

codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH
ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE:

Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME: Tel. 57971 Telex: 610181 FAO I. Cables Foodagri

ALINORM 83/24

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Fifteenth Session, 1983

REPORT OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF
THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

The Hague
15-20 June 1981

W/M2965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Opening Speech by the Minister of Health and Environmental Protection	2
Adoption of the Agenda	3
Matters of Interest to the CCPR	4
-Reports of the 1979 and 1980 JMPR	4
-International Programme on Chemical Safety	4
-Problems related to temporary ADIs and Guideline Levels	5
(e.g coumaphos, amitraz)	
-MRLs in Tobacco	6
-Report of the Coordinating Committee for Africa	6
-Report of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling	7
-Report of the Codex Committee on Process Meat and Poultry Products	7
-Report of the Codex Committee on General Principles	7
-Report of the Executive Committee	7
-Reports by International Organizations: OECD, CE, FAO, EPPO	8
Report on Acceptances by Governments of Codex MRLs	9
Intake of Pesticide Residues	10
Amendment of Codex MRLs	12
Consideration of MRLs at Steps 4 and 7	13
-Method of Reporting Comments at Steps 3 and 6	13
-Acephate (No.95)	19
-Aldicarb (No.117)	22
-Captan (No.7)	14
-Carboophenothion (No.11)	14
-Carbofuran (No.96)	19
-Cartap (No.97)	19
-Chlordane (No. 12)	15
-Chlorobenzilate (No.16)	15
-Chlorothalonil (No.81)	17
-Chlorpyrifos-methyl (No.90)	18
-Cyanofenphos (No.91)	18
-Cypermethrin (No.118)	23
-Demeton-S-methyl (No.73)	17
-Diazinon (No.23)	15
-Dichlofluanid (No.82)	18
-Disulfoton (No.74)	17
-Dithiocarbamates (No.105)	21
-2,4-D (No.20)	15
-Edifenphos (No.99)	19
-Endosulfan (No.32)	15
-Ethiofencarb (No.107)	21
-Fenbutatin oxide (No.109)	21
-Fenitrothion (No.37)	15
-Fenvalerate (No.119)	24
-Inorganic bromide (No.47)	16
-Lindane (No.48)	16
-Methamidophos (No.100)	20
-Methidathion (No.51)	16
-Permethrin (No.120)	26
-Phosmet (No.103)	20
-Pirimicarb (No.101)	20

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
-Propargite (No.113)	22
-Propoxur (No.75)	17
- <u>sec</u> -Butylamine (No.89)	18
-Thiometon (No.76)	17
-2,4,5-T (No.121)	27
Validation of Toxicological Data	27
Analysis of Pesticide Residues - Report of WG	27
Collaborative Effort in the analysis of inorganic bromide residues	28
Expression of MRLs for Fat-soluble Pesticides in milk and milk products	28
Sampling - Report of WG	29
Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries - Report of WG	30
Regulatory Principles - Report of WG	31
Priority Lists - Report of WG	32
Questionnaire on GAP	32
Other Business - Date and Place of next Session	33

APPENDICES

List of Participants	- Appendix I	34
Report of the <u>Ad Hoc</u> WG on Methods of Analysis	- Appendix II	46
Report of the <u>Ad Hoc</u> WG on Sampling	- Appendix III	49
Report of the <u>Ad Hoc</u> WG on Problems in Developing Countries related to Pesticide Residues	- Appendix IV	50
Report of the <u>Ad Hoc</u> WG on Regulatory Principles	- Appendix V	55
Report of the Ad Hoc WG on Priorities	- Appendix VI	58
Maximum Residue Limits submitted to the Commission for Adoption as Codex Maximum Residue Limits	- Appendix VII	61
Amendments to Codex Maximum Residue Limits	- Appendix VIII	64

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Fifteenth Session, 1983

REPORT OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION OF
THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES
The Hague, 15-20 June 1981

INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues held its Thirteenth Session in The Hague, The Netherlands, from 15 to 20 June 1981. Mr. A.J. Pieters, Public Health Officer of the Ministry of Health and Environmental Protection, Foodstuffs Division, acted as Chairman. The session was attended by Government delegates, experts, observers and advisers from the following 41 countries:

Algeria	Gabon	Norway
Argentina	German Democratic Rep.	Philippines
Australia	(observer)	Poland
Austria	Germany, Fed. Rep. of	Portugal
Belgium	Guyana	Romania
Brazil	Hungary	South Africa, Rep. of
Canada	Ireland	(observer)
Chile	Israel	Spain
Czechoslovakia	Italy	Sweden
Denmark	Japan	Switzerland
Egypt, Arab Republic of	Kuwait	Thailand
Finland	Mexico	United Kingdom
France	Netherlands, The	United States of America
	New Zealand	Venezuela
	Nigeria	Yugoslavia

The following International Organizations were also represented:

International Organization for Standardization (ISO)
 Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
 Council of Europe (CE)
 European Economic Community (EEC)
 Nordic Committee on Food Analysis (NMKL)
 International Organization of Consumer Unions (IOCU)
 International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC)
 International Federation of National Association of Pesticide Manufacturers (GIFAP)
 European Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)
 International Dairy Federation (IDF)
 International Federation of Margarine Manufacturers Associations (IFMA)

The list of participants, including officers from FAO and WHO, is attached as Appendix I to this Report.

OPENING BY THE MINISTER OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

2. The Thirteenth Session was opened by Dr. L. Ginjaar, Minister of Health and Environmental Protection of The Netherlands. He welcomed the participants and referred to the appearance, nine years ago, of the first report of the Club of Rome. Today, it must have become clear to mankind that limits to growth do exist and it has also become clear that economic factors play an even more important role than the shortage of basic materials and pollution in imposing these limits. The increase in the cost of energy has set limits to growth more effectively than any other measure designed to protect mankind from the consequences of its own actions. The Minister stated, however, that there was no reason for Governments to be less critical of industrial activities. In periods of reduced growth or recession there was a tendency to stimulate economic development heedless of the consequences for humans and the environment. This could lead to a regrettable deterioration of the quality of life, for which future generations would have to foot the bill. There was, therefore, every reason to continue to be careful as will be confirmed by each country in its own way, based on its own experience. Having been charged with the policy in the field of health and environmental protection for almost four years, Dr. Ginjaar indicated that he had been confronted with a series of incidents during this period, partly resulting from the action of human beings since the end of the fifties, nowadays considered as unacceptable. For example, the dumping of waste chemicals in the past had created great nuisance and expenses years afterwards, in some cases even with worse consequences. These situations should be prevented, not only for the present generation but also for future generations and in every aspect of human activities. The serious criticism by the general public of certain aspects of the production of chemicals was in some cases justified. Regulations in this field had been insufficient in the past and people had not been aware that they were doing anything wrong. Rules to prevent these situations from arising should be developed and enforced, but not only in relation to circumstances at present known to result in unacceptable situations. Imagination and creativity were needed in order to visualize as far as possible where problems are likely to arise. It was only in this way, the Minister said, that criticism of future generations can be avoided.

Criticism of the chemical industry was, in fact, one-sided since other areas of human activity might also have adverse consequences; the most accidents to people occurred in or around the home. Another example was road traffic, yet, general concern about the dangers from the chemical industry outweighed that about road accidents.

The criteria for weighing advantages against disadvantages were obviously not of the same type as those used for the products of the chemical industry. Insufficient knowledge of what this branch of science had done for mankind resulted in a situation where the disadvantages attracted all the attention. This applied especially to pesticides, because they are toxic to living organisms, because they are sprayed in the environment and, last, but not least, because traces of them can be found in food.

The Minister emphasized that it was the continuing responsibility of the chemical industry, agriculture and governments to look for ways of informing the public about the essential role which pesticides play in the production of sufficient food of acceptable quality, in safeguarding food stocks and transports and in protecting human and animal health against diseases and pests. There was, however, yet another task: to ensure that no products were brought on the market that could endanger human health and the environment, either in the short-term or after long-term use or exposure. Experience had often proved that an apparently safe use was followed by disadvantages coming to light. This did not bolster public confidence. The creativity of all scientists involved should develop pesticides which are safe in the short or long term. The Minister said that he was aware of the fact that additional safety measures were necessary, especially with respect to the proper use of pesticides in situations and in quantities that are really necessary.

The Minister considered the attitude of the Committee during the past years as a good example of an approach to controlling pesticides. Maximum residue limits should be set at levels in accordance with the requirements of public health but not higher than required by good agricultural practice. This approach had greatly contributed to the trust which the results of this work had generated throughout the world.

3. In his words of thanks to the Minister for opening the Session and for his continuing interest, the Chairman pointed to the high percentage of acceptances by countries of the maximum residue limits recommended by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, as a measure of success. On the other hand, a number of countries had not accepted Codex maximum residue limits and thus will not allow free distribution of food containing residues in accordance with Codex recommendations. Many countries had not yet reacted to the invitation of the Codex Secretariat to express their views on acceptances. The Chairman pointed out that new data could give rise to a revision of proposed maximum residue limits and that the non-availability of data required to convert temporary ADIs into full ADIs could have its consequences for the status of the recommended maximum residue limits. While a critical attitude in reviewing past procedures should be recommended, the onus was on the pesticide industry to supply most of the data needed for evaluation and re-evaluation. The Chairman expressed the hope that the Committee would discuss problems of such general character more thoroughly at the present session.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

4. On the request of the delegation of The Netherlands, item 11, Establishment of Priority Lists, was advanced to an earlier point on the Agenda.

5. As Governments had been asked to comment on the expression of MRLs for fat-soluble pesticides in milk and milk products, the delegation of The Netherlands requested to discuss the problem during this meeting. It was agreed to deal with this matter under Agenda item 7, Methods of Analysis.

6. The delegation of The Netherlands suggested to rediscuss the decision taken at the last session that "Guideline Levels" should not be presented for governments' comments. They also wished to discuss the situation with regard to temporary ADIs. It was decided to consider these problems when discussing the 1980 JMPR Report.

7. On the proposal of the delegation of Australia, the Committee agreed that a draft report on an international collaborative study on the analysis of inorganic bromide residues should be discussed under item 7 of the Agenda.

8. The modified Agenda was adopted by the Committee.

9. The delegation of the United Kingdom raised the question whether rapporteurs should be appointed. The delegation of Mexico was of the opinion that a rapporteur for the Spanish language could be helpful. On the suggestion of the Secretariat, the Committee agreed that no rapporteurs be appointed at this Session.

10. The Committee was informed of the retirement of Prof. W.F. Almeida, Chairman of the Working Group on Problems in Developing Countries concerning Pesticide Residues, from Government Service. As a result, Prof. Almeida could not attend the present Session and could not continue as Chairman of the above Working Group. The Committee expressed its appreciation to Prof. Almeida and Mrs. Almeida for their valuable contribution to the work of the CCPR and wished them well in their future activities.

11. The Chairman mentioned that both Dr. van Tiel and Prof. Besemer of the delegation of The Netherlands would be participating for the last time at sessions of the CCPR in their present capacity in view of their impending retirement.

12. The delegates were asked to give their views on the way this meeting was organized in order to enable the Chairman to judge whether to continue in this way.

MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

(a) Report of the 1979 Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)

13. The Committee had before it the Report of the 1979 Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 20).

14. The delegation of Switzerland suggested that WHO should review the ADI of inorganic bromide. It was pointed out by the representative of WHO that a general review of bromide intake by the JMPR would take place in 1981 but that a complete re-evaluation could only be carried out when new data were available. The Committee was informed that the study on the subject in The Netherlands was not yet finished. They would try, however, to send the provisional report as soon as this becomes available. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that they would request their toxicologists to contribute data for a possible re-evaluation.

