

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of
the United Nations



World Health
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Fax: (+39) 06 5705 4593 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

Agenda Item 11

CX/PR 23/54/13
June 2023

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

54th Session
26 June-1 July 2023

ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION/RE-EVALUATION BY JMPR

(Prepared by Australia as Chair of the Electronic Working Group on Priorities)

BACKGROUND

Based on email correspondence, advice from participants in the EWG on Priorities and responses to CL 2023/26-PR, the following is submitted for consideration by CCPR. Responses to CL 2023/26-PR were received from Canada, Indonesia, Egypt, India, the European Union (EU). They are reproduced in Appendix I in original language.

A. SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS

1. Appendix A includes the CCPR Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides (Tables 1-4) as specified in the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) Procedural Manual "Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR)".
2. Amendments to the CCPR Schedules and Priority Lists following comments received in reply to CL 2023/26-PR and since CCPR53, are shown in red bold text. Every effort is made to accurately record nominations lodged during this period. As this is a 'working' spreadsheet, amendments can be made without delay, should errors be identified.
 - Nominating members and observers are encouraged to closely review the worksheets to ensure accuracy.
 - The schedules and priority lists are finalised during the CCPR session. Members and observers may discuss proposed changes to the Tables as they currently appear in Appendix A with the Chair EWG Priorities immediately before or during the early stages of the session.
3. The 2023 CCPR Schedule of Evaluations by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) is closed but included at this stage for reference only.

B. FINALISING THE 2024 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

4. To assist consideration of scheduling for 2024, the proposed 2024 CCPR Schedule of JMPR Evaluations is extracted from Tables 1 and 2A and appears in three worksheets with the prefix '2024'.
5. The '2024-new cpd' worksheet lists seven compounds in the 2024 new compound proposed schedule. National registrations have been confirmed for all the listed compounds.
 - **No further nominations to this schedule can be accepted.**
6. The '2024-new use-other' worksheet lists seventeen nominations for new use. Advice on registration has been provided for all compounds. The commodities for these compounds are listed in upper case text. Nominators are reminded that, if not already provided, evidence of product labels / national registration is required to confirm a place on the proposed 2024 schedule. Nominations are prioritised based on evidence of registration and date stamp as well as on JMPR advice on capacity to conduct these evaluations. Subject to confirmation by JMPR, some previously nominated compounds may not be accommodated in JMPR 2023 and may be deferred to JMPR 2024. Where known, these compounds have been transferred to the 2024-new use-other worksheet, however JMPR may update CCPR on further changes.
 - **No further nominations to this schedule can be accepted.**

7. The '2024-periodic review' worksheet lists six compounds in the proposed 2024 Schedule of Periodic Reviews and three compounds with RESERVE status. This list is currently over-subscribed but may be modified based on further advice from sponsors and JMPR and decisions of CCPR.
8. The sponsor for ethoxyquin has requested CCPR consider a 4-year rule be implemented however, should the Committee agree, the sponsor is prepared to submit a dossier in 2023 for evaluation by JMPR in 2024.
9. At CCPR53, a new sponsor for chlorpyrifos committed to have a dossier prepared for evaluation by JMPR in 2024. To finalise the 2024-periodic review worksheet, this commitment should be confirmed. Support for some other compounds on this list is uncertain. Currently, there is no evidence of support for parathion-methyl or chlorpyrifos-methyl.
10. In response to CL 2023/26-PR, suggestions were made to significantly increase the list of periodic review substances in the 2024 year (up to twenty) to accommodate uncertainties. Further suggestion was made that substances with unclear support should be marked with a RESERVE status in Tables 2A and 2B and either re-evaluated or deleted at the latest after 25 years from last evaluation. CCPR54 should consider these suggestions.
 - **There may be other compounds from the 2021-2023 schedules of periodic reviews where the evaluation was not completed. Further advice from JMPR and the sponsors is required to clarify the status of those compounds.**
 - **Noting the compounds listed in the 2024 proposed schedule and compounds which may have yet been evaluated from previous years, no further nominations to this schedule can be accepted.**
 - **Additional information including commodities supported, availability of residue trials and the availability of toxicological data packages is required for several of the supported compounds.**
 - **Members and observers are strongly encouraged to indicate support for compounds in the periodic review lists, and to consider strategies for retention if these compounds are important to their interests.**

