
3. Mr Yun HU, Vice Governor of Sichuan Province of the People's Republic of China, also addressed the Committee and extended a warm welcome to 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 and encouraged all delegates to contribute towards the fair use and trade of pesticides.
4. Mr Zhongjun ZHANG, Officer-in-Charge, FAO Representation in China, Mr Soren MADSEN on behalf 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 CXLs in the Codex database for maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pesticides under Agenda item 14 (Other business).
  - establish an in-Session Working Group (WG) open to all Members and Observers, chaired by India, 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 to prepare a proposal for consideration by the plenary.

## 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, United Kingdom, and USA for their support to the CCPR's core work to establish MRLs for pesticides. The Chairperson acknowledged the valuable assistance of rapporteurs to ensure that the discussions and decisions taken by CCPR in this regard are accurately reflected in the report of its session.

## MATTERS REFERRED TO CCPR BY CAC AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda item 3)<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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)<sup>2</sup> and CCPR<sup>3</sup>, the Codex Secretariat recalled that, following a request from CCCF16 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, in view of 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 JECFA should take the lead on the evaluation of EtO, with support from JMPR, and that this approach would expedite the establishment of an ML for EtO as a contaminant by CCCF due to uses other than a pesticide.
11. The Codex Secretariat informed the Committee that CCCF17 (2024)<sup>4</sup> 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.

**Conclusion**

12. CCPR:
- (i) noted the matters for information referred by CAC, 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 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)<sup>5</sup>**

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

**FAO**22<sup>nd</sup> 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 pesticide; facilitate the development and quality control of biopesticides; and contribute to risk reduction of pesticides and sustainable crop production and protection.

16<sup>th</sup> 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 sale, drone application, illegal trade, nano-pesticides, and recommendations for future directions. JMPM endorsed the *Guidance on arial application of pesticides* and published *Guidance on use of pesticide regulation to prevent suicides*<sup>6</sup> and *Guidance on the monitoring and observance of implementation of the Code of Conduct*<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> REP23/CF16, paras. 121-122

<sup>3</sup> REP23/PR54, paras. 248-254

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

<sup>5</sup> CX/PR 24/55/3

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc5070en>

<sup>7</sup> <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 organisation 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 which is a web-based, comprehensive, day-to-day decision support system designed specifically for pesticide registrars in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) for the evaluation and approval of pesticides. In 2023, six Toolkit trainings were organized in Africa, Asia, and Near East.

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

17. CCPR was informed that the 5th Meeting of 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 to address HHPs under the Global Framework on Chemicals. FAO supported Members to mitigate the risk of HHPs through the development of guidance on HHPs, and supported Members in the Africa 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*<sup>8</sup> and informed by the JMPR monographer's guidance document<sup>9</sup>. Project progress will be published on the website of the WHO's water, sanitation, hygiene, and health unit<sup>10</sup>.

### Dioxin and dioxin-like compounds

19. CCPR was informed that WHO had completed its work on the updating the Toxic Equivalency Factor (TEF) values for dioxin and dioxin-like compounds which have been published in a scientific journal<sup>11</sup>. The TEF values were used to weigh the toxicities of different dioxin-like compounds against each other, as some dioxin-like compounds had a higher toxicity than others and the toxicities of these compounds needed 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 diseases<sup>12</sup>, 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 there were no pesticides among them. A global source attribution study is also being conducted in conjunction with the estimates of the burden of foodborne disease. More details on the overall progress update could be found on the WHO website<sup>13</sup>.

## **Discussion**

21. A Member requested FAO to consider organizing workshops on risk assessment of pesticide residues in different regions to enhance knowledge of the risk assessment process and participation in MRLs setting. The Representative of FAO indicated FAO's willingness to explore possibilities to organise 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 the development of national regulations. It was noted that biostimulants were increasingly used to enhance plant growth and productivity, but they had not been classified as a pesticide or fertiliser. 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.

<sup>8</sup> [\(WHO, 2022\) - Water Sanitation and Health \(who.int\)](#)

<sup>9</sup> [\(WHO, 2015\) - Pesticide residues in food: guidance document for WHO monographers and reviewers](#)

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.who.int/teams/environment-climate-change-and-health/water-sanitation-and-health>

<sup>11</sup> 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>

<sup>12</sup> [WHO estimates of the global burden of foodborne diseases: foodborne diseases burden epidemiology reference group 2007-2015](#)

<sup>13</sup> [https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/foodborne-diseases/ferg/ferg-6th-meeting-presentation-2023.pdf?sfvrsn=165dbd0\\_3](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)<sup>14</sup>****Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture**

## 24. The Representative of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre (IAEA) introduced the item via video and:

- recalled that Member countries have been participating in a number of international research activities with the aim of supporting 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 symposium on food safety and control held in Vienna, Austria (May 2024). The event, in its organization and implementation, was supported by the Codex constituents, 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 constituents to support the initiative, in 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 the monitoring and regulation of pesticide residues. They also congratulated the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre on celebrating its 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary and indicated their willingness to continue working together with Joint Centre in the aforesaid 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.

**REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ARISING FROM THE 2022 JMPR REGULAR MEETING (Agenda Item 5a)<sup>15</sup>**

27. The WHO JMPR Secretariat introduced the item and summarised key points of discussion on general considerations arising from the 2022 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 provided a summary of the key points of discussion on the 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, as well as 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 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 further investigate options for using alternative deterministic models such as the GECDE-mean and GECDE-high for the assessment of 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 was essential. Unlike the IEDI for which spreadsheets are available, the GECDE-mean is currently understood by only a limited number of experts. The CCPR, as the risk manager, needed time to evaluate the implementation of GECDE-mean and needs the calculation spreadsheets to be able to critically assess and review the calculations. 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 about 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 transition from the international estimated of dietary intake (IEDI) to the global estimate of chronic dietary exposure (GECDE) and noted the positive potential of this change to improve the long-term dietary risk assessment methodology at Codex level and harmonise 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 summarised in CRD10(Rev.1) that needed to be further addressed, to allow an informed discussion at risk management level. The MO would welcome more information and transparency on this initiative 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 EU level, work has initiated on the modification of the methodology used for long-term exposure and EFSA was concluding a new revision of the pesticide residue intake model (PRIMo revision 4). More information on the model was included in the Annex to the aforesaid CRD.
34. These comments were supported by other members.
35. An Observer also supported the development of scientifically valid improvements to the dietary exposure assessments. However, the evidence demonstrating that 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 IED method is a 500% increase which may challenge a significant number of existing and future CXLs. The Observer proposed that, before any changes were made, a working model and user manual be made publicly available for the new method. 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.

---

<sup>15</sup> 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, together with 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 on the application of the methodology and their potential impact on the setting of MRLs;
  - the JMPR Secretariat would do its utmost to ensure the transparency of the process leading to the application of the GECDE methodology and the transition from the IEDI to the GECDE methodology;
  - the JMPR Secretariat would explore opportunities for making GECDE calculations available to the public and
38. In relation to 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 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 the establishment of 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 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 the application of the new methodology.
40. On whether CCPR as a risk manager must endorse the new methodology, or it was independent from CCPR:
- The Codex Secretariat recalled that CCPR provides advice and takes decision on risk management while JMPR is responsible for conducting the risk assessment hence, each body maintains their 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 on 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 lied with JMPR, while the choice on the level of protection was a management decision that lies with CCPR, hence the Committee could set an acceptable level of protection and made a risk management decision based on the agreed protection goal.
41. On the mechanism to support continued collection of food consumption survey data, the Codex Secretariat agreed to issue a circular letter with input from the JMPR Secretariat to ensure that the data collected is compatible with the requirements for inclusion 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 account for both general population and specific population groups and harmonizing the work between CCPR and 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 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 in JMPR 2024 and provide further clarification for consideration by next CCPR session;
  - encouraged Members to provide data from national dietary surveys to the CIFOcOs data base 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 for the establishment of MRLs for pesticides to protect consumers health and ensure fair practices in trade (paragraph XX).

2. Development of guidance on the assessment and interpretation of nonlinear toxicokinetics

43. The JMPR Secretariat noted that the guidance did not aim at developing new study designs by sponsors but to assist JMPR experts when assessing data sets that show 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 was increasingly relying 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 had been cases where JECFA received inaccurate data on the chemical structure which had led 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 in order for JMPR to verify the validity of the data submissions.

**Conclusion**

46. CCPR emphasized the importance of accurate information on the chemical structures when assessing the toxicological relevance of metabolites.

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 in order to make a consistent evaluation of these metabolites.

**Conclusion**

48. CCPR:

- noted that the consistent assessment of common metabolites is a crucial aspect that need 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 of particular relevance 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 of time 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 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 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. A scheme for assessing metabolites has been produced by the JMPR. There might be toxicological or analytical issues that prevent the proper assessment of the safety of metabolites, and hence, prevent finalization of the residue definition despite the establishment of 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, quality of data, especially electronic data submissions. The file name/company codes should be easily understood, complete dossiers should be timely submitted to perform the evaluation without undue delays, etc.

**Conclusion**

55. CCPR agreed that this issue should be further discussed when considering enhancement of 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 the assessment of common metabolites (point 4). The Secretariat noted that they had received a comprehensive overview of the data available for five dithiocarbamates and two major common metabolites in a coordinated submission which would assist JMPR in planning the periodic review of this group of pesticides. He also noted that the evaluation of this group may require several years/experts hence would require significant resources from JMPR in the periodic review programme.
57. The EWG Chair on Priorities requested the JMPR Secretariat to provide an update on the strategy of the re-evaluation of dithiocarbamates and their metabolites by JMPR (2024) for consideration by CCPR56 (2025) in order 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 re-evaluation of dithiocarbamates in CCPR 56 in order 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 REGULAR MEETING (Agenda Item 5b)<sup>16</sup>**

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

<sup>16</sup> 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>



**PROPOSED MRLs FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED (at Steps 7 and 4) (Agenda Item 6)****General Remarks**

60. The EU advised CCPR of the adoption of CXLs which were previously endorsed by 46th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) in 2023, and the EU did not express any reservations during the CCPR54.
61. 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.
62. 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 EU level or is available but not yet assessed at EU level; and/or
  - the proposed CXLs are not sufficiently supported by data as per the FAO manual or other agreed requirements; and/or
  - the CXL is not acceptable to the EU with respect to areas such as supporting data, extrapolations, as well as environmental issues of global nature, such as the decline of pollinators or the accumulation of persistent bioaccumulative and toxic substances in the environment.
63. Switzerland advised CCPR that they would be supporting all EU reservations as their residue risk assessment approach and policies were the same as that of the EU. Switzerland also advised that their support also includes EU reservations which are based on environmental issues of global nature, such as the decline of pollinators or the accumulation of persistent bioaccumulative and toxic substances in the environment.
64. The USA indicated that global environmental issues was beyond the mandate of CCPR, as its focus is on protection of consumer health and facilitation of global trade.