(b) Report of the 1980 Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)

15. The Committee had before it the Report of the 1980 Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 26). Several delegations congratulated FAO for publishing this report in time for the Session of the CCPR.

The representative of FAO pointed to some changes in presentation which should facilitate the use of the report. It was agreed to put this Report again on the agenda of the next Session.

International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS)

16. The delegation of The Netherlands, in referring to their written comments, expressed their serious concern with regard to the functioning of the JMPR and CCPR in relation to the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS), notwithstanding reassurance given to the Committee on several occasions. While they recognized the importance of IPCS as proposed by WHO, they stressed that, so far, JMPR and CCPR had exclusively dealt with maximum residue limits of agricultural pesticides. Merging the work of JMPR into IPCS might introduce non-agricultural pesticides and non-pesticidal chemicals as well as aspects of environmental impact and occupational hazard for which neither JMPR nor CCPR were equipped and which would likely result in a delay in the progress of the CCPR in the field for which it had been established. Given the increasing budgetary restrictions, they wondered whether much support from national lead institutions might be forthcoming.

17. The delegation of the United Kingdom, joining in the doubts expressed by the delegation of The Netherlands, pointed to the duplication of effort between the IPCS and the work of the JMPR. About 80 percent of the activities of the IPCS dealt with aspects of pesticides. The already scarce resources of the JMPR would now have to be shared with IPCS, which would result in a dilution of the work.

18. The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Australia, Ireland and Switzerland expressed views similar to those of The Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

19. The representative of WHO responded that it was by no means intended to change the terms of reference of the JMPR. Meetings of the JMPR had been proposed for the biennium 1983/84. He stated that no other IPCS component would deal with problems related to pesticide residues.

The question was considered as to how far national governments could support WHO in activities such as summarizing toxicological data and the preparation of monographs. He undertook to circulate a paper for the next Session describing how delegates could increase their support to JMPR. A document describing the present situation of IPCS was distributed for information of the Committee (see para 38 of this Report).

20. The representative of FAO indicated that his Organization had so far not decided to join IPCS.

Problems related to temporary ADIs and Guideline Levels

21. The delegation of The Netherlands presented a room document illustrating growing concern with regard to temporary ADIs as in many cases information required to enable temporary ADIs to be converted into full ADIs was not forthcoming. In some cases, this had already led to the withdrawal of temporary ADIs. As a result, temporary MRLs had been converted by the JMPR into Guideline Levels even in cases where the MRLs were at Step 9. It was expected that the number of similar cases might increase in the near future. The reasons for this situation varied. In many cases, they were of the same nature as those which prevented Guideline levels being changed to MRLs. In a number of cases, there was difficulty concerning the protection and use of proprietary data.

22. Several delegations questioned the concept of temporary ADIs and the consequences of this temporary character for the work of the CCPR. The representative of WHO explained the toxicological and administrative justification of temporary ADIs. It was suggested that temporary MRLs should not be advanced further than Step 7 of the Codex Procedure until complete toxicological clearance was obtained. This would avoid situations as that with coumaphos where the 1980 JMPR had withdrawn the temporary ADI although TMRLs were already at Step 9.

23. The problems related to Guideline Levels were sometimes close to those of temporary ADIs. Here again, several reasons could be mentioned why the information required by the JMPR was not forthcoming. Amongst these, difficulties concerning the use of proprietary data was a major reason. A number of cases were mentioned where governments had reviewed data necessary to establish both ADIs and MRLs but where these data had not been submitted to Codex and to the JMPR. This had resulted in situations where national MRLs were identical to Guideline Levels.

24. Several delegations stated that, notwithstanding the decision of the Committee at its Twelfth Session (ALINORM 81/24, paras 139-144), it would give very valuable information both to governments and to the JMPR if at least one round of government comments on Guideline Levels were obtained. It was recalled that the Committee, at its Ninth Session, had decided to invite governments to comment on Guideline Levels. This could, perhaps, be done outside the formal Codex Procedure, although a similar approach as for substances with a temporary ADI (e.g. to advance them to Step 7) would also be possible.

25. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany drew attention to substances, such as hydrogen phosphide, for which MRLs had been established on the basis that no residues were present at the time of consumption, and where full toxicological data were not considered to be necessary. As in similar cases, sometimes Guideline Levels had been proposed, they pointed to the need for a more consistent approach to setting MRLs, temporary MRLs and Guideline Levels in general.

26. The delegation of the USA stated that Guideline Levels were published in the Reports and Monographs of the JMPR and thus were available to governments. They would hesitate to process them even through the early Steps of the Codex Procedure as this implied a kind of endorsement. As residues of pesticides for which Guideline Levels

had been recommended did occur in food moving in international trade, other delegations questioned such a formal approach which would prevent the exchange and discussion of extremely useful information. Moreover, there was a chance that in the near future a number of temporary ADIs might expire and, therefore, the corresponding MRLs would be converted to Guideline Levels.

27. It was agreed not to take any decision this year, but to accept the offer of the delegation of the USA to prepare a background paper reflecting the problems connected with temporary ADIs and Guideline Levels. This paper would be circulated well in advance of the Fourteenth Session in order to enable Governments to give the matter ample consideration.

Coumaphos

28. Related to the problems of temporary ADIs and Guideline Levels was the case of coumaphos, for which MRLs were at Step 9, but for which the 1980 JMPR had withdrawn the ADI since data, partly required already since 1968, had not been forthcoming. It was stressed that coumaphos was still an important pesticide in the treatment of cattle against ticks and that residues did occur in meat and milk.

29. It was agreed to draw this problem to the attention of the next Session of the Commission and to explain the situation in a circular letter, asking governments to comment so that further discussion could take place at the next Session. Comments should include an indication of the importance of coumaphos residues in foods in international trade.

Amitraz

30. The delegation of Canada was concerned that a temporary ADI had been estimated for amitraz, a substance which was reported to increase the incidence of tumours in mice at high feeding levels, while its metabolite caused tumours in both rats and mice. They recalled the discussion in the 1977 JMPR Report on organochlorine compounds which concluded that, in cases where tumours occurred in one species, carcinogenicity studies in two other species would be appropriate. The delegation of Canada requested an outline of WHO's present policy with regard to the assessment of ADIs for known animal carcinogens and also asked whether WHO now considered it unnecessary to carry out carcinogenicity studies in two other species.

31. The representative of WHO replied that the philosophy was that an ADI was derived whenever a no-effect level in relation to appropriate toxicological criteria could be established. The concern of the experts on possible carcinogenicity of amitraz was reflected in their requirement for additional long term studies.

Tobacco

32. In reply to a question of the delegation of Belgium, the representative of FAO said that the JMPR would only deal with residues in tobacco if specifically requested by the Committee. In this respect, the decision at the Twelfth Session not to deal with residues in tobacco (ALINORM 81/24, para 14), was noted.

(c) Matters Arising from Codex Sessions

Coordinating Committee for Africa

33. The Committee noted that the Coordinating Committee for Africa had been informed of the recommendation of the CCPR that, where possible, countries should replace technical HCH (para 18-21, ALINORM 81/28). It was also noted that technical HCH was still being used by developing countries both in agriculture and in vector control. The Coordinating Committee had also discussed the continuing practice of the sale by

companies of pesticides not sufficiently cleared toxicologically or not permitted for use in the country of export. There was a need in this connection, to strengthen the ability of developing countries to ensure the acceptability of imported pesticides preparations (see also para 10, Appendix IV)

Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS)

34. The Committee was informed that the CCMAS had noted the views of the CCPR concerning the need to consider the question of confirmatory tests in relation to the Codex criteria for the selection for methods of analysis. The question is also being dealt with by the Working Group on Analysis of the CCPR (see para 8, ALINORM 81/23).

Codex Committee for Processed Meat and Poultry Products

35. The Committee noted that the preparation of meat products necessitated the sterilization of spices for reasons of hygiene. As the use of ethylene oxide for this purpose, and the relevant ethylene oxide and ethylene chlorohydrin residues and other conversion products had come under criticism from a toxicological point of view, the Committee on Processed Meat Products had referred the matter to this Committee.

36. It was pointed out that the problem with this kind of fumigant related to possible interaction products with the food and required considerable chemical research. This would not be likely to be forthcoming in view of the fact that ethylene oxide was no longer covered by patent rights. The question was raised whether this fumigant should be regarded as a pesticide or a food additive. It was noted that on two previous occasions the JMPR had examined ethylene oxide as a fumigant (i.e pesticide). The Codex Secretariat pointed out that the fumigation of and possible interaction with spices, used as very minor components of manufactured foods, represented a particular case which might require safety considerations different from those made in connection with other pesticides. The delegation of Australia informed the Committee that long-term inhalation studies were in progress on this fumigant. The delegation of the USA undertook to inform the Committee of the studies.

Codex Committee on General Principles

37. The Committee was informed that the Codex Committee on General Principles had reconsidered the Codex Procedures for the elaboration of standards and MRLs. The Procedure for the elaboration of commodity standards had been streamlined by the combination of Steps 1, 2 and 3 in the same way Codex MRLs were being elaborated. At Step 5 provisions were being proposed which would enable Committees to seek comments at Step 6, in anticipation of the Commission adopting draft standards and MRLs at Step 5, in order to overcome difficulties created by phasing of sessions of Codex Committees and of the Commission. Draft standards and MRLs adopted by the Commission at Step 8 were to be considered "Codex" standards or MRLs. The Codex Alimentarius would thus become a collection of Codex MRLs, standards and other associated texts plus government acceptances.

The Committee noted these proposed changes with satisfaction and also noted that the Fourteenth Session of the Commission would consider the final adoption of the new Procedures.

Executive Committee

38. The Committee noted that the Twenty-seventh Session of the Executive Committee had received a full report from the Director of the WHO Environmental Health Division concerning details of the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS) (see also paras 16-20 of this Report). The Executive Committee had noted that a possible FAO participation in the work of the IPCS might lead to additional funds and resources being required in order to cover the additional workload which could result from such a participation (see para 51, ALINORM 81/3).

(d) Reports from Other International Organizations

Report from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)

OECD Test Guidelines and Principles of Good Laboratory Practice

39. The Committee was informed by the representative of OECD that the Council had agreed that, in the testing of chemicals, data generated in an OECD Member Country in accordance with test guidelines and OECD principles of Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) shall be accepted by other Member Countries for purposes of assessment and other uses relating to the protection of man and the environment.

The reasons for such agreement as above were:

- i) to facilitate action to protect humans and the environment;
- ii) to avoid the development of non-tariff barriers to trade;
- iii) to reduce the cost burden associated with testing; and
- iv) to utilize more effectively the scarce test facilities, and specialist manpower that are available in the Member Countries.

The test guidelines and principles of GLP had been developed as a result of a concerted effort on the part of various interested groups and Organizations. Work of ISO and WHO had been incorporated, wherever relevant. The Committee was informed that a mechanism had been established for updating the test guidelines, which certain countries had already incorporated into their national guidelines. It noted that the activities of OECD and CCPR in related programmes were not overlapping but mutually supplementary.

Information Exchange related to Exports

40. The Committee was also informed of the progress of a new project on Information Exchange related to Exports. An Expert Group was established under the leadership of Canada with a mandate to study the subject and to propose, as necessary, guidelines on the information exchange related to the export of hazardous chemicals. While doing so, the Expert Group was invited to take into account such considerations as:

- i) the criteria for the selection of chemicals to be included in such information exchange;
- ii) the needs of importing countries; and
- iii) the resource implications for both exporting and importing countries.