Advice Notes (New Use and Other Evaluations)

11. Consistent with the approach taken at CCPR48, member countries and observer international organizations (sponsors) who have nominated compounds for the proposed new uses and other evaluations schedule can only confirm a place on the schedule by submitting documented evidence of a registered use / authorized formulation labels / Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) or at least evidence of data submission to a national regulatory authority with a view to obtaining a registration / authorized formulation label / GAP prior to CCPR54. Nominators / manufactures are encouraged to submit evidence of national registrations / product labels as soon as practicable.
12. Should more than 20 compound nominations on the 2022 Schedule meet the registered use / formulation label / GAP requirement, the first 20 compounds meeting the requirements will be scheduled for evaluation and those beyond number 20 will be given a **RESERVE** status. As per the new compound approach, should the opportunity present, JMPR may choose to evaluate a **RESERVE** compound.

C. PRIORITY LISTS 2025 AND BEYOND – TABLE 1

13. The 'Table 1 – 2025 & beyond-new cpd' worksheet includes eleven nominations for future scheduling. Eight of the compounds have been requested for the 2025 Proposed Schedule for CCPR55. One remaining compound is marked for 2026 and two for 2027 on request by the nominators / manufacturers.
14. The 'Table 1 – 2025 & beyond-new use-other' worksheet includes thirty-nine nominations for future scheduling, thirty-five nominated for 2025 which far exceeds the limit of 20 (note the scheduling advice notes under paragraphs 10 and 11). For almost half the nominations, only a single commodity has been identified for evaluation. Sponsors are encouraged to support efficient use of JMPR resources by optimising the number of new use commodities.

D. PRIORITY LISTS 2025 AND BEYOND – TABLE 2A

15. The 'Table 2A' worksheet includes priority lists for periodic reviews in 2025, 2026 and 2027 (up to 15 compounds). All the listed compounds meet the "25-year rule". A number are under the 4-year rule decision by CCPR and should be prioritised.

E. TABLE 2B

16. The 'Table 2B' worksheet lists approximately 60 compounds which meet the "15-year rule" but have not yet been listed for periodic review.

F. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

17. In accordance with the nomination process described in the Codex Procedural Manual “Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues”, members and observers may lodge public health concerns (PHC) for any compound in the CCPR Pesticide List including those already listed in Tables 2A and 2B. In lodging a public health concern, the nominator must provide supporting scientific data. JMPR will assess the PHC nominations and advise CCPR if a periodic review is supported. The EU has raised a PHC for phosmet. JMPR should consider this concern at its upcoming meeting.

PERIODIC REVIEWS (UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS)

18. There are several compounds from previous schedules of periodic reviews which were not evaluated by JMPR (listed in the new Table 5). Advice from sponsors is urgently required to clarify the status of those compounds. A decision concerning ongoing retention of unsupported compounds on the CCPR List of Pesticides and maintenance of existing Codex maximum residue limits for pesticides (CXLs) should be made at CCPR54. The Discussion Paper concerning the management of unsupported compounds may assist CCPR to reach a decision regarding these compounds. If CCPR54 considers removal of CXLs for these compounds, further deliberation should be given to the potential impact on CXLs of other compounds (see worksheet comments for methamidophos and dinocap). Member countries and observers with an interest are strongly encouraged to provide advice on the following compounds which remain unsupported:

- amitraz PHC (122), fenbutatin oxide (109), 2-phenylphenol (56), dinocap (87), methamidophos (100), bitertanol (144), terbufos (167), fenthion (39).

Members and observers are strongly encouraged to consider appropriate strategies for retention should any of these compounds remain important to respective interests. CCPR should consider removing related CXLs or, if members indicate support, commencing the 4-year rule at CCPR54. If implemented, dates of commencement and expiry of 4-year rules should be documented in these lists.

H. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

19. Nominating Codex members and observers are encouraged to closely review the worksheets to ensure accuracy. The intent of a few nominations requires further discussion with the member / observer. The Chair of the EWG on Priorities will discuss these nominations with the relevant parties at CCPR54 prior to finalising the Schedules for consideration of the Committee.