**Inclusion of additional commodities in Class A and Class C**

65. The Codex Secretariat advised CCPR that JMPR had recommended MRLs for two commodities for which there are no Codex commodity numbers in either the old nor the current (revised) Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989). The Secretariat further proposed to replace the temporary code CP 0448 Tomato, ketchup, with DM 3527 under Group 069 Miscellaneous derived edible products of plant origin.
66. CCPR agreed to forward this change to CAC47 as consequential amendment to the revised Classification.

**Assignment of the ID number 333 to a new compound**

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

**Consideration of Guideline Levels (GLs)**

69. 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 has been discontinued since 1999, the designation of "Guideline Values" were assigned to those MRLs that had only reached Step 4 in the Codex Step Procedure. These GLs were assigned as not possible to establish MRLs due to the full risk assessment was incomplete, often due to missing toxicological data and an established acceptable daily intake (ADI).

70. The Codex Secretariat further stated that these "guideline levels" were never actually submitted to the Codex Commission for formal adoption as CXLs, and that they were essentially retained at Step 4 without full adoption. In addition, there was not an 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.*"
71. On the above basis, the Codex Secretariat proposed to either remove these GLs from the Codex database entirely or update the database to indicate that they are retained at Step 4 and do not represent Codex recommendations.
72. The EWG Chair on Priorities advised CCPR that guazatine remains on the priority list and suggested that it be reviewed by JMPR this year in accordance with the 4-year rule.
73. 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.
74. 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;
  - await consideration of Guazatine (114) by JMPR at its next meeting; and
  - add Methyl Bromide (052) to the Priority List - Table 2A, awaiting data submission from sponsor.

#### **CXLs for okra**

75. The Codex Secretariat recalled that at CCPR54, the Committee Agreed to keep okra in Subgroup 12B (Pepper and pepper-like commodities) in the Codex Classification of Food and Feed while awaiting the generation of data on okra and subsequent evaluation by JMPR. Consequential amendments were then made to the relevant Codex Maximum Residue Limits (CXLs) for the pepper groups and subgroups to implement this decision.
76. 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.
77. 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.
78. 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.
79. The Observer of GPC, as the data sponsor, advised CCPR that they had identified 3 pesticide compounds appropriate for field trials of both pepper and eggplant, and they were awaiting confirmation of their field trial protocol before proceeding.
80. CCPR agreed to make consequential amendments to the CXLs for the "Peppers (subgroup)" (VO 0051) for Pyrethrin (063) and Permethrin (120), based on the clarification provided by the Codex Secretariat.

#### **CXLs for milk and milk fat**

81. The Codex secretariat informed the Committee that CCPR40 (2008) agreed that where MRLs are recommended for whole milk and milk fats for regulatory purposes, whole milk should be tested, and any residue results 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.
82. The Codex Secretariat further noted that this decision had never been implemented and the Codex database would need to be updated after consideration of all relevant CXLs at CCPR56.

83. CCPR agreed to:

- Ask the 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 analysed and the result compared to the MRL for whole milk*”; and
- Ask the JMPR to advise on the adoption of 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**

84. The Codex Secretariat informed CCPR of a number of editorial amendments to CXLs in the Codex database to align with previous decisions of CCPR 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 taken up 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 for consistency 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).

#### **Consideration of compounds**

##### **027 Dimethoate/055 Omethoate**

85. The CCPR was reminded that 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.
86. JMPR advised CCPR that they did not receive any additional data to review at their last meeting. The data sponsor indicated that toxicological data was available and could be submitted for JMPR for review in 2024.
87. CCPR agreed to retain the proposed MRLs at Step 4, while awaiting the JMPR review.

##### **062 Piperonyl butoxide**

88. JMPR informed CCPR that they were unable to recommend MRLs for any commodity due to insufficient trials or limited data obtained from supervised trials. CCPR noted the request made by EU and Switzerland that complete and good quality dossiers be submitted by applicants, for the good use of JMPR resources.
89. The EWG Chair 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 to be moved from Table 2B to Table 2A for discussion at the next year’s CCPR meeting and all CXLs be retained.
90. 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.
91. CCPR agreed to maintain 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 CCPR 56, agreed that this compound and all related CXLs will be deleted from the Codex Database.

##### **63 Pyrethrins**

92. JMPR informed CCPR that they were unable to recommend MRLs for any commodity due to no trials matching the GAP and/or insufficient data. CCPR noted the request made by EU and Switzerland that complete and good quality dossiers be submitted by applicants, for the good use of JMPR resources
93. The Chair of the EWG on Codex Schedules and Priorities, supported by Ghana, suggested that all CXLs for this compound should be retained and that this compound, which is currently listed in Table 2B, could be considered for transfer to Table 2A to provide sponsors the opportunity to evaluate their support and gather the necessary data package for the periodic review process.
94. CCPR55 decided to maintain all existing CXLs for one year, awaiting data submission from sponsors.

**072 Carbendazim**

95. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that both Carbendazim (072) and Thiophanate-methyl (077) were re-evaluated under periodic review by the 2017 JMPR. JMPR further noted that after two attempts of re-evaluation of 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.
96. India, supported by Iran, Singapore, Uganda and the Observer from CropLife International, commented that this compound was still widely used in many countries, including India, for the control of diseases. Withdrawing the CXLs for this compound would result in trade disruption.
97. The EU and Switzerland were of the view that the CXLs for this compound should be revoked as its health-based guidance values were withdrawn and their evaluations were conducted more than 25 years ago.
98. The Observer from CropLife International expressed its commitment to providing data for a future JMPR evaluation.
99. The Chair of the EWG on Codex Schedules and Priorities suggested prioritizing this compound on the 2025 Periodic Review List to facilitate JMPR's review in 2025.
100. Noting the concerns of Members, CCPR agreed to retain all CXLs for this compound, while awaiting data submission from sponsors and the outcome of the 2025 JMPR, and if there is no commitment for data at CCPR 56, agreed that this compound and all related CXLs will be deleted from the Codex Database.