Statement of the Representative of the Council of Europe

41. The Committee was informed by the representative of the Council of Europe that the 5th edition of the booklet "Pesticides" which is primarily intended for national authorities responsible for pesticide registrations and for guidance on the management and safety in use of pesticides had recently been published and is available on request. There was considerable improvement over the 4th edition. References to Good Laboratory Practice and confidentiality of research and development data were included in the introductions. The toxicity data were thoroughly revised to bring them up to date with recent developments. The chapter on the classification and safety labelling of pesticides, particularly with respect to the LD₅₀ was largely modified in the light of the EEC directive 78/631 (of 26.6.78). Two new chapters, one on guidance for the registration of biological agents used as pesticides and another on efficacy data were included. Bibliographic references were provided, where possible, at the end of each chapter and national Registration Authorities of non-member Council of Europe states were listed in an Appendix.

The Committee was informed that the Council of Europe had received valuable assistance from GIFAP and EEPA in the above task of revision. Other works by the Council of Europe in the field of pesticides included:

- i) the publication of three resolutions since June 1980: AP(81)1 on the disposal of surplus pesticides and pesticide containers, AP(81)2 on guidelines to reduce the risk of contamination of animal products for human consumption by pesticide residues resulting from pesticides in feedstuffs and AP(81)3 on the domestic use of pesticides;
- ii) preparation of resolutions on a) wood preservation; b) aerial spraying of pesticides and c) risks of contamination of animal products resulting from the use of pesticides in livestock premises;
- iii) revision of the resolution on the importation of cereals treated with pesticides (AP(73)3).

The representative from GIFAP informed the Committee that his Organization had been given the opportunity to comment on the draft Council of Europe Booklet on Pesticides at an early stage. This coordinated effort between government and industry had led to a well-balanced and scientifically sound document with respect to questions relating to residues, toxicology and efficacy. However, Chapter V "Effects on wild life" contained generalities which lacked supporting data in the scientific literature. GIFAP hoped that this situation would be remedied in the next edition of the Council of Europe Booklet. As in the past, GIFAP would be willing to assist the Council of Europe in the preparation of the next edition of the Booklet on "Pesticides".

Food and Agricultural Organization

42. The Committee was informed by the representative of FAO about the organization in 1982 of a second ad hoc Government Consultation on the harmonization for Pesticide Registrations. This Consultation will discuss proposals for a Model Scheme for Registration, guidelines for labelling, packaging and storage of pesticides, biological efficacy evaluation and evaluation of residue data. In this forthcoming activity, FAO liaised closely with EPPO and OECD. WHO would provide background data on toxicological and testing requirements of pesticides that may be required for the Consultation. The delegation from Mexico informed the Committee about the meeting that the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences was organizing on pesticide registration to be held possibly in November 1981. It sought the assistance from FAO and WHO in organizing this meeting, which could be regarded as a forerunner of the 1982 FAO Consultation.

Statement of the Representative of EPPO

43. The representative of EPPO informed the Committee that EPPO had been concentrating on the establishment of guidelines on efficacy testing of pesticides since 1970. These include insecticides, acaricides, nematocides, fungicides, rodenticides and herbicides. Some fifty guidelines established by EPPO expert groups had been adopted by the thirty-four EPPO Member Countries and by GIFAP which were already used in practice in some countries. In order to encourage the general introduction of the guidelines, EPPO was organizing for the beginning of 1982, a conference on the harmonization of registration procedures with special reference to efficacy testing. Finally, he mentioned that an extended new version of the guidelines on ultra low volume (ULV) applications has been prepared by an EPPO expert committee.

(e) Report on Acceptances by Governments of Codex MRLs

44. The Committee had before it a report CX/PR 81/3 on acceptances of Codex MRLs. The paper attempted to analyse government replies received so far on the recommendations contained in the 4th, 5th and 6th Series of Step 9 MRLs submitted to governments for acceptance. The Secretariat in introducing the paper expressed the opinion that not

only full acceptance but also other forms of acceptance (i.e F, L, T/F and T/L) and the form of non-acceptance, where governments undertook to permit the free movement of foods complying with Codex MRLs to move in their territories of jurisdiction (i.e NFD), served the purposes of the Commission (see definition of the various forms of acceptances in document CX/PR 81/3).

The Committee noted, in this connection, the recommendation of the Codex Committee on General Principles that the form of non-acceptance, NFD, should no longer be referred to as a negative reply.

45. The representative of the EEC stated that the Community had been prompted by the decisions in the CCGP, especially in connection with the NFD-form of "non-acceptance", to undertake a review of its position vis-à-vis Codex MRLs. While a formal acceptance by the EEC, in one of the ways provided for in the Codex Procedures, could not be ruled out in the future, the EEC representative indicated that as a first and early step, the EEC envisaged making a communication to Codex indicating whether, and to what extent, foodstuffs complying with certain Codex MRLs can be freely distributed within the Community.

46. The Committee noted that the figures indicated in the Secretariat papers were only indicative of an overall trend and also noted that the MRLs for several pesticides were proving to be more acceptable to governments than the MRLs for other pesticides. The Secretariat was requested to look into a possible explanation of this matter, possibly in terms of whether the pesticides concerned had a firm or a temporary ADI. It was noted that in many cases, the percentage of non-acceptances were very high indicating that perhaps the Codex MRLs were not appropriate. It was suggested that the JMPR could also examine the Secretariat paper to see where a revision of previous recommendations might be necessary.

47. The Committee concluded that the Secretariat should continue to study acceptances received and keep the Committee informed of developments. The suggestion was made that future papers should examine selected commodities of importance in international trade to test the acceptability of Codex MRLs and should include reference to non-acceptance with free distribution under certain conditions (e.g. NDCC). The delegation of Argentina informed the Committee that its government had recently sent its response to the Sixth Series of Codex MRLs. The delegation of Spain indicated that its government intended to indicate its position in relation to twelve pesticides for which Codex MRLs had been submitted for acceptance.

INTAKE OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES

(a) FAO/WHO Guidelines for the Estimation of Food Contaminant Intake

48. The Committee was informed by the Secretariat of recent developments concerning the above FAO/WHO publication which the Committee had decided to await before considering the elaboration of guidelines on the estimation of pesticide residue intake (see para 37, ALINORM 79/24). The Secretariat indicated that the FAO/WHO publication was in preparation and that a very restricted number of copies would be printed probably towards the end of 1981. It would not be possible to make a distribution of the publication to Codex Contact Points for reasons of cost. The FAO/WHO publication dealt in detail with the objectives of monitoring programmes, types and sources of residue intake data, types of surveys, data management, etc. However, it contained no recommendations or guidelines concerning the way pesticide residue intake studies should be carried out.

49. Delegations at the Session made practical suggestions as to how the FAO/WHO publication might be issued so that it would be available to interested persons. It was agreed that documents meriting wider interest should be given appropriate publicity

through publication. The Secretariat was requested to bring these views to the attention of FAO/WHO.

50. The delegation of the United States of America raised the question of Codex publications on pesticide residues as a general issue. That delegation expressed serious concern about the fact that many recommendations of the Committee and of the Commission had not yet been published. For example, the Second Issue of the Guide on Limits for Pesticide Residues had been overdue for a number of years although this publication represented an important source of information for governments and also represented a summary of the work and achievements of the Committee. Similarly, neither the Seventh Series of Step 9 MRLs nor the recommended methods of analysis and associated tests had been published. Every effort should be made to ensure an early remedy of this situation.

(b) Reports on Pesticide Residue Intake Studies in various countries

51. The Committee had before it the report of a market basket study from Australia and Room document No.7 concerning an adult total diet study from the United States. The delegation of Australia, in introducing their study, pointed out that besides several pesticides also some heavy metals had been included in the survey. Very important for their country was the residue of fenitrothion in cereal products which turned out to be always well below the ADI. It was also stated that studies would continue and that the 1980 study had already been completed. These data would be available next year.

52. The delegation of the United States explained that their survey had been carried out since 1965, using a table-ready teenage meal. The survey consisted of 20 market basket samples each year. The analytical methods included in the study were capable of detecting about 200 pesticides and industrial chemicals. The table listed only the chemicals detected and these were all below the ADI.

53. The delegation of the United Kingdom stated that they had been conducting intake studies since 1966. Last year, however, their method of carrying out the survey had been revised, with an increase from 6 to 20 in the number of food groups covered. The methods of analysis used were capable of detecting about 200 pesticides and industrial chemicals should residues of these compounds in fact be present. Samples were taken every two weeks with preparation being carried out at one central point for the sake of uniformity. Results of the study would be made available to the CCPR but results so far indicated that intake of dieldrin residues, as the pesticide with the highest level of intake in relation to the ADI, had been shown to be at around 1/3 of the ADI. Intake found for other compounds was but a small fraction of the ADI.

54. The representatives of FAO and WHO recommended that other countries also undertake dietary studies and not to be discouraged by not being able to analyse as many as 200 pesticides. Less ambitious programmes could also provide valuable data.

55. The delegation of Finland informed the Committee that Finland had carried out two surveys showing an increase from around 20 mg of total pesticide residue/inhabitant/year to around 55 mg of total pesticide residue/inhabitant/year. Ninety percent of this residue was due to imported food. Most of the intake was due to fungicides, which should be included in intake studies. As regards fungicides, the Committee noted that the occurrence of residues from this group of pesticides depended on the prevailing agricultural conditions, but appeared to be within the ADIs.

56. As regards the question of pesticide residue intake, the Committee agreed that it was necessary to develop guidelines for the approach to pesticide residue intake studies and accepted the offer of the delegations of the United States of America and

the United Kingdom to prepare, in cooperation with FAO, a working paper for the next Session of the Committee.

57. The question was asked whether ETU had been included in intake studies. It was noted that some countries had not included ETU in their studies while others had done so in relation to cooked products.

58. The delegations of Denmark and Finland raised the problem of a number of residues being found on fruits imported into their countries. It was noted that residues of several pesticides could be present on fruits as a result of treatment of agricultural crops at various stages of production (e.g pre-harvest treatment and post-harvest treatment). It also appeared that increasing use was being made of pesticide mixtures. In this connection, the problem of toxicological interaction was raised.

59. The Committee noted that this question was not easy to resolve and requested the JMPR to consider possible implications of the use of pesticide mixtures.

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO STEP 9 MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS^{1/}

Consideration of proposed amendments in the light of Government Comments

60. The Committee had before it the amendments on which Government comments had been sought as contained in part B of Appendix VI, ALINORM 81/24, and the United States' comments on the amendments as contained in CX/PR 81/4 Add. 1:

- (a) As regards the amendment regarding bromophos in blackberries at Step 3, there was unanimous agreement to the proposed MRL of 1 mg/kg. The Committee agreed to advance it to Step 5 of the Procedure.
- (b) The Committee reiterated its previous conclusion that the proposed changes for thiabendazole in tomatoes and fenitrothion in wheat flour were substantive. The Commission was, therefore, requested to initiate the amendment procedure for these items.
- (c) The Committee reiterated that the amendments proposed for dichlofluanid in sweet peppers and certain cereal grains were not substantive and recommended to the Commission that they be so adopted.
- (d) The previous recommendation to the Commission that the MRL for inorganic bromide in wholemeal flour be amended was considered erroneous and was deleted from Part B, Appendix VI, ALINORM 81/24.
- (e) The Committee also noted that the MRL for thiophanate-methyl in raspberries at Step 9 was in error and should be corrected to 5 mg/kg. The Commission was requested to authorise this correction.