I. NOMINATION OF COMPOUND FOR PARALLEL REVIEW

20. According to the report of CCPR52 (REP21/PR, paragraph 226), as part of the CCPR Schedules and Priorities work there is an opportunity for data sponsors to nominate compounds for the parallel review pilot. Members and observers are invited to nominate a suitable compound.

J. CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR

21. This item should be read in conjunction with Agenda Items concerning Unsupported Compounds and the National Registrations Database.
22. The Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR can be accessed through the following link and it is available in English only:

To download/open the excel file please click on the following link:

https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/codexalimentarius/doc/Schedules_PriorityList_For_consideration_CCPR54_2023_Appendix_A_17052023x.xlsx

APPENDIX I
Comments submitted in reply to CL 2023/26-PR
(For information)
ORIGINAL LANGUAGE ONLY

CANADA

Canada's Comments on the Establishment of the CCPR Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides for Evaluation/Re-evaluation by JMPR**GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

Canada would like to thank Australia for the preparation of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides as well as the work done to incorporate the requests from members and sponsors.

Canada acknowledges the challenge in selecting a new compound for consideration as a pilot for the parallel review with JMPR, however, Canada continues to encourage sponsors to support the initiative and look at future new compound nominations that may be good candidates for the pilot.

Canada is hopeful that the work on enhancement of operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR will assist in developing a manageable and efficient schedule of pesticides for evaluation and re-evaluation.

A. SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS 2024-2025

Canada understands that the 2023 CCPR Schedule of JMPR Evaluations is closed and provided for reference.

Canada offers the following comments to the revised Priority Lists of 2024-2025 and beyond.

B. FINALISING THE 2024 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Canada notes that the ratio of new compound evaluations and periodic reviews for 2024 has increased to 7:5 which seems to be feasible from a workload perspective for JMPR, however, not likely to address the backlog of periodic reviews in terms of the 15- and 25-year rules.

The list (17) of new uses and other evaluations appears quite extensive and Canada questions the feasibility of having JMPR review all these uses in light of the limited resources.

C. PRIORITY LISTS 2025 AND BEYOND – TABLE 1

Canada recognizes that the quota of new compounds (8) has been met but is concerned that the number of nominated new uses and other evaluations (26) far exceeds the JMPR's capacity. If this is the case, there is a risk that many of these new uses will be deferred to later JMPR Meetings. To reduce the number of new uses for the same compound being reviewed at different Meetings, Canada encourages sponsors maximize the number of uses requested within one petition.

D. PRIORITY LISTS 2025 AND BEYOND – TABLE 2A

Canada's observation is that all compounds on the list have been deferred from 2021 under the 4-year rule. Canada is concerned with the increasing number of compounds falling under the 4-year rule, which is evidence that sponsors are not addressing all the data requirements at the time of the data call-in. This results in JMPR having to revisit the same compound again within 4 years, precluding the evaluation of a new compound and/or periodic review and exacerbating the backlog.

E. TABLE 2B

The number of compounds on list 2B is quite extensive. Canada acknowledges the work being conducted on the National Registration Database and hopes that this initiative will encourage sponsors and member countries to provide advice on supporting data packages and/or indication of support that would allow a triage and prioritization of the listed compounds.

F. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

There are no compounds in the CCPR Pesticide List, or in Tables 2A and 2B, for which Canada would like to lodge a public health concern.

G. PERIODIC REVIEWS (UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS)

Canada is in favour of deleting compounds from the CCPR pesticides list that are no longer supported by a sponsor and for which a public health concern has been identified. The withdrawal of the corresponding CXLs will reduce the number of substances for which a periodic review is needed. Therefore, Canada supports the removal of related CXLs from the CCPR pesticides list for Amitraz PHC (122), Bitertanol (144), Carbaryl (8), Dinocap (087), Fenbutatin oxide (109), Fenthion (39), Methamidophos (100), Terbufos (167).

Canada believes that maintaining CXLs that are not supported by submission of complete dossiers of toxicology, residue chemistry and other relevant data, does not comply with requirements as prescribed in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues. Canada acknowledges the work on a discussion paper concerning the management of unsupported compounds.