**077 Thiophanate-methyl**

101. CCPR noted the conclusion by JMPR on the new residue definition and the outcome of intake estimates for thiophanate-methyl, and the clarification that the residue definition for thiophanate-methyl includes the metabolite carbendazim. JMPR 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.
102. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservation on the advancement of the proposed MRL for Almonds (TN 0660) as the residue definition used by the JMPR was incompatible with the one that EU adopted for enforcement.
103. Japan informed CCPR that the re-evaluation of this compound has been scheduled for 2024 in Japan. If a GAP is identified based on the supervised residue trials, additional uses will be proposed.
104. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR, while noting the reservation of EU and Switzerland.

**087 Dinocap**

105. 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.
106. 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**

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

**145 Carbosulfan**

109. JMPR informed CCPR that this compound is related to carbofuran (096) and similarly they recommended that all CXLs be revoked, except mango and eggplant, in which MRLs was recommended and the exceedance of ARfD was identified.
110. Singapore, supported by 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.
111. 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 taken into account in the previous assessments conducted by JMPR or other national authorities. The data sponsor ICN notified CCPR of a commitment to submit toxicological data on the metabolites by 2026.

112. The Chair of the EWG on Codex Schedules and 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.

113. 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.
- revoke all other existing CXLs, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

### **103 Phosmet**

114. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the periodic review of the compound has been scheduled for 2024 in light of the identification of exceedance of ARfD in new intake estimates.

115. CCPR acknowledged JMPR's clarification and agreed to maintain all CXLs pending the periodic review of the compound in 2024 by JMPR.

### **111 Iprodione**

116. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for Almonds; Beans with pods; subgroup of cane berries; subgroup of cherries; onion; subgroup of peaches; and potato; as the genotoxicity of several metabolites was not sufficiently addressed. The EU and Switzerland further noted a reservation for blackberries and raspberries due to acute dietary intake concerns for EU consumers.

117. The EU, supported by Singapore and Thailand, opposed the advancement of the proposed MRL for broccoli due to an acute consumer risk identified by JMPR.

118. CCPR considered the recommendation of JMPR to set a separate MRL for potato and for potato, culls, and requested that the data sponsor provide additional information about the residue trials to JMPR for further review.

119. 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; 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)**

120. 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 risk were identified for EU consumers with exceedances of the ARfD and the ADI.

121. 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.

122. 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 and to add a designation indicating the source of the residues for the proposed MRLs.

### **120 Permethrin**

123. JMPR informed CCPR that they could not reach a conclusion on 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.

124. The JMPR Secretariat further noted that although they received additional data from the data sponsor, it was still considered to be insufficient for a conclusive evaluation.

125. The Observer CropLife International informed CCPR that data sponsor would submit additional data that would allow for a complete JMPR evaluation.

126. Australia, supported by Kenya, proposed retaining all the existing CXLs, while awaiting JMPR review of the new data from the data sponsor.

127. CCPR agreed to retain all CXLs, while awaiting JMPR review.

### **130 Diflubenzuron**

128. 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.

129. JMPR informed CCPR that the metabolite PCA was not included in the residue definition endorsed by the JMPR. The residue definition, and the potential inclusion of PCA, would be considered at the next periodic review on the basis of the toxicological and residues data.

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

### **135 Deltamethrin**

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

### **138 Metalaxyl**

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

### **142 Prochloraz**

133. CCPR noted that the review of this compound was not completed at the 2023 JMPR meeting, and would be continued at 2024 JMPR meeting, and that therefore there were no recommendations to review at this time.

### **160 Propiconazole**

134. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to 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.

135. The EU noted that an assessment for the triazole derivative metabolites (TDMs) has 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.

136. 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 JMPR secretariat agreed that the MRL for avocado should be 0.01 mg/kg.

137. The UAE expressed reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRL for Rice, polished (CM 1205) due to health concerns based on the risk assessment with its national data.

138. 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. Given the higher trade volume of polished rice compared to parboiled rice, these members suggested JMPR consider establishing separate MRLs for polished rice and parboiled polished rice.

139. 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. JMPR further suggested that they 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.

140. The Codex secretariat confirmed that a code for this commodity could be provided if deemed necessary.

141. 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 JMPR 2023 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.

142. 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**

143. The CCPR Secretariat reminded CCPR that the proposed MRL for lettuce, head, was retained at step 4 awaiting an alternative GAP from the data sponsor. The Observer CropLife International advised CCPR that the previous identified alternative GAP for bifenthrin was no longer valid and another alternative GAP was not provided.

144. Due to lack of alternative GAP, CCPR agreed to withdraw the proposed MRL for lettuce, head.

#### **202 Fipronil**

145. 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**

146. The JMPR Secretariat acknowledged the concerns of the EU with regards to the 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 JMPR 2023 advised CCPR that there was no concrete evidence to substantiate the request for reprioritization of the periodic review of indoxacarb.

147. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that there were dietary exposures that exceeded the ARfD established by the JMPR, but only slightly.

148. The Chair of the EWG on Codex Schedules and 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.

149. The CCPR acknowledged the clarification made by the JMPR secretariat and also noted that additional written comments from the EU would be considered by the JMPR. The CCPR recommended that the proposal for prioritization be addressed under Agenda Item 10.