CONSIDERATION OF NEW AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY GOVERNMENTS AND THE 1980 JOINT MEETING ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

61. The Committee had before it documents CX/PR 81/5 containing proposed changes to Step 9 MRLs and CX/PR 81/5 Add.1 containing comments from the United States.

- (a) The Committee recalled the considerable discussion on coumaphos during an earlier agenda item (see paras 28-29). Noting that the change to the temporary MRLs for coumaphos necessitated by the withdrawal by the JMPR of the temporary ADI of that pesticide would involve questions of fundamental principles, it agreed to discuss this question at the next Session in the light of the paper to be prepared by the United States (see para 27 of this Report).

^{1/} See Appendix VIII of this Report.

- (b) The Committee felt that the proposed amendments for captafol in onions, methidathion in milk and milk products and fenamiphos in tomatoes as well as the recommendation that fenamiphos in Citrus fruit (except oranges) be deleted, were non-substantive and recommended that the amendments be adopted by the Commission.
- (c) The Committee agreed that, as regards 2,4-D in raw cereals, the new MRLs for the individual cereals should follow the Codex Step Procedure. These items were, therefore, advanced to Step 3 and government comments were requested. It was understood, once adopted by the Commission, the MRLs for specific cereals would become exceptions to the general MRL for cereals.
- (d) With respect to chlorpyrifos in celery, cottonseed, cottonseed oil (crude), mushrooms, onions and sugar beets, it was agreed that the Step 9 MRLs were at the limit of determination and should be so indicated. The Committee considered this change as non-substantive and requested the Commission to adopt it.

CONSIDERATION OF CODEX MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS AT STEP 4 AND 7
IN THE LIGHT OF GOVERNMENT COMMENTS

62. The Committee had before it the following documents:

- (a) The summary of MRLs at Steps 3, 6 and 7 of the Codex Procedure on which government comments had been asked (CX/PR 81/2 and ADD.1):
- (b) the report of the 1979 JMPR;
- (c) the summary of written comments which had been received prior to the Committee's session, CX/PR 81/6 and ADD.1 to this document and room document No.13. In order to ensure a more detailed discussion of Government comments when this report is reviewed, the Committee urged delegates to give full consideration to the written comments submitted.

63. The representative of FAO suggested that comments from countries could be considered more quickly and the reasons for non-acceptance of a proposal be communicated more clearly, if countries adopted a harmonized approach to identifying these reasons. He noted that comments usually reflected views on:

- a) Public health concern;
- b) proposed MRLs that are considered too high and which, based on data from studies, do not represent good agricultural practice;
- c) proposed MRLs that are considered to be based on inadequate data;
- d) proposed MRLs that are considered to be based on adequate data but on which there has been a different interpretation;
- e) the definition of the residue;
- f) proposed MRLs that are considered too low and need additional data based on good agricultural practice in other countries;
- g) other reasons.

The Committee agreed to request that written comments from countries at all Steps should either indicate acceptance or should identify the reason(s) for non-acceptance as indicated above.

64. The following paragraphs reflect the discussions concerning individual maximum residue limits. Only those proposed MRLs are referred to on which discussions took place. Where no special indication is made, proposals were advanced from Step 4 to Step 5 or from Step 7 to 8, as appropriate.

CAPTAN (No. 7)

65. As the 1980 JMPR decided to change the MRL from 40 mg/kg it was agreed to send it back to Step 6 for another round of comments.

CARBOPHENOTHION (No.11)

66. It was noted that the 1979 JMPR had established an ADI of 0.0005 mg/kg which was higher than the temporary ADI of 0.0002 established by the 1977 JMPR, but 10 times lower than that of 0.0005 established in 1972. It was also noted that most of the proposed MRLs had originated from the 1972 JMPR and that for apples and pears the 1979 JMPR had proposed to increase the MRLs from 0.5 to 1 mg/kg.

67. Several delegations expressed their concern on possible consequences of these proposals for public health in view of the low ADI and relatively broad spectrum of use. Other delegations, on the contrary, thought that the proposals reflected current good agricultural practice and indicated that exceeding the ADI could only be demonstrated through studies on actual residue intake. It was noted that, so far, such studies had not been carried out for this compound but that the product was used only in a limited number of agricultural situations where it proved to be very useful.

68. The representative of FAO stressed that proposals made by the JMPR were joint recommendations of the FAO and WHO panels of experts and thus were acceptable to the toxicologists in the JMPR. The Committee noted, however, that no reference to discussions on the MRLs in the light of the revised ADI could be found in the Reports of the JMPR (see para 66 of this Report).

69. Several delegations were in favour of the new proposal of 1 mg/kg for apples and pears while others preferred the former proposal of 0.5 mg/kg. As a number of delegations were not prepared to accept most of the proposals it was concluded that countries be invited to undertake studies on the actual intake of the residues of the compound and to leave the proposals at Step 7 (except those mentioned in para 71), awaiting the outcome of these studies. The Joint Meeting should be informed of the discussion by the Committee and of the concern expressed about possible consequences for public health.

70. The delegation of Chile informed the Committee that they had been forced to change their good agricultural practice and to allow only winter application on apples in order to be able to meet the maximum residue limits of countries to which they exported.

Milk, Milk products, Pecans, Potatoes, Rapeseed, Sugar beet, Walnuts

71. The proposed MRLs for these pesticides, being at very low levels or at the limit of determination were advanced to Step 8.

Prunes

72. As it was not clear as to what the 1972 JMPR had meant by this entry, the representative of FAO undertook to look into the original data to see what the commodity description should be.

Description of the residue

73. The Committee agreed to the description of the residue proposed by the 1980 CCPR (para 5.2, Appendix II, ALINORM 81/24).

CHLORDANE (No. 12)

74. As only nine replies had been received to the questionnaire (CL 1980/5) requesting information on the use pattern and residues of chlordane, endosulfan and hexachlorobenzene, it was decided to urge governments to reply to this questionnaire in order to enable the JMPR to re-evaluate the compounds in 1982. In the meantime, all proposals were kept at Step 7.

CHLOROBENZILATE (No. 16)

75. It was noted that the 1980 JMPR had reviewed the compound and had confirmed the ADI. Residue data which was to have been provided by the USA for evaluation had not been received. It was decided to return the proposals to Step 6 in order to enable governments to comment on them.

2,4-D (No. 20)

76. On the proposal of the delegation of Sweden, it was decided to lower the proposals to 0.1 mg/kg which was considered appropriate to cover the actual use of 2,4-D in forest treatment since the use pattern had been changed. The proposals were returned to Step 6 in order to enable governments to give their comments on the new MRL. With regard to the type of limit, it was concluded that under the old definition, this would have been regarded as a "practical residue limit" but that in the light of the new definition of "extraneous residue limit" actually under consideration, it was more appropriate to consider it as a MRL.

DIAZINON (No. 23)

Kiwi fruit

77. After some discussion, it was decided to advance the proposal to Step 5.

ENDOSULFAN (No. 32)

78. The Committee decided to take the same approach as for chlordane (see para 74 of this Report).

FENITROTHION (No. 37)

Peaches

79. The Committee considered the recommendation of the 1979 JMPR to change the MRL to 1 mg/kg. As there was general agreement on this proposal, it was decided to advance the MRL of 1 mg/kg to Step 8 of the Procedure.

Pears

80. For the same reasons as above, the Committee decided to advance the MRL of 0.5 mg/kg to Step 8 of the Procedure.

Wheat bran (processed)

81. The Committee considered a proposal by the 1979 JMPR for an MRL of 2 mg fenitrothion per kg in processed wheat bran. The delegations of The Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany expressed reservations concerning this MRL in view of the high consumption of cereals. The Committee recalled its decision at the last Session that the Step 9 MRL of "20 mg/kg in wheat bran" should be clarified to mean "20 mg/kg in raw wheat bran and 2 mg/kg in processed wheat bran" and that the Commission be requested to adopt this clarification as a non-substantive change (see Part A, Appendix VI, ALINORM 81/2 and the Report of the Fourteenth Session of the Commission).

82. In view of the re-evaluation of this pesticide by the JMPR, the Committee decided to return all the MRLs to Step 6 of the Codex Procedure.

INORGANIC BROMIDE (No. 47)

Cabbage, Lettuce

83. The Committee had before it a proposal by the 1979 JMPR for 100 mg bromide per kg in these products. In this connection, the Committee discussed the intake of bromide ion resulting from natural sources as well as from the practice of soil fumigation. It was noted that the effect of small levels of bromide ion in food were not fully understood especially as the ADI had been based on levels which were close to effect levels. It was also pointed out that the MRL of 100 mg/kg was perhaps unduly high and could be set around 50 mg/kg. The delegations of France, Belgium, the United Kingdom and The Netherlands undertook to provide residue data.

84. It was suggested that intake studies might provide information on the amount of bromide ingested and an indication of the source of bromide. The representative of FAO indicated that the JMPR was ready to review the question of bromide ion residues in food and their implications in 1981. A number of delegations indicated that they would make data available to the 1981 JMPR well before the Session, in order that such a review might be possible (see also para 14 of this Report). The Committee noted the above remarks and decided to advance the MRLs of 100 mg/kg for cabbage and lettuce to Step 5 of the Procedure.

LINDANE (No. 48)

85. The Committee had before it a recommendation of the JMPR to increase the MRL to 2 mg/kg in tomatoes. The delegations of Poland, Finland and Sweden were not in favour of such an increase either for toxicological reasons or reasons of good agricultural practice considerations. The Committee decided to advance the MRL of 2 mg/kg to Step 8 of the Codex Procedure, noting that the limit suggested by the JMPR had been based, as usual, on residue data from supervised trials.

METHIDATHION (No. 51)

Mandarins

86. The MRL of 5 mg/kg for methidathion in mandarins had been proposed by the 1979 JMPR as an exception from the general MRL for Citrus fruit. The need for a higher limit for mandarins was questioned. The Committee noted that methidathion was needed in preventing red scale in mandarins and that the residue was retained mostly in the peel. Noting that only very small amounts of the residue were found in the edible portion of the fruit, the Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5. The Federal Republic of Germany reserved its position, pending re-evaluation of toxicological data.

THIABENDAZOLE (No. 65)

Strawberries

87. The Committee noted that the 1979 JMPR had recommended that the present MRL of 0.1 mg/kg be increased to 1 mg/kg. The delegation of The Netherlands informed the Committee that new data on residues of thiabendazole following fumigation in glasshouses indicated that a MRL of 3 mg/kg appeared more appropriate. The Committee agreed to retain the MRL of 0.1 mg/kg for thiabendazole in strawberries at Step 7 and to await reconsideration by JMPR at its next Session, taking into account the data to be provided by The Netherlands.

The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Committee that they reserved their position concerning any MRL for thiabendazole pending the elucidation of the effect of the chemical on the thyroid gland.

DEMETON-S-METHYL (No. 73)

Animal feed

88. The Committee noted that the MRLs of 5 mg/kg for the different animal feeds proposed by the JMPR in 1979 were acceptable to many countries. The delegation of The Netherlands, however, indicated that the MRL which had been suggested represented residue levels which may have an effect on livestock and reserved their position. The Committee advanced the MRLs to Step 5.

DISULFOTON (No. 74)

Alfalfa(hay) and Clover(hay)

89. The Committee noted that the JMPR had not been able to reconsider these MRLs as new residue data promised by the countries at the last Session of the CCPR had not been provided for review. The Committee decided to hold the MRLs for alfalfa (hay) and clover (hay) at Step 7 pending reconsideration by the JMPR. The Committee noted that the definition of the residue should refer to the disulfoton group and to demeton-S and its oxidation products rather than to demeton as given in the paper (CX/PR 81/2). The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany reserved its position concerning the proposed MRL of 0.5 mg/kg in potatoes in view of the rather low ADI and the relatively high consumption figures of this commodity.