EGYPT

Regarding to document no. CL 2023/26-PR, Egypt would like to inform you that , Egypt appreciates the work which done in the document & agrees on the proposed draft of the schedules and priority lists for pesticides for evaluation/re-evaluation by JMPR, and we would like to move the pesticide residues from Table 2B to Table 2A “periodic review (2024 & beyond)”:

- Piperonyl butoxide (62),we would like to request a re-evaluation for this PR inWheat commodity.
- Chlorpropham (201), we would like to request a re-evaluation for this PR in Potato commodity.

EUROPEAN UNION

European Union comments on Circular Letter CL 2023/26-PR

Request for comments on the establishment of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation / re-evaluation by the joint FAO/WHO expert meetings on pesticide residues (JMPR)

European Union Competence. European Union Vote.

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on Priorities chaired by Australia for the preparation of CL 2023/26-PR and its appendices, as well as the work done to incorporate the requests from members and sponsors.

B. FINALISING THE 2024 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Paragraph 7

The EU notes that although eight compounds have been listed, for several compounds it is not clear whether these will be reviewed in 2024. The EU notes that as the experience from previous years has shown that although there are always several compounds scheduled for a periodic review in that specific year, the review is often postponed or not possible to finish (e.g., ethoxyquin and guazatine) for several reasons for one or more years. Therefore, one option could be to list a certain number of substances e.g., 20 substances for the year 2024 in order to ensure that there will be a stock of substances from which a minimum of five substances¹ for 2025 could be selected for the review, plus already another 5 substances for 2026. In programming more substances at the onset, a continuous flow of periodic reviews will be ensured for the coming years.

In addition, substances with unclear support should get a reserve status in Table 2A (Priority lists of periodic reviews – 2024 & beyond) and Table 2B (Periodic review list (compounds listed under 15-year rule but not yet scheduled or listed). Those with a reserve status will be re-evaluated once the data will become available or the reserve status should be deleted, and the compound should be deleted from the Codex List of pesticides at the latest after 25 years after last evaluation.

The table below, which was presented last year at the CCPR53 shows that from the substances planned for a periodic review in a given year only roughly half get evaluated. This might indicate that old active substances are of less importance for sponsors, contrary to what has been said in the previous discussions under agenda item 13 on enhancement of the operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR:

“Thirdly, we believe the review program is delayed beyond the usual frequency. While not as key to trade enablement as CXLs for new compounds and uses, the periodic review program is an important element in updating standards to compliance with current safety requirements accounting for the availability of new data on the compound or risk assessment approaches employed by the JMPR expert panels”².

¹ [Report of the 49th session of the Codex Committee on Residues](#)

² [CCPR 52nd Session, Comments submitted by CropLife . CRD11 page 2](#)

Year	New compounds		New uses and other evaluations		Periodic reviews		Ratio (new compounds: new uses: periodic reviews) which were evaluated
	Planned (plus reserve)	Evaluated	Planned	Evaluated	Planned (plus reserve)	Evaluated	
2018 ³	7 (+2)	8	20	19	5	2	4:9.5:1
2019 ⁴	7 (+1)	8	14 (+3)/20*	16/19*	7	4	2:8.75:1
2021 ⁵	6 (+5)	6	30 ⁶	3/30*	6 (+2)	2	2:16.5:1

The EU has signalled a public health concern for the substance phosmet by submitting a concern form for this substance. Consequently, the EU believes that phosmet should be prioritised over other compounds in Table 2A and should be urgently scheduled for a periodic review in 2024.

Paragraph 8

The ongoing retention of unsupported compounds on the CCPR List of Pesticides and maintenance of existing Codex maximum residue limits for pesticides (CXLs) is not a solution to solve the problems with an increasing backlog of substances for periodic review.

Such decisions should be taken along the rules set in the Procedural Manual and considering the work done in the eWG on Unsupported compounds. Decisions should be taken in due course because the first compounds will become outdated due to missing full toxicological re-evaluation after 25 years.

The EU notes that the most urgent compounds are those for which concern forms have been lodged.

As reiterated in previous years, the EU considers that maintaining CXLs that are not supported by submission of toxicology, residue, and other relevant data violates the requirements laid down in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues.

F. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

Paragraph 14

The EU has recently sent a public health concern for the substance phosmet. Consequently, phosmet should be transferred from Table 2B to Table 2A.