#### **221 Boscalid**

150. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for Pomegranate (FI 0355) to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

#### **224 Difenoconazole**

151. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for Cane berries; Mustard greens; Radish; Radish leaves; Stone fruits; subgroup of Maize cereals; and Sweet potato, pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation 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.

152. 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.

153. The Observer of CropLife 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). JMPR Secretariat agreed with the amendments.

154. 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**

155. The 2023 JMPR considered new uses of thiamethoxam and, as clothianidin is a major metabolite of thiamethoxam, the JMPR also recommended MRLs for clothianidin.

156. 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; Goji berry, dried; 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 re-iterated that environmental issues of global concern would be taken into account when determining whether to accept CXLs.
157. Japan disagreed with the view of EU and Switzerland on the impact to pollinators and suggested that MRLs are not an appropriate tool for addressing environmental issues, including the protection of pollinators.
158. Iran requested clarification on the MRL proposed for tree nuts (group) and suggested that, as residues in pistachio 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.
159. JMPR secretariat clarified that recommendations for the group of tree nuts was based on sufficient residue data on almonds and pecan and critical GAP the available to the 2023 Meeting. The UK confirmed the clarification.
160. 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**

161. 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; Goji berry, dried; 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 re-iterated that environmental issues of global concern would be taken into account when determining whether to accept CXLs.
162. 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**

163. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservation to 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; edible offal of Poultry; Poultry fats, and Poultry meat, pending the review of the dietary burden calculations in the JMPR evaluation report, once available.
164. JMPR informed CCPR that the dietary burden calculations would be included as an amendment to the JMPR report.
165. Russia sought clarification from JMPR on the reason of the MRL for Oats (GC 0647) increased from 0.2 mg/kg to 0.4 mg/kg.
166. JMPR clarified that the recommendation was solely based on the outcome of their scientific review on the data available.
167. The CCPR noted the comment from the Observer CropLife that the new uses evaluated by the 2023 JMPR represent the critical use in the USA and Canada, which is a lower application rate than previously assessed by the JMPR that is no longer registered. CropLife further informed CCPR that they no longer have registrations on cereals outside Northern America.
168. 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**

169. The EU expressed reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRL for Soya bean, dry and requested that the MRL should be flagged with an asterisk indicating that residues above the LOQ are not expected.
170. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that the MRL for Soya bean, dry was not flagged with an asterisk was due to some detectable residues identified in JMPR's evaluation.
171. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

#### **247 Emamectin Benzoate**

172. 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.
173. JMPR clarified that some of the data was collected from trials with animals that are not an appropriate proxy for human health and that the recommendations made by JMPR are appropriate.



174. CCPR noted that the 2023 JMPR re-confirmed the previous established ADI and ARfD for this compound.

#### **248 Flutriafol**

175. The Observer CropLife, on behalf of the data sponsor, advised CCPR that the compound was listed on Priority Schedule for review by JMPR in 2026 and that data covering rice commodities would be included in the data submission.

176. CCPR agreed to retain the proposed MRLs at Step 4, awaiting JMPR review.

#### **255 Dinotefuran**

177. The EU expressed reservation to 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.

178. 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**

179. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation to 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 is based on the following points:

- for soya beans under the subgroup of "Beans, dry", EU proposed that a lower MRL of 0.04 mg/kg could be established;
- for grapes, the details and rationales of 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 a MRL of 3 mg/kg, based on the cGAP applied in the EU member state of Malta.

180. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that 2023 Meeting recommended MRLs for 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, JMPR further clarified that they established those MRLs based on the data that was available to them, and suggested that the recommendation could be refined if additional data were provided.

181. The Observer from 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.

182. 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.

183. The JMPR Secretariat agreed to review their evaluations and would notify CCPR 56 if the MRL recommendations should be revised.

184. CCPR agreed to:

- retain the proposed MRLs for table olives and olives used for oil production at Step 4, while awaiting JMPR's clarification.
- advance the remaining proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, with subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs.

#### **267 Imazapyr**

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

#### **273 Cyflumetofen**

186. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRL for Coffee beans due to the lack of metabolism studies in a representative commodity for coffee bean (classified as pulses), which should be included pursuant to the FAO manual. JMPR secretariat clarified that in this specific case the metabolism in coffee is sufficiently addressed by the available data based on scientific considerations.

187. The EU informed CCPR that a more critical GAP 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. EU further encouraged the data sponsor to submit the data for the EU GAP for hops to JMPR for review.

188. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption.

**291 Oxathiapiprolin**

189. The EU expressed a reservation to 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
190. The EU also requested the applicant to share with JMPR the EU GAP and support trials on hops with a view to aligning the Codex MRL with the EU MRL.
191. The JMPR Secretariat agreed with EU's observation that the MRL for avocado should be lower when accounting for the whole commodity.
192. 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**

193. JMPR informed CCPR that the evaluation of this compound could not be accomplished by the 2023 JMPR due to the late submission of data on metabolites and impurities and the evaluation would be continued at the 2024 JMPR.
194. The EU requested that the applicant submit complete and high-quality dossiers, in order to make the best use of JMPR resources.
195. CCPR noted the information provided and its previous decision on the ID number of this compound (see paragraph XX).

**317 Triflumuron**

196. CCPR noted that the toxicological information on triflumuron metabolites has been included in the monograph of the 2023 JMPR report.

**320 Mefentrifluconazole**

197. Singapore informed CCPR that it does not support advancement of the proposed MRLs for Lettuce, leaf, and Spinach due to potential acute toxicity risks for Singapore's consumers.
198. EU, Switzerland, and Australia supported the view of Singapore and suggested that the proposed MRLs for Lettuce, leaf and Spinach should be withdrawn.
199. The Observer from 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.
200. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for Lettuce, head to Step 5/8 for adoption and to withdraw the proposed MRLs for Lettuce, leaf, Spinach, and Leafy greens (subgroup), as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

**324 Tetranilprole**

201. The EU expressed reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRL for Mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup) as there was lack of available toxicological data at EU level.
202. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption, with withdrawal of the previous proposed MRL, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR, noting that the reservation of the EU.