PROPOXUR (No. 75)

Cocoa beans

90. The Committee noted that the residue data which the United Kingdom had undertaken to collect had not been made available to the JMPR for re-evaluation and agreed to hold the MRL of 0.05 mg/kg for cocoa beans at Step 7. The delegation of the United Kingdom indicated that new data would be provided as soon as methods of analysis had been validated.

THIOMETON (No. 76)

Egg plants, Mustard seed and Rape seed

91. The MRL of 0.5 mg/kg for egg plants and 0.05 mg/kg for mustard seed and rape-seed proposed by the JMPR were advanced to Step 5. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany indicated that toxicologists in their country had expressed certain reservations concerning the toxicological assessment of thiometon and its residues. It was noted that the residue had been defined by the 1979 JMPR as "the sum of thiometon, its sulphoxide and its sulphone, determined as thiometon sulphone and expressed as thiometon".

CHLOROTHALONIL (No. 81)

92. The delegations of Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany reserved their position until doubts on certain toxicological aspects had been cleared.

Grapes

93. The Committee noted that the proposed MRL had been based on trials carried out in Canada, but that the use of chlorothalonil on grapes was not registered in that country and, therefore, could not be considered as good agricultural practice in that country. Insufficient information had been received on recommended uses in other countries. The delegation of Australia informed the Committee that chlorothalonil was registered for use on grapes in their country.

The proposal was advanced to Step 5.

Governments were requested to supply information on registered uses and the resulting residues to the JMPR.

DICHLORFLUANID (No. 82)

Blackberries

94. As the 1980 JMPR had not responded to the request of the Twelfth Session of the Committee to reconsider this limit (see ALINORM 81/24, para 90), it was decided to retain the proposal at Step 7 and to repeat the request to the JMPR.

Eggplant

95. As no data had been forthcoming, the 1980 JMPR had not been able to substantiate the MRL of 2 mg/kg suggested by the CCPR for this commodity. The delegation of The Netherlands stated that their experience, based on a number of studies for related pesticides, had shown that data available for tomatoes could validly be extrapolated to eggplants. They had no data available for dichlorfluanid on eggplants. It was decided to ask the JMPR to reconsider the proposal for eggplant in the light of this similarity and possibly on data that might be made available by governments and others

Decided kept at Step 7.

SEC-BUTYLAMINE (No. 89)

96. The delegations of Canada and France reserved their position on this compound pending toxicological questions and those relating to metabolism being resolved.

Citrus Molasses, Dried pulp

97. It was agreed to endorse the changes proposed by the 1980 JMPR and to return the amended proposals to Step 6 for government comments.

Kidney and Liver of Cattle and of Goats

Milk, Milk products

98. The Committee decided to advance these proposals as amended by the 1980 JMPR to Step 8, with the exception of milk products, for which the proposal had been withdrawn.

CHLORPYRIPHOS-METHYL (No. 90)

99. All proposals recommended by the 1979 JMPR were advanced to Step 5. The delegation of the United States of America referred to their written comments with regard to the description of the residue which, in their opinion, should include one or more metabolites.

The Committee decided not to amend this description.

CYANOFENPHOS (No. 91)

Cabbage

100. It was noted that, following the request at the Twelfth Session (ALINORM 81/24, para 102) the manufacturer had written to the representative of FAO informing him that they had no information available. It was stated that the original data had been submitted by the manufacturer who should, therefore, be able to clarify certain points. As no data had been provided by the manufacturer or by others it was decided to keep the proposal at Step 7 awaiting additional information.

Rice (hulled)

101. The clarification given on this proposal at the Twelfth Session was confirmed (para 103, ALINORM 81/24). The proposal was advanced to Step 8.

ACEPHATE (No. 95)

102. The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Philippines and Denmark questioned whether the proposed MRLs for acephate were in line with those for methamidophos (No. 100). They recalled the discussion at the Twelfth Session (ALINORM 81/24, paras 109-111).

Lettuce

103. The delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that data of residue trials in California, supporting an MRL of 10 mg/kg, apparently had not been available to the JMPR. They undertook to attempt to make these data available. In the meantime, the proposal of 10 mg/kg was kept at Step 7.

Soybeans

104. The proposal as amended by the 1979 JMPR was advanced to Step 8.

Potatoes, Sugar beet (leaves), Sugar beets

105. As the 1980 JMPR had not responded to the request of the Committee at its Twelfth Session to reconsider the proposals on basis of the data presented in the 1976 Evaluations (ALINORM 81/24, paras 106 and 107) it was decided to repeat this request and keep the proposals at Step 7.

The Committee was informed that data presented in these Evaluations showed that following GAP, levels of 0.5 mg/kg for potatoes and sugar beets were never exceeded. The need for an MRL of 1 mg/kg was, therefore, not understood.

CARBOFURAN (No. 96)

Sugar beet tops

106. The 1979 JMPR had changed the proposal for sugar beet (tops) at 1 mg/kg into a proposal for sugar beet (leaves) at 0.2 mg/kg. This modification was accepted by the Committee and the proposal was advanced to Step 8.

Eggplants, Kohlrabi

107. As the proposals (0.1 mg/kg) were at the limit of determination, the Committee decided to advance them to Step 5 and recommended at Steps 6 and 7 be omitted.

CARTAP (No. 97)

108. The Committee was informed that the method of analysis mentioned by the delegation of Japan during the previous Session was acceptable to the Working Group on Methods of Analysis. It was concluded that the proposals held at Step 7 pending clarification of this matter, could now be advanced to Step 8 of the Procedure.

EDIFENPHOS (No. 99)

Rice in the husk

109. The Committee agreed to delete this proposal as rice in the husk is not a commodity in trade and as separate MRLs were already established for rice (hulled) and rice (polished).

METHAMIDOPHOS (No. 100)

110. The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and The Netherlands expressed their concern on the possibility that the ADI might be exceeded, when considering the number of MRLs proposed. The Committee agreed that information should be requested from governments on the use pattern of acephate and methamidophos in order to ascertain the source of these residues (see para 102). In view of the relationship between methamidophos and acephate, the JMPR was requested to re-examine the MRL proposed for both compounds to ensure that they were appropriate for all situations where either compound is applied.

Tomatoes, Lettuce, Broccoli and Cauliflower

111. The representative of FAO pointed out that, as soon as new data will be available, the proposals for these commodities will be reviewed. The proposals were kept at Step 7.

Eggplant, Cucumber

112. The 1979 JMPR proposed to lower the MRL for eggplant from 1 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg and for cucumber from 1 mg/kg to 0.5 mg/kg. This would be possible by changing the pre-harvest interval. The delegation of Mexico, however, explained that a MRL of 1 mg/kg was needed according to their GAP and promised to send data to the JMPR. The proposals were kept at Step 7.

Alfalfa

113. The delegation of the United States was of the opinion that an MRL of 1 mg/kg would be more consistent with a cholinesterase inhibition no-effect level of 10 ppm. According to the residue data available in the 1976 Evaluations such a MRL, based on a pre-harvest interval of 21 days, was possible. The proposal was advanced to Step 5.

PIRIMICARB (No. 101)

Beans (with pod)

114. The Committee noted that the 1979 JMPR had recommended an MRL of 1 mg/kg for beans (with pod) to replace the previous proposal of 0.5 mg/kg. As this proposed change had not been made sufficiently clear in the circular letter requesting comments and since governments had, therefore, not commented on the new proposal, the Committee decided to return it to Step 6 for comments. The delegations of France and the Federal Republic of Germany indicated that, in their opinion, an MRL of 0.5 mg/kg would be more in line with good agricultural practice.

PHOSMET (No. 103)

Kiwi fruit

115. The Committee noted that the 1979 JMPR had increased the MRL to 15 mg/kg from 10 mg/kg on the basis of new residue data. The delegation of New Zealand said that with the now accepted pre-harvest interval of 21 days the residue data indicated that the proposed MRL of 15 mg/kg was acceptable. The delegation of Switzerland preferred an MRL of 10 mg/kg while the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany suggested that an MRL of 2 mg/kg on the edible portion might also have been set. As several delegations opposed strongly to set MRLs on the edible portion, the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that a full discussion on the principle was needed (see also paras 177-181).

The delegation of the United States of America indicated that, from monitoring studies, it appeared that an MRL of 25 mg/kg would be more appropriate. The Committee decided to advance the MRL of 15 mg/kg to Step 5 of the Codex Procedure.

DITHIOCARBAMATES (No. 105)

116. The Committee had before it a number of temporary MRLs expressed as CS₂ which had been held at Step 7 pending re-evaluation by the JMPR in the light of new methods of analysis which could distinguish between EBDC, DMDC and PBDCs (see para 126, ALINORM 81/24). The Committee also had before it the conclusions of the 1980 JMPR and a paper prepared by the Secretariat (CX/PR 81/7).

117. The Committee noted that there was no general correlation between levels of ETU in food arising from EBDCs and the parent pesticides, since the formation depended on a number of factors relating mainly to processing, such as cooking. Attention was drawn, however, to published experiments in which a fair correlation under similar conditions had been found. In this light the delegation of Finland questioned whether the proposals for ETU and EBDCs had been sufficiently linked. In this connection, the Committee noted that originally the JMPR had indicated guideline levels for ETU.

118. The Secretariat indicated that the approach described in the paper CX/PR 81/7 was intended merely to indicate that the MRL expressed in terms of CS₂ applied separately for each of the three groups of dithiocarbamates mentioned above. As the analytical method could not determine the individual dithiocarbamates which had been given an ADI or temporary ADI by the JMPR and as the expression on the basis of CS₂ did not provide an indication of the identity of the individual dithiocarbamate involved, it was necessary to indicate the compounds which were covered by the Codex MRLs. A method distinguishing between EBDCs and the other dithiocarbamates is now available. This is of importance, especially in those cases where the commodities normally are cooked before consumption. With regard to the ETU problem, a distinction between the different EBDCs was not considered to be relevant.

119. In order to enable governments to consider this matter more fully, the Committee decided to postpone further consideration of the question of MRLs for dithiocarbamates until the next Session. The MRLs were returned to Step 6 of the Procedure.

120. The delegation of Canada informed the Committee of a publication of the Canadian National Research Council which contained information on many aspects of ethylenethiourea (Ref. Ethylenethiourea; Criteria for the Assessment of its Effects on Man. Rose, Pearson, Zuker and Roberts, National Research Council Number 18469(1980)

121. The Committee noted that guideline levels had been recommended by the JMPR for CS₂ residues as such resulting from CS₂ fumigation but that analytically, it was possible to distinguish between such CS₂ residues and CS₂ produced during the analysis of dithiocarbamates. It was also noted that the JECFA had evaluated CS₂ as a food grade solvent.

122. The delegation of France indicated that an MRL of 3 mg/kg expressed as CS₂ for glasshouse lettuce would be more appropriate. The JMPR was invited to consider any residue information provided by interested countries.

ETHIOFENCARB (No. 107)

123. The proposals were kept at Step 7 in order to give the JMPR an opportunity to consider the new data available, as unfortunately this had not yet been done.

FENBUTATINOXIDE (No. 109)

Grapes

124. The delegation of the United States of America was invited to make data available to support their request for an MRL higher than 5 mg/kg when the proposed use becomes GAP. The proposal was advanced to Step 5.