Paragraph 15

The EU is in favour of deleting compounds from the CCPR pesticides list that are no longer supported by a manufacturer and for which a public health concern has been identified. The withdrawal of the corresponding CXLs will reduce the number of substances for which a periodic review is needed. Therefore, Amitraz PHC (122), Bitertanol (144), Carbaryl (8), Dinocap (087), Fenbutatin oxide (109), Fenthion (39), Methamidophos (100) and Terbufos (167) should be removed from the CCPR pesticides list.

General comment on the 2022&23 CCPR Schedule of Evaluations by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)

The EU notes that at present only three substances and the reserve compound are supported for periodic review in 2022 and 2023. This once again proves that additional substances should be included in the periodic review schedule so that at least minimum of five substances could be assessed.

³ [Report of the 49th session of the Codex Committee on Residues, Appendix XIV](#)

⁴ [Report of the 50th session of the Codex Committee on Residues, Appendix XIII](#)

⁵ [Report of the 51st session of the Codex Committee on Residues, Appendix X](#)

⁶ Initial proposal was to evaluate 20 substances and keep 10 in reserve but as the assessments were postponed to 2021, 8 additional substances were taken from the list "2021 new use-other".

INDONESIA

Indonesia wishes to express our appreciation to an electronic working group led by Australia for the preparation of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation or re-evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR).

In response to CL 2023/26-PR, Indonesia proposes the following comments for consideration:

B. FINALISING THE 2024 PROPOSED SCHEDULE**Paragraphs 5 and 6 of CL 2023/26-PR**

Indonesia supports the proposed schedule for 2024-new compounds, 2024-new uses, and other evaluations.

Paragraph 7 of CL 2023/26-PR

Indonesia supports the proposed schedule for the 2024 periodic review, especially maleic hydrazide, tebufenozide, 2-phenylphenol, folpet, and ethoxyquin. Indonesian regulation does not approve the use of chlorpyrifos for rice, chlorpyrifos-methyl for home pest control, or parathion-methyl for all kinds of uses.

C. Priority Lists 2025 and Beyond: Table 1**Paragraphs 10 and 11 of CL 2023/26-PR**

Indonesia supports the proposed schedule for 2025-new compounds, 2025-new uses, and other evaluations.

D. Priority Lists 2025 and Beyond (Table 2A)**Paragraph 12 of CL 2023/26-PR**

Indonesia supports the proposed schedule for the 2025 periodic review.

INDIA

**Establishment of CCPR schedules and priority lists for the evaluation/re-evaluation
of pesticides by JMPR**

Comments from India

India is proposing to submit the monitoring data of following pesticides on cumin to JMPR for fixation of MRLs.

1. Difenoconazole and
2. Pyraclostrobin


PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA		COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRL > LOQ				
2025	-	Difenoconazole	Difenoconazole	Yes	MRL not available	Cumin	-	India (Member)	-
2025	-	Pyraclostrobin	Pyraclostrobin	Yes	MRL not available	Cumin	-	India (Member)	-

Registration evidence of Difenoconazole and Pyraclostrobin on cumin (<http://ppqs.gov.in/divisions/cib-rc/major-uses-of-pesticides>)

Difenoconazole

mup_of_fungicides_up_to_01.02.2023.pdf

1 of 51



Government of India
Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare
Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage
Central Insecticide Board & Registration Committee N.H.-IV,
Faridabad-121001 (Haryana)

MAJOR USES OF PESTICIDES
 (Registered under the Insecticides Act, 1968)

(UPTO - 01/02/2023)
 (Based on certificate issued)

Disclaimer: The document has been compiled on the basis of available information for guidance and not for legal purposes.