**326 Broflanilide**

203. CCPR was advised to correct the commodity code VL 0466 Chinese cabbage (type pack-choi) at 2 mg/kg by VB Chinese cabbage (type Pe-tsai) for consistency with the MRL recommendation arising from JMPR (2022).
204. CCPR agreed to forward the revised CXL for VB 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 pack-choi).

**330 Isoflucypram**

205. The EU expressed reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for Barley; Barley bran, unprocessed; Barley, flour; Barley, hay and /or straw; Edible offal (mammalian); Eggs; Mammalian fats (except milk fats) (MF 0100); Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); Milk fats; Milks; Poultry fats; Poultry meat; Poultry, edible offal of; Triticale; Triticale, hay and/or straw; Wheat (GC 0654); Wheat bran, unprocessed (CM 0654); Wheat germ (CF 1210); and Wheat, hay and/or straw (AS 0654).
206. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

**331 1,4-Dimethylnaphthalene**

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

**332 Florylpicoxamid**

208. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for Banana; Citrus oil, edible; 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 fats; Poultry meat; Poultry, edible offal of; Pummelo and grapefruits (including Shaddock-like hybrids, among others Grapefruit) (subgroup), awaiting EU assessment of import tolerance.
209. EU further requested that the MRLs for lentils, poultry fat, meat, and edible offal should be flagged with an asterisk indicating that residues above the LOQ are not expected. JMPR secretariat agreed with the observation.
210. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

**334 Isocycloseram**

211. The EU and Switzerland expressed a reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for Apple pomace. wet; Broccoli; Brussels sprouts; Cabbages, head; Cauliflower; Cherries (subgroup); Citrus oil, edible; Coffee beans; Cotton seed; Cucumber; 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; Orange, dried pulp; Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup); Peaches (including apricots and nectarine) (subgroup); Peppers, chili; Peppers, sweet (including pimento or pimiento); Plums (including fresh prunes) (subgroup); Pome fruits (group); Potato; Prunes; Pummelo and grapefruits (including Shaddock-like hybrids, among others Grapefruit) (subgroup); Soya bean (dry); Soya bean, hay and/or straw; Soya bean, hulls; Squash, summer; Tomato; Tomato, dried; and Tomatoes, pomace; due to lack of available toxicological data at EU level.
212. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

**335 Isotianil**

213. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for Banana; Citrus oil, edible; 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 fats; Poultry meat; Poultry, edible offal of; Pummelo and grapefruits (including Shaddock-like hybrids, among others Grapefruit) (subgroup), awaiting EU assessment of import tolerance.
214. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

**336 Mepiquat Chloride**

215. Australia requested clarification from JMPR for the commodity of cottonseed, delinted, noting that in the 2023 report, the JMPR estimated a STMR for use in the risk assessment rather than a MRL recommendation.
216. The JMPR secretariat confirmed that JMPR only estimated a STMR and there is no MRL recommendation for cotton seed, delinted.
217. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

**337 Tricyclazole**

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

**General conclusion**

219. CCPR:

(i) agreed to forward to CAC47:

(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 which have been withdrawn are attached as Appendix IV (discontinuation of work) and to inform CAC accordingly.

- (b) MRLs retained at Steps 4 and 7 are attached as Appendices VI and V (for information).
- (iii) noted the conversion of GLs into MRLs retained at Step 4.
- (iv) noted the Codex Secretariat, in collaboration with the JMPR Secretariat, will review the CXLs for milks and milk fat in the Codex database to address the recommendation of CCPR40 in relation to the incorporation of a footnote to these CXLs.
- (v) noted alignments of CXLs in the Codex database with previous decisions of CCPR that do not require further action by CAC.

**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)<sup>17</sup>**

220. India, as Chair of the Electronic Working Group (EWG) established by CCPR54, the Virtual Working Group (VWG) convened prior to the CCPR55, and the in-session Working Group (ISWG), speaking also on behalf of the co-chairs Argentina and Singapore, introduced the item and recalled the background of the work, mandate of the EWG, work process, and key points of discussions, and revisions made by the EWG, VWG, and ISWG.
221. 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 consideration by CCPR.
222. CCPR was invited to consider the advancement of 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 the incorporation of provisions to cover mixed pesticide standards solutions.
223. CCPR agreed to use CRD27 as the basis for discussions.

**Discussion**

224. CCPR noted the general support for the work done so far and on expanding the scope to cover mixed pesticide standard solutions. Member 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 CAC and further consideration by CCPR56.
225. A Member highlighted the usefulness of the guidelines for their country in terms of ensuring food safety and facilitating international trade, as they faced challenges such as the high cost, limited shelf life, and late supply of reference materials as a result of supply chain constraints.
226. The Codex Secretariat indicated that procedurally, it was necessary to inform CAC and CCEXEC on the expansion of the scope of the guidelines to cover mixed pesticide standard solutions. As there was already general support in CCPR on extending the scope, the EWG could be re-established to incorporate relevant provisions for mixed pesticide standard solutions.

**Conclusion**

227. 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) agreed to expand the scope of the guidelines to cover mixtures of pesticides and to inform CCEXEC and CAC accordingly; and
  - (iii) agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by India, and co-chaired by 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.

<sup>17</sup> 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, United Arab Emirates (UAE), United States of America (USA) and International Commission for Uniform Methods of Sugar Analysis (ICUMSA))

**MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW (Agenda item 8)<sup>18</sup>**

228. Chile, as Chair of the EWG, speaking also 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, fenthion, parathion methyl, amitraz, dinocap (except those commodities for which CXLs were set for meptyldinocap until the periodic review of this compound) and methamidophos (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.
229. 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 to 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 CCPR to delay one year the decision to revoke these compounds to allow countries to gather relevant data to support the periodic review of these compounds.
230. The EWG Chair further clarified that the EWG was not in position to generate data to support the periodic review of compounds which have not received support from the manufacturer but 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 and 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 not commitment for submission of the relevant data package could be confirmed at CCPR56 (2025).

**Discussion**

231. CCPR noted the general support for the recommendations of the VWG, and also noted the following comments:
- it was necessary to generate data, especially toxicological data, to support the periodic review of these compounds in order to maintain them in the Codex list of pesticides;
  - presenting the results of the work of the EWG at CCPR56 would give members another year to further consider these compounds and to seek assistance from the 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 globally phase out its use as pesticide, revocation of its CXLs required more careful deliberation, since its residue also arises from the use of acephate. The same would apply for 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 particular case of methamidophos, there other crops besides those mentioned in CX/PR 22/54/7, paragraph 21, that 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; and
  - 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.

**Conclusion**

232. 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.

---

<sup>18</sup> 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, United Arab Emirates (UAE), United Kingdom (UK), and United States of America (eUSA))

233. 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 commitment to submit suitable data package for the JMPR periodic review of bitertanol, fenthion and parathion-methyl, amitraz, dinocap, and methamidophos. If there is no support, CCPR56 (2025) will recommend revocation of the CXLs by CAC47 (2025).
234. CCPR further 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 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 chairs on priorities and national registration database 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)<sup>19</sup>**

235. Germany, as Chair of the EWG, speaking also 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 remain low and mainly account from 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.
236. The EWG Chair further explained that there were some compounds for which support by data sponsors would be expected and, 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 discussion on next steps could be taken up by the EWG 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 which might raise further questions on how to grade the importance of substances and how to find data and data supporters.
237. The EWG Chair further indicated that comments submitted in reply to CL 2024/47-PR were constructive and would allow further improvements of the NRD.

#### **Discussion**

238. 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 hence have yet to move to Table 2A scheduling compounds for evaluation by JECFA (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.
239. 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.
240. CCPR noted that Dr Karsten Hohgardt (Germany) would soon retire. The Committee acknowledged and thanked Dr Karsten for his long-standing contribution to the work of the Committee, 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.

---

<sup>19</sup> CL 2024/47; CX/PR 24/55/8; CX/PR 24/55/8 Add.1 (Comments of Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, European Union (EU), India, Peru, Sierra Leone, and United Arab Emirates (UAE))

## Conclusion

241. 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.

242. CCPR accepted the offer of Germany 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.

243. 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 understanding and use of the NRD by member countries.

## **ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR (Agenda item 10)<sup>20</sup>**

244. 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 to facilitate discussion had prepared CRD02 which contained the Schedules and Priority Lists for 2025, 2026 and beyond.

### 2025 Schedule for JMPR evaluations

245. 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.

246. 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.

247. The EWG Chair further explained that nominations for the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) were consequently added for five compounds, namely pyriproxyfen, fludioxonil, flubendiamide, metaflumizone and pyraclostrobin, 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. spinetoram, flupyradifurone and buprofezin, tentatively listed on the priority list for JMPR evaluation in 2026 or 2027.

## Discussion

248. CCPR noted general support to add 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 to move the nominations for spinetoram from the 2026 priority list to the 2025 priority list as a reserve compound.

249. For the 2025 periodic review evaluations, 10 compounds were proposed. Seven of these compounds were under the - 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.

250. 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, 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.

---

<sup>20</sup> CX/PR 24/55/9

## Public Health Concerns

251. CCPR was advised that no potential Public Health Concerns were identified at CCPR55.

### Priority lists for 2026 and beyond

252. 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 these assessments that are typically conducted by the JMPR in any given year (approximately 20).

253. 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, piperonyl butoxide, pyrethrins and methyl bromide were added to this list following discussion at CCPR55. The Chair of the EWG 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

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

### Conclusion

255. CCPR agreed to:

- (i) endorse the proposed priority list of Pesticides for evaluation by the 2025 JMPR; 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)<sup>21</sup>

256. The United States of America, as Chair of the EWG, speaking also 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.

257. 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 a short-term work for a period of three years (2024-2026) and a long-term work over three or five years (2026-2028).

258. The EWG Chair also presented the results of the virtual working group (VWG) held prior to the Session and highlighted that the VWG had agreed that the EWG had completed its terms of reference (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. It was noted that, in making such recommendation, the VWG had taken into account comments submitted in reply to CL 2024/48-PR as well as those provided by the FAO and WHO JMPR Secretariats during the virtual meeting.

### Discussion

259. 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.

260. 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 to establish a programme 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 further noted that having a compliance or admissibility check would allow to immediately reject dossiers that did not meet the requested benchmarks, resulting in a better management of time and resources.

261. Another Member stated that having more resources was essential to allow JMPR to continue doing its work.

---

<sup>21</sup> 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, United Arab Emirates (UAE), and United Kingdom (UK))



262. A Member Organization noted that, while there was a need to consider more compounds and schedule more periodic reviews, the quality and timeliness of dossiers submitted by data sponsors was not satisfactory to proceed with the work correctly and this had become a recurring problem which could be address as part of the short-term approach.
263. 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 per six new compounds and 15 revaluations to reduce the backlog of the evaluations.
264. 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.
265. The EWG Chair informed CCPR that the USA was exploring how to improve financial and other types of support for the work of JMPR and that it would develop and submit a detailed proposal for discussion at CCPR56 (2025).

### **Conclusion**

266. 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 focus of the work would be on the short-term approaches which could constitute the new mandate of the EWG. The feedback provided by JMPR (2023) as well as comments provided by members and observers in reply to CL 2024/48-PR and during the VWG, which could further inform the work of the EWG on the short-term approaches.
267. 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 there is support and there are resources 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 can be adopted by CCPR and JMPR 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)<sup>22</sup>**

268. New Zealand, as Co-Chair of the Joint EWG, speaking also on behalf of the United States of America (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.
269. The Joint EWG Co-Chair recalled that the terms of reference of the Joint EWG covered work to:
- identify and prioritize issues affecting both committees and recommend ways to address the issues and to 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 for CCPR/CCRVDF to consider selecting the higher MRL value; and
  - consider the matter related to harmonized food descriptors to be used by JECFA and JMPR.

---

<sup>22</sup> CX/PR 24/55/11

270. 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.

271. 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 in order to progress work on issues related to the establishment of harmonized MRLs for pesticides and veterinary drugs for compounds with dual use.

#### **Discussion**

272. 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 harmonization of 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 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 (for veterinary drugs) in support of CCPR and CCRVDF, and it would not be possible to just choose the higher HBGV. In response, the Joint EWG Co-Chair clarified that the primary focus of the Joint EWG was to harmonise MRLs and it would defer to JECFA and JMPR on scientific assessments, and not make recommendations on HBGVs.

273. A Member requested CCPR delegates from Member countries to reach out to their CCRVDF counterparts to coordinate their positions and that both CCPR and CCRVDF delegates should be encouraged to attend the virtual meeting of the Joint EWG.

#### **Conclusion**

274. 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)<sup>23</sup>**

275. The Observer of Global Pulse Confederation (GPC), as the author of the discussion paper, introduced the item recalling that CCPR56 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 CXs 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).

276. 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.

---

<sup>23</sup> CL 2024/49-PR ; CX/PR 24/55/12; CX/PR 24/55/12-Add.1 (Comments of Bangladesh, Canada, Chile, EU, Iraq, UK, and UAE)

277. The Observer recalled that this item was considered by 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 which included questions related to four different points namely: whether the assessment reviewed the original data, with respect to accommodating for 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 the results could be reviewed by JMPR.
278. 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 VWG 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.
279. 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. 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.

### Discussion

280. 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.
281. CCPR noted the following comments:
- Although the analysis presented in the document was informative and well-presented, this proposal might increase the workload of JMPR.
  - JMPR could advise CCPR on the best way forward so that the Committee would then be in a position to take a decision 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 and hence it was important to set MRLs for this crop.
  - 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 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 be used also 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, support minor uses, without overloading JMPR work, protecting at the same time consumer health which remained a priority.
  - The JMPR review would need to focus not only on the risk assessment but also on the full assessment performed by GPC for description and that if JMPR would envisage amendment of the procedure, this would need to be carefully noted when considering future points of similar nature.

- 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, how to further support the work on minor use while giving proper consideration to consumer health. The data had been already evaluated by JMPR and that another re-evaluation was outside the current procedures.

282. The JMPR Secretariat, while noting the trade value of establishing MRLs for minor crops, highlighted the importance for 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 which 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 risk manager, recalling at the same time that should CCPR trust JMPR with the assessment, JMPR would do so according to its procedures and requirements.

283. 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 to the priority list, the JMPR Secretariat clarified and 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.

284. 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, in order to make an informed decision on the work process at its next session.

285. 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, fludioxonil, flubendiamide, metaflumizone and pyraclostrobin, 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 further noted that this proposal could be further considered under Agenda item 10.

286. 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 was seeking clear guidance from JMPR on what information was required in a request 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 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 also provide an insight into the benefit this information could provide for minor crops.

### **Conclusion**

287. 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 the 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 the JMPR to be the risk assessor for the CCPR;
- (iv) requested that JMPR considered the procedures outlined by the Observer of GPC to support MRLs for eggplants based on the MRLs already established for tomatoes and/or peppers. This would be carried out with a view for JMPR to recommend 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 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; and
  - (e) Any other relevant aspects influencing the risk assessment.
- (vi) and advise whether, in its view, it 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)*

288. The European Union requested clarification on:

- the publication of the updated full version of the Classification and Principles and Guidelines on the Codex webpage. The Delegation further requested to remove the old versions of these documents from the Codex webpage;
- 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; and
- 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.

289. 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 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 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 of a consultant to run this project, but due to 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 on the update of the Codex database start this year, there would be a specific item on the agenda of CCPR to report on the findings of this exercise for consideration by the Committee.

290. 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 would find 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**

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

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

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

## LIST OF CRDs

CRD No.	Agenda item	Submitted by
01	/	EU Division of competence and voting right between EU and its Member States
02	10	EWG Chair (Australia)
03	7	EWG Chair (India) assisted by EWG Co-chairs (Argentina, Singapore)
04	7	VWG Chair (India) assisted by VWG Co-chairs (Argentina, Singapore)
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	EU
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	USA

<b>CRD No.</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Submitted by</b>
24	8	Agrocare Latinoamerica
25	6, 7, 10, 13	Bangladesh
26	6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13	Ecuador
27	7	In-session WG Chair (India) assisted by In-session WG Co-chairs (Argentina, Singapore)