PROPARGITE (No. 113)

125. The Committee was informed that the 1980 JMPR had confirmed the temporary ADI at the same level. It was, therefore, decided to return the proposals to Step 6 and to invite governments to comment on them.

Grapes, Raisins

126. The 1980 JMPR considered that the proposed limit for grapes of 10 mg/kg also covered raisins. It, therefore, decided to delete the proposal for raisins. The Committee decided not to delete the proposal for raisins but to amend it to 10 mg/kg in line with the data available to the JMPR, since the commodity description 'grapes' did not cover 'raisins'.

ALDICARB (No. 117)

127. The Committee was informed by the delegation of the United States of America that the re-evaluation of aldicarb had been completed and that the United States ADI, derived from the same data bank as used by the JMPR, would remain at 0.003 mg/kg body weight. The difference between the United States ADI and the ADI established by the JMPR was due to the use of different safety factors.

128. The Federal Republic of Germany informed the Committee of its general reservation concerning the acceptance of the the MRLs because the toxicity of aldicarb was being investigated in that country. The delegation of Belgium informed the Committee that aldicarb was used for sugar beets but that a waiting period of 5 months was required before another crop may be grown. Alternatively, maize may be grown which is used only as animal feed. The delegation of Chile indicated that aldicarb was not permitted for agricultural use in that country because of considerations of safety to operators and persistence in the soil.

The Committee was informed that the subject of waiting periods in relation to the possible residues in following crops had been reviewed in Pesticide Science, 1980. The delegation of France was of the opinion that fodder crops containing aldicarb residues may be toxic to livestock.

Banana

129. The Committee was informed that the residues in bananas as a result of aldicarb application are distributed uniformly in the peel and pulp of banana. The delegation of the United States of America felt that the MRL proposed was high and proposed a lower figure of 0.2 or 0.3 mg/kg. It agreed to make data available to JMPR for re-evaluation. The Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5.

Citrus fruit

130. The Committee noted that the residues in Citrus fruit as a result of aldicarb application are distributed between the peel and pulp in the ratio of approximately 4:1. It was informed by the delegation of the United States of America that in their country, according to good agricultural practice, residues of up to 0.23 mg/kg were found at the maximum application rate of 10 lbs/acre (11 kg/hectare) at 199 days after the last application. The delegation proposed a higher MRL level of 0.3 mg/kg. It was agreed that the JMPR would consider any new data that would be made available by the United States of America and would review the subject. The proposal was not amended and was then advanced to Step 5.

Milk

131. Some delegations were of the opinion that in connection with the limit of determination, an MRL of 0.01 mg/kg for milk would be more realistic. The Committee, however, felt that the basis for the JMPR to limit the MRL to 0.002 mg/kg might be due to the fact that, in general, the limit of determination in milk could be lower than in other types of food.

The Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5 and referred the problem of establishing a lower limit of determination to the Working Group on Methods of Analysis.

Peanuts

132. The Committee considered whether the MRL proposed by the JMPR referred to the whole product or to the kernel. The Committee was informed that the MRL for the kernel could be very low (0.002 mg/kg). The Committee noted that according to Annex 1, Appendix III, ALINORM 81/24 which is now at Step 5, the portion of peanut to which the MRL applies should be the kernel and decided to so indicate. The JMPR Secretariat agreed to refer to the original submissions received on the subject and to confirm whether the MRLs refer to the kernel or to the whole product.

The delegation of the United States of America brought to the attention of the Committee that the US had an MRL of 0.5 mg/kg for peanut hulls.

Potatoes

133. Many delegations indicated that the proposed MRL of 1 mg/kg was not acceptable in view of the rather high toxicity of aldicarb and informed the Committee that this MRL was not required by good agricultural practice.

The delegation of The Netherlands stated that, when aldicarb was applied in the control of golden nematode at the recommended level of 3 kg/hectare, the resulting residues were observed to be as low as 0.3 mg/kg. The point was made that changing GAP in order to lower the MRL would deprive certain areas of an effective control of this potato pest.

134. Although the residue level in potatoes was reduced by 50% on cooking, the levels found were still unacceptable. The delegations from Canada and The Netherlands agreed to make data available on nematode control and the residues resulting from those high rates to the JMPR for reconsideration. The Committee felt that more information should be sought from governments through a circular letter on specific agricultural problems such as the use pattern of aldicarb for potatoes and the rate of application for golden nematode control. The Committee also felt that the information should also include the variability of residue levels observed by the different countries. The Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5.

CYPERMETHRIN (No. 118)

135. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany reserved their position with regard to the compound because, in their opinion, the neurotoxicity had not yet been sufficiently evaluated. The delegation of Canada reserved their position because the results of a long-term test in a non-rodent study which was currently underway, were not yet available. The representative of WHO replied that neurotoxicity was only observed at very high doses in rodents and was found to be reversible. Neurotoxicity had also been described for other synthetic pyrethroids. Although long-term studies, so far, had been carried out in rodents only, a 90-day study in dogs was reassuring. The 1979 JMPR had required additional data on cumulation in adipose tissue and metabolism for 1981. This information might help to clarify the mechanism of neurotoxicity.

Brassica leafy vegetables

136. The delegation of the United States of America stated that a limit of 2 mg/kg might be more appropriate to cover uses on all the different types of cabbages. They were invited to provide data on which the JMPR could recommend additional MRLs or confirm the general limit of 2 mg/kg. The proposal at 1 mg/kg was advanced to Step 5.

Cherries

137. The delegation of the United States of America questioned whether a limit of 1 mg/kg would be sufficient. It was explained that only a minimum set of data were available to the JMPR. Therefore, the JMPR would welcome receiving more information on which further assessment could be made. The proposal was advanced to Step 5.

Grapes

138. The delegation of The Netherlands was of the opinion that, according to data in the Evaluations and taking into account a normal application and pre-harvest interval, an MRL of 0.5 mg/kg would be sufficient. The proposal was not amended. It was then advanced to Step 5.

Kidney beans (without pod), Peas

139. The Committee was informed that the proposal for kidney beans referred to the fresh bean according to the Codex classification. The same was valid for peas although in this case the proposal, being at the limit of determination, would be the same for fresh or dried peas. As there were no objections the proposals were advanced to Step 5.

Lettuce

140. According to the delegation of The Netherlands an MRL of 1 mg/kg would be consistent with the data in the Evaluations when an appropriate pre-harvest interval were chosen. Because of the toxicity of the compound this would be a better approach. The delegation of the United Kingdom, however, was of the opinion that the JMPR had adequate data to justify 2 mg/kg and even if new data were presented indicating a good agricultural practice in which somewhat lower residues resulted, the validity of these data would remain.

Maize, Sweetcorn

141. The delegations of Australia and the United States of America were of the opinion that higher MRLs would be necessary according to data from a study in the Federal Republic of Germany presented in the Evaluations. The proposals were advanced to Step 5.

Wheat

142. As the highest residue found was 0.1 mg/kg after a pre-harvest interval of 7 days, the delegation of The Netherlands suggested lowering the MRL from 0.2 mg/kg to 0.1 mg/kg with a pre-harvest interval, as recommended, of 14 days. It was decided to ask the JMPR to look into this matter and the proposal was advanced to Step 5.

FENVALERATE (No. 119)

143. The Chairman noted that toxicological concerns similar to those raised on cypermethrin had been expressed by the delegations of Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany in their written comments. Further studies to clarify the neurotoxicity of the compounds were also considered necessary by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Alfalfa

144. According to the delegation of The Netherlands an MRL of 10 mg/kg would be sufficient. The delegation of the United Kingdom explained, however, that the residue in the dried alfalfa would be about three times higher than in fresh alfalfa. In order to ascertain as to which category of alfalfa the MRL applied, the representative of FAO was requested to consider the original data. The proposal was advanced to Step 5. The representative of the EEC drew attention to the conventional practice in Europe to express limits for animal feedstuffs on a standardized water content of 12% of these commodities. The JMPR was invited to consider a similar approach.

Broccoli, Brussels sprouts, Cabbage, Chinese cabbage, Cauliflower

145. As it did not seem appropriate to have a lower MRL for Chinese cabbage than for other varieties of cabbage, it was decided to amend the proposal to 2 mg/kg. It was suggested that a group MRL of 2 mg/kg be established for the group Brassica leafy vegetables. It was decided not to amend the proposals at this Session but to ask governments to comment on this possible change.

Cereal grains, Wheat bran, Wheat flour(white) Wheat flour(wholemeal)

146. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany considered the proposal for cereal grains relatively high in relation to those for wheat flour and wheat bran. The delegation of Australia explained that the limit of 5 mg/kg was required for cereal grains since the distribution of the residue in the raw grain was rather unhomogeneous leading to residues up to 5 mg/kg in some parts of the product. Blending and milling of the cereals resulted in a much more homogeneous distribution of the residue requiring a smaller MRL than would be expected on the basis of processing itself. Pending examination of new data for synthetic pyrethroids and their review as insecticides for storage of cereals, scheduled for the 1981 JMPR, it was decided to advance the proposals to Step 5.

Animal fat

147. The delegation of the United States of America was of the opinion that the proposed limit might be too low. They were invited to supply supporting data to the JMPR, when the proposed uses become GAP. The proposal was advanced to Step 5.

Peanuts

148. It was noted that, according to ALINORM 81/24, Annex I to Appendix III, "Portion of commodities to which Codex Maximum Residue Limits apply and which is analysed", the proposal should be based on the residue present in the kernel. As data in the 1979 Evaluations tended to show that the proposal was based on the whole peanut, the representative of FAO undertook to look into the data and to give clarification at the next Session of the Committee. The proposal was advanced to Step 5.

Potatoes, Radishes, Sugar beets, Sweet corn

149. The representative of FAO undertook to look into the data which were available to the JMPR in order to see whether the proposed limit of 0.05 mg/kg had to be considered as the limit of determination. Several delegations were of the opinion that 0.05 mg/kg was a reasonable limit of determination. The proposals were advanced to Step 5.

Tomatoes

150. The delegations of Australia and of The Netherlands stated that the data presented in the 1979 Evaluations supported an MRL of 0.5 mg/kg instead of 1 mg/kg. The proposal was not amended. It was then advanced to Step 5.

PERMETHRIN (No. 120)

151. The delegation of Canada informed the Committee of the chronic toxicity studies carried out on permethrin since the evaluation of this compound in 1979. From three carcinogenicity studies, one study carried out on mice showed the possibility of carcinogenic effects. The delegation suggested that no proposals for MRLs for permethrin should be advanced in the Codex Procedure pending a further complete evaluation of the carcinogenic potential of the chemical. The representative of WHO expressed the hope that these studies would be made available to the JMPR. In spite of this view, the Committee advanced the MRLs to Step 5.

Broccoli

152. The delegation of The Netherlands informed the Committee that an MRL of 1 mg/kg would be more appropriate, based on data available in the 1979 Evaluations. The Committee noted that for broccoli a higher MRL had been proposed than for cauliflower, but that both MRLs in question had been established on the basis of separate residue data from supervised trials. The Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5.

Cabbage

153. Some delegations proposed a consideration of lower MRLs for cabbage on the basis of good agricultural practice. The Committee noted that varying residue levels for the same cabbage could be found depending upon (i) the extent to which the wrapper leaves were removed and (ii) variation in the sampling procedures. The Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5.

Gherkins

154. The Committee noted that the MRL proposed for gherkin was much lower than those for similar crop products such as eggplants and cucumbers and felt that an MRL of 0.5 mg/kg appeared more realistic. The Committee agreed that governments which had data available on MRLs in gherkin treated with permethrin be requested to send these to the JMPR for reconsideration. Meanwhile, the Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5.

Leeks and Spring onions

155. Some delegations were of the opinion that the MRLs proposed both for leeks and spring onions treated with permethrin should be considerably lower and proposed an MRL of 1 mg/kg. The Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5 and requested governments that have data available on MRLs in leeks and spring onions treated with permethrin, to provide these to the JMPR for re-evaluation.

Lettuce

156. The proposed MRL for lettuce of 20 mg/kg was considered very high and the Committee felt that this could result from repeated treatment which may not be necessary in good agricultural practice. Some delegations proposed MRLs ranging from 0.4 to 1 mg/kg. Awaiting further studies recommended by the JMPR, the Committee advanced the MRL to Step 5.

Tea

157. The Committee was informed that the rather high MRL of 20 mg/kg proposed for tea was based on data made available to the JMPR for evaluation. Some delegations felt that an MRL of 10 mg/kg appeared more realistic. The Committee, however, advanced the MRL to Step 5.

2,4,5-T (No. 121)

Cereal straw

158. The delegation of The Netherlands was of the opinion that there was not enough background information available to establish this group MRL. They proposed to establish separate MRLs for the individual cereal straws. Governments were invited to send data available and the proposal was advanced to Step 5.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON VALIDATION OF TOXICOLOGICAL DATA

159. The Chairman drew attention to the written comments submitted by the delegation of Canada regarding the fact that toxicological data for a number of pesticides had been evaluated on the basis of toxicological studies carried out by Industrial Biotest Laboratories. Many of these studies had now been found to be invalid. They reserved their position on the pesticides concerned until replacement studies were evaluated. The attention of the Committee was drawn to para 2.4 of the 1980 JMPR Report which had dealt with validation of toxicological data.

ANALYSIS OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES

160. The Committee received the Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis. It was introduced by the Chairman of the Working Group, Dr. P.A. Greve of The Netherlands (see Appendix II of this Report). The following questions were discussed by the Committee.

Recommendations for methods of analysis

161. The attention of the Committee was drawn to the fact that the Working Group had succeeded in recommending methods of analysis for all pesticides in the Codex system with the exception of the compounds for which only Guideline levels existed. The Committee agreed, on the suggestion of the delegation of Canada, to change the deadline for contributions or amendments to the list of recommendations to February 1, 1982 in order to give the Chairman of the Group the possibility of sending the data collected to participants before the Group meets again. Deadlines mentioned in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Working Group report were changed accordingly.

Methods of expression of residues relating to analytical practice

162. During the Twelfth Session of the Committee (see paras 109-111, ALINORM 81/24) it was decided to look at the approach to handling pesticides where metabolites of the compounds were pesticides in their own right. The Chairman of the Working Group promised that this question would be dealt with at the next meeting. The comments received from the United States and from other countries would be taken into consideration (see Room Document 12).

163. It was pointed out that the question of metabolites being also separate pesticides represented not only a problem of analysis but also a question of regulatory approach and policy and also involved toxicological considerations. The Working Group on Regulatory Principles indicated that it would be prepared to look at the policy aspects of this question. The representative of FAO proposed to prepare a document concerning this matter, to be considered by the 1981 JMPR in accordance with the decision of the 1979 JMPR. The Committee agreed that this question should represent a separate agenda item for the next year's plenary Session.

Establishment of an ad hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis

164. The Committee thanked Dr. Greve and the Working Group on Methods of Analysis for the valuable work performed during 1980-1981 and at the present Session. The Commit-

tee appointed a new ad hoc Working Group under the Chairmanship of Dr. Greve to continue with the proposed work until the end of the next Session. Membership would be the same as for the outgoing Working Group.

ANALYSIS OF INORGANIC BROMIDE RESIDUES IN CEREAL GRAINS

165. The Committee had before it a report prepared by Australia on an international collaborative study on the analysis of inorganic bromide in cereal grains. It was introduced by Mr. Snelson of the delegation of Australia. He indicated that results had been received from 35 of the 46 laboratories to which samples had been sent. The 33 laboratories mentioned in the study should be 35, as the summary provided by Dr. Greve (The Netherlands) covered the results of 3 rather than 4 laboratories.

The results of the study are presented in three tables. The study was designed to compare samples with bromide residues 20% below and above the MRL but, unfortunately, one sample contained less than was intended. The repeatability was quite acceptable, the co-efficient of variation within laboratories generally being less than 5% of the value reported. Around 25% of the laboratories reported results within 5% of the mean whereas the same percentage of laboratories reported results that were more than 20% wide of the mean. Mr. Snelson indicated that it was this sort of variation which caused difficulties in trade. Some of the results indicated that some consignments complying with the MRL whereas others could have been accepted although the MRL was exceeded.

166. The delegation of the United Kingdom drew the Committee's attention to Figure 1 of the Report showing the distribution of the results. From this diagram, it could be seen clearly how an MRL had to be chosen so that it will cover analytical errors and not result in the rejection of food which, in fact, is in compliance with the MRL. The Secretariat added that studies such as those carried out by Australia illustrated the need for care in formulating regulations for pesticide residues in food so that MRLs are not assigned greater significance and accuracy than is inherent in the procedures for their establishment and measurement. This question might be considered by the Working Groups on Regulatory Principles and on Methods of Analysis.

167. After receiving comments, a final report will be prepared by the Australian delegation which may then contain also the results of the other laboratories. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the delegation of Australia for their significant contribution to the work of the CCPR.

Expression of MRLs for Fat-soluble Pesticides in Milk and Milk Products

168. The Committee had before it Room Documents 8, 9 and 11 containing the comments of several delegations on the proposed demarcation point of 2% fat in milk products (see ALINORM 81/24, para 148). Most delegates were of the opinion that a cut-off point of 2% would be a practical and workable compromise. Although there would always remain some problems, it would not be helpful to present the matter for further review to the Working Group or to other Codex Committees.

169. The delegation of New Zealand requested clarification on how to handle dried milk products which will not always be reconstituted before use. It was agreed that these should be analysed after reconstitution to the original product. In order to know what the original product was, it might be necessary to consult the label or other information. The Secretariat undertook to have a look into this matter and to report on it at the next Session.

170. The delegation of the United Kingdom drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that there is no definition for "milk products". Furthermore, they were of the opinion that data on dairy products should be made available to the JMPR noting,

however, that it had been decided during last year's meeting (see para 28 of ALINORM 81/24) that, as a rule, MRLs would not be established for single processed food items such as specific products derived from milk, unless there were special reasons for doing so.

171. It was proposed by the delegation of Spain that the help of the International Dairy Federation (IDF) be requested, as several members of that Federation were members of this Committee. Dr. Tuinstra, representative of the IDF was of the opinion that, although IDF was willing to assist, it probably would be preferable to ask the Joint FAO/WHO Group of Governmental Experts on Milk and Milk Products for its opinion.

172. The delegation of France agreed to accept a cut-off point of 2%, although, according to their experience, this choice gives rise to difficulties in monitoring and analysis.

173. The delegation of the United Kingdom noted that the Committee had, in their opinion, agreed that whole liquid milk should be analysed on a whole product basis whatever its fat-content may be and whatever cut-off point had been agreed upon for milk products. This view was not shared by all delegations.

174. Although it was proposed by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany that there be another round of comments, the Committee decided to agree on the proposed demarcation point of 2% fat in milk products and that liquid milk should always be expressed on a whole product basis. The Secretariat was asked to examine the existing recommended MRLs for recalculation where necessary, with the assistance from the Secretariat of the JMPR and possibly from others.

175. In conclusion, the Committee decided to ask the JMPR to follow the same approach as now agreed upon. The next edition of the Guide would also have to mention this agreement. The Joint FAO/WHO Food Monitoring and Feed Programme was requested to provide to the JMPR pesticide residue data which it had collected for milk and milk products.

SAMPLING

176. The Committee considered the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Sampling (see Appendix III to this Report) which was introduced by Mr. J.A.R. Bates, Chairman of the Working Group.

Portion of the commodity to which Codex Maximum Limits apply

177. The delegation of Spain stated that they did not agree with the expression of MRLs on the whole fruit for the type of fruit which had an unedible peel, such as Citrus fruit, melons, pineapples and kiwi fruit. It was noted that the Committee, at its Twelfth Session, had discussed the document "Portion of Commodities to which Codex maximum residue limits apply and which is analysed" (ALINORM 81/24, Appendix III, Annex I). It had been decided to forward the text for adoption to the Commission at Step 5 with a recommendation that Steps 6 and 7 be omitted.

The delegation of Spain came back to this decision because, in their opinion, the Committee should have another opportunity to discuss the document in due course. From several interventions during this Session of the Committee, it became clear that omission of Steps should not be recommended, especially because the document was considered to be of great interest and would have far-reaching consequences for the work of the Committee. The delegations of Argentina, the Federal Republic of Germany, Mexico and Portugal supported the request that Steps 6 and 7 not be omitted.

178. It was pointed out that the proposal had been referred to the Commission and that delegations objecting to the omission of Steps should raise their objections at the next Session of the Commission, which would then decide concerning the matter.

179. The delegation of Australia supported by several other delegations was fundamentally opposed to the idea of setting MRLs on the edible portion instead of on the whole commodity for the type of fruits mentioned. They explained that the MRLs not only served the purpose of facilitating international trade and protecting the health of the consumer, but primarily served as a means of controlling good agricultural practice. If MRLs were set on the edible portion, this might result in situations where bad practices could lead to very high residues on the peel whereas in the pulp the residues might still be at a very low level. Several delegations attached great importance to having data on residues in that part of the commodity which is normally consumed, in order to be able to judge the public health aspects. The same applied to data on residues in fruit juices. These data would have to be submitted when applying for registration.

180. The delegation of Belgium stated that if MRLs were set both on the whole commodity and on the edible part, a legally difficult situation could arise in cases where GAP had been followed and where, say, the MRL on the edible portion was exceeded but not the MRL on the whole fruit. In the opinion of the delegation of the United Kingdom this might even result from handling of the sample during preparation before analysis.

181. The representative of GIFAP stated that this discussion showed the importance of giving guidance to industry as to the kind of data which had to be submitted both to national authorities for registration purposes and to the JMPR.

Establishment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on Sampling

182. The Committee thanked the Working Group on Sampling and its Chairman for their contribution to this Session. It decided to appoint a new ad hoc Working Group, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Bates (FAO), to continue with the proposed work until the end of the next Session, with the same membership as the outgoing Group.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PESTICIDE RESIDUE PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

183. The Committee had before it the Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries (see Appendix IV). The report was introduced by Dr. A. Furtado Rahde (Brazil), since Prof. W.P. Almeida, who had chaired the Working Group for the last several Sessions, had since retired from his position in the Government of Brazil and was no longer in a position to carry on his function as Chairman of the Working Group.

184. In introducing the report of the Ad Hoc Working Group, the Chairman of the Group recalled the significant contribution and valuable guidance of Dr. Almeida to the Working Group and wished him success in his new position as Professor in Environmental Health at the University of Campinas at Sao Paulo. He drew the attention of the Committee to the statements made by representatives of Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela highlighting the efforts being made by their Governments in promoting programmes on pesticide residues. He stressed that information on the availability of facilities on pesticide analysis, toxicological evaluation and manpower development in certain developed countries, which offered bilateral assistance to developing countries, would be very useful and that every effort should be made to gather this information. Developing countries were progressively increasing their interest in the work of the CCPR, and the Chairman felt that organization of regional meetings on pesticide residues regularly prior to the CCPR Session would result in increased inputs from developing countries.

He then made reference to such a meeting being organized in Brazil or in Argentina in 1982. He noted with satisfaction the efforts that were made as a follow-up of the recommendations of the Working Group at its last Session aimed at assistance to developing countries in becoming self-reliant in their capacities for solving problems related to analysis, toxicological evaluation and regulation of pesticide residues.

185. The Committee noted these developments in developing countries aimed at becoming self-reliant in pesticide matters. It felt that the Codex Regional Coordinating Committees could provide a further forum for consultations among the developing countries on problems relating to pesticides and means for resolving them. Some delegations stressed the need for developing countries which did not participate in the work of the Committee and/or the Working Group, to join in this work.

186. The Committee noted that the Codex Alimentarius Commission had attuned its work to reflect better the needs of developing countries and had placed emphasis on strengthening the capabilities of developing countries in residue control and in other fields of food control, leading to effective participation in the work of the Commission. The Chairman of the CCPR also stressed the need for renewed efforts by the Committee to meet the needs of developing countries and informed the Committee that, in order to facilitate a proper exchange of views by participants from developing countries, arrangements would be made at future sessions for providing facilities for simultaneous interpretation for the Working Group on Developing Countries.

187. To a point raised by the delegation of Guyana concerning the need for information on the safe handling of pesticides, the representative from FAO reminded the Committee concerning the availability of FAO/WHO data sheets on safe and efficient handling of pesticides and referred to current work on a proposed FAO manual on this subject. The representative of IUPAC drew the attention of the Committee to a Symposium on Pesticide use in Developing Countries at the 5th International Congress of Pesticide Chemistry, August 29 to September 4 1982, Kyoto, Japan, and indicated that the Symposium would provide a forum for contributions from the developing countries on their problems in pesticide use. The representative of GIFAP indicated that manufacturers of Pesticides were prepared to provide safety data on their products on request (see also OECD activities, paragraph 39 of this Report).

Setting up of a new Ad Hoc Working Group

188. The Committee thanked the Ad Hoc Working Group and especially Dr. A.F. Rahde, for their valuable work and appointed a new ad hoc Working Group. The Committee noted that the Working Group had appointed Dr. M.A. Martinez of Mexico as Chairman until the end of the next session. Dr. Martinez will also act as a Contact Point. The Committee also appointed Dr. A.F. Rahde of Brazil as rapporteur for the Working Group in order to assist in the work of the Working Group.

The delegations who participated in the present Working Group Session, expressed willingness to continue their participation at the future sessions of the Working Group. In addition, the Working Group will have participation from Guyana, Nigeria and Kuwait. The Federal Republic of Germany also indicated its desire to participate in the Working Group because of its special interest in assistance of certain developing countries.

REGULATORY PRINCIPLES

189. The Committee considered the Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Regulatory Principles (see Appendix V to this Report) which was introduced by Mr. J. Wessel (USA), Chairman of the Working Group.

190. The Committee noted that replies to the questionnaire on National Government Systems for the Regulation of Pesticide Residues in Food had been received from 26 countries. The Committee urged governments to ensure that their responses are sent to Mr. Wessel so as to provide further information to the Working Group. It was noted that the questionnaire would again be distributed to interested persons. It was hoped that the impediments to acceptance by governments of Codex MRLs would be identified and that guidelines could be developed which would enable governments to take Steps to ensure that the recommendations of the Commission are applied in their regulations. The Working Group would also reconsider the question of definitions at its next session.

191. The Committee agreed that the problems on regulatory aspects referred to in the report of the Working Group were of considerable interest to governments and agreed that a separate item should be included concerning this subject on the agenda for its next session. The preliminary report prepared by the Working Group indicated that legal systems in themselves did not prevent governments in giving acceptance to Codex recommendations. However, there were procedural and policy matters which served as obstacles to governments accepting or using Codex MRLs.

Setting up of a new Ad Hoc Working Group

192. The Committee thanked Mr. Wessel and the Working Group on Regulatory Principles for the work it had done and appointed a new ad hoc Working Group. Mr. Wessel agreed to continue as Chairman of the Working Group and also act as the contact point. The delegations present at the Working Group meeting at the present Session expressed willingness to continue their participation in the Working Group.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PRIORITY LISTS

193. The Committee had before it the Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Priorities (see Appendix VI). The Report was introduced by Prof. Dr. A.F.H. Besemer, Chairman of the Group, who thanked those who had contributed in the work of the Group.

194. The Committee was informed that nitrofen had been temporarily withdrawn from the market in the United States of America, pending the collection of additional data, but that the substance met the criteria for inclusion in List I. As the workload of the JMPR did not permit the placing of more substances on the agenda, it was agreed that nitrofen would be put on List II, but that it would be evaluated earlier if for one of the substances on List I sufficient data for evaluation were not received.

195. Attention was drawn to the need to review old compounds that were or had been in the Codex system (i.e. on previous Priority Lists). If there were new reasons for establishing priority for an old compound, this would be a justification to place it on one of the Priority Lists, provided that it met the criteria mentioned in para 2 of the Report of the Working Group. The Committee agreed that this procedure should be followed by the Group if, in the future, it proved necessary.

196. The delegation of Mexico asked for the inclusion of a new criterion relating to environmental contamination. It was noted that the consideration of environmental effects fell outside the terms of reference of the Committee. However, the presence of pesticide residues in food of significance from an environmental point of view was already covered by various criteria used by the Working Group in establishing priorities.

Questionnaire on Good Agricultural Practice

197. The Committee had before it an updated version of the Summary of Replies to the Questionnaire on Good Agricultural Practice in the Use of Pesticides in the Production

of some important selected Foods prepared by Canada (CX/PR 81/8). In introducing the document Mrs. J. Stalker (Canada) indicated that it was an updated version of document CX/PR 78/2, covering data on a certain number of food items. The Committee accepted the offer of the Canadian delegation to conduct a new survey on the crops last considered in CX/PR 79/16, and to consolidate the information from the two surveys into a single document. The Canadian delegation agreed that late replies to the survey reported in CX/PR 81/8 could be entered in the consolidated report. The Canadian delegation suggested that, after the Fourteenth Session, the need for Good Agricultural Practice surveys be considered at intervals of five, rather than three years.

198. Several delegations expressed their great interest in the document and regretted that they had not been able to reply in time to the questionnaire for this updated version. It was noted that the Canadian document contained useful and relevant information which assisted in the work of the Working Group on Priorities and the JMPR and which was also of interest to governments.

199. The Committee thanked the delegation of Canada for their excellent work.

Establishment of an ad hoc Working Group on Priorities

200. The Committee thanked the Working Group on Priorities and their Chairman for the work they had done and appointed a new ad hoc Working Group under the Chairmanship of Prof. Besemer. The membership of the Group will be the same as previously.

OTHER BUSINESS

201. The delegation of the United Kingdom was of the opinion that it would be useful to include reference to pesticides covered by Guideline Levels indicating the relevant JMPR reports and 'Evaluations' in the next edition of the Guide to Codex MRLs for Pesticide Residues. Such an action would not be contrary to the decision of the Committee that Guideline Levels should not be published in Codex documents. The Committee agreed that this be done and requested the Secretariat to take the appropriate steps.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION

202. The Chairman of the Committee indicated that the next (Fourteenth) Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and its Working Groups would take place from 12 to 21 June 1982 in The Hague and suggested the following timetable:

<u>Ad Hoc</u> Working Group on Regulatory Principles	- 12 June 1982	09.00 hours
<u>Ad Hoc</u> Working Group on Priorities	- 12 June 1982	13.00 hours
<u>Ad Hoc</u> Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries	- 14 June 1982	09.00 hours
<u>Ad Hoc</u> Working Group on Sampling	- 14 June 1982	09.00 hours
Ad Hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis	- 14 June 1982	11.00 hours
Opening of the plenary Session	- 14 June 1982	14.00 hours

203. The Chairman informed the Committee that arrangements for simultaneous interpretation would be made available to the Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries in order to facilitate free communication among the participants. He suggested that the Chairmen of the Working Groups should make available the agenda and documentation to the participants in advance in order to facilitate discussions.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

Chairman of the Session
Président de la session
Presidente de la reunión

Ir. A.J. Pieters
Directorate of Public Health
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam
Netherlands

REPRESENTATIVES OF MEMBER COUNTRIES

ALGERIA
ALGERIE
ARGELIA

MRS. MERAD BOUDIA
Ministerie Algerien de la Santé
Publique
Laboratoire de Toxicologie
Institut des Sciences Medicales
2 rue Didouche
Alger

ARGENTINA
ARGENTINE
ARGENTINA

BEATRIZ DIAZ HOLTON
Commercial Secretary
Argentine Embassy
Javastraat 20
The Hague - The Netherlands

VICTORIANO C. TOLOSA
Director General Servicio Nacional
Laboratorios
Productos Ganaderos
Ministerio Agric. y Ganaderia
P. Colon 922 - 2º p. of 228
Buenos Aires

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE
AUSTRALIA

R.S. BELCHER
Chief Chemist
Department of Agriculture
5 Parliament Place
Melbourne 3001

J.C. BENSTEAD
Agricultural & Veterinary
Chemicals Association
c/o Shell Chemical (Aust.)
Pty.Ltd.
155 William St.,
Melbourne 3000

J.T. SNELSON
Pesticides Coordinator
Dept. of Primary Industry
Canberra A.C.T. 2600

AUSTRIA
AUTRICHE
AUSTRIA

E. KAHL
Head of the Federal Institute
for Plant Protection
Trunnerstrasse 1-5
A-1020 VIENNA

APPENDIX I (contd.)

AUSTRIA (cont.)

E. PLATTNER
Bundesanstalt für Lebensmittel-
untersuchung und -forschung
Kinderspitalgasse 15
A-1090 VIENNA

BELGIUM
BELGIQUE
BELGICA

R. VAN HAVERE
Inspecteur-Chef de Service
des Denrées Alimentaires
Ministère de la Santé Publique
Centre Administrative de l'Etat
Quartier Vésale 4
B-1010 Bruxelles

W. DEJONCKHEERE
Lab. voor Fytofarmacie
Fac. van de Landbouwwetenschappen
Rijksuniversiteit Gent
Coupure 533
B 9000 Gent

M. GALOUX
Station de Phytopharmacie à
Gembloux
Ministère de l'Agriculture
11 Rue du Bordia
B-5800 Gembloux

BRAZIL
BRESIL
BRASIL

DURVAL HENRIQUES DA SILVA
Ministerio Agricultura
Engenheiro Agronomo
Director Divisao de Produtos
Fitossanitarios
Super Venancio 2000
Bloco B no. 60 3^o andar
Brasilia

ALBERTO FURTADO RAHDE
Ministry of Health
Riachuêlo 677/201
Porto Alegre 9000

J.M. DE CARVALHO COELHO
Ambassade du Brésil
Mauritskade 19
The Hague - The Netherlands

CANADA
CANADA
CANADA

H.V. MORLEY
Director, London Research Centre
Agriculture Canada
University Sub Post Office
London, Ontario
N6A 5B7

W.P. COCHRANE
Chief, Mass Spectrometry Laboratory
Laboratory Services Division
Agriculture Canada
Plant Products Building 22
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A OC5

P.R. BENNETT
Bureau of Chemical Safety
Food Directorate
Health Protection Branch
Health and Welfare Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A OL2

J.M. STALKER
Pesticides Division
Plant Products & Quarantine
Directorate
Agriculture Canada
K.W. Neatby Building, Room 1129
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A OC6

CHILE
CHILI
CHILE

JOSE CATALDO
Chilean Embassy
Javastraat 11
The Hague - The Netherlands

ROBERTO H