FUNGICIDES

- Fungicides single product formulations use (Page No. – 02 to 32).
- Fungicides combination uses (Page No. – 33 to 51)

mup_of_fungicides_up_to_01.02.2023.pdf

9 of 51

				equipment used	
Cyazofamid 34.5% SC					
Potato	Late blight	80g	200ml	500	27
Tomato	Late blight	80g	200ml	500	3-5
Grapes	Downy mildew	80g	200ml	500	7
Difenoconazole 3% WS					
Wheat	Loose smut	6.0	200	This is used as seed dresser	This is used as seed dresser
Difenoconazole 25% EC					
Apple	Scab	0.004% or 4 g/100 ltr. water	0.015% or 15ml/100 ltr. water	As required depending upon the size of the plant and plant protection equipment used	14
Paddy (Rice)	Sheathblight	0.0125% or 12.5g/100ltr. water	0.05% or 50 ml/100ltr. water	500	25
Chilli	Die-back, Fruit rot	0.0125% or 12.5g/100 ltr. water	0.05% or 50 ml/100ltr. water	500-1000 (as per the size of plant)	15
Cumin	Blight, Powdery mildew	0.0125% or 12.5 g/100 ltr. water	0.05% or 50 ml/100 ltr. water.	500	15
Onion	Purple blotch	0.025% or 25 g/100 ltr. water	0.1% or 100 ml/100 ltr. water.	500	20
Pomegranate	Fruit rot	0.025% or 25g/100ltr. water	0.1% or 100 ml/100 ltr. water.	500	7
Grape	Anthracoese, Powdery mildew	0.0075% or 7.5 g/100 ltr. water	0.03% or 30ml/100 ltr. of water	500	10
Groundnut	Leaf spot, rust	0.025% or 25g/100ltr. water	0.1% or 100 ml/100 ltr. water.	As required depending upon the size of the plant and plant protection	34

9

Pyraclostrobin

620Feb'23/mup_of_fungicides_up_to_01.02.2023.pdf

— + ↩ 46 of 51 🔍 📄

	Alternaria blight		0.25%		than8 weeks
BlackPepper	Phytophthorafootrot	1.8ga./vine or0.09%	2.5gm/vine or0.125%	2lt./vine (spraying) 5lt./vine (soil drenching)	Notless than21 weeks
Pearlmillet	Downy mildew	1440gm or0.28%	2000gmor 0.4%	500lt.	Notless than7 weeks
Metiram 44% + Dimethomorph 9% WG					
Grapes	Downy mildew	1325	2500	1000	10
Metiram 55% + Pyraclostrobin 5% WG					
Tomato	Early blight	900-1050	1500-1750	500	5
Potato	Late blight	900-1050	1500-1750	500	15
Grape	Downy mildew	900-1050	1500-1750	750	34
Chilli	Anthracnose	900-1050	1500-1750	5	5
Onion	Purple blotch	900-1050	1500-1750	16	16
Cotton	Alternaria leaf spot	900-1050	1500-1750	45	45
Apple	Premature leaf fall disease & Alternaria leaf spot and blight	1750g/ha	100g/100L	1750	12
Pomegranate	Fruit spot	900-1050	1500-1750	500	67
Blackgram	Leafspot disease	900-1050	1500-1750	500	32
Cumin	Alternaria blight & Powdery mildew	900-1050	1500-1750	500	20
Greengram	Cercospora leaf spot	900-1050	1500-1750	500	18
Groundnut	Tikka disease	900-1050	1500-1750	500	42
Banana	Sigatoka leaf spot disease	900-1050	1500-1750	500	85
Cucumber	Downy mildew disease	900-1050	1500-1750	500	5
Bitter gourd	Downy mildew disease	900-1050	1500-1750	500	5
Penflufen 13.28% w/w + Trifloxystrobin 13.28% w/w FS					
Groundnut	Seed and Seedling rot	12.32+12.32-	80 – 100		

APPENDIX II
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS¹

Chair: Karina Budd, Australia

The EWG had more than 50 participants from the following members and observer organisations

AgroCare	Iran
Argentina	Japan
Australia	Landis International
Canada	Mexico
Chile	New Zealand
China	Republic of Korea
Costa Rica	Saudi Arabia
CropLife International	Sierra Leone
Egypt	South Africa
Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce & Industry	Sweden
France	Tea & Herbal Infusions Europe
Germany	Thailand
Gowan	Uganda
Guatemala	United Kingdom
India	United States of America
Institute of Food Technologists	UPL
International Council of Beverages Associations	

¹ Please contact the focal point of the Member Country or Observer Organization for the details of the delegates. The list of Codex contact points for members and observers are available from the Codex website at:
<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/members/en/>
<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/observers/observers/obs-list/en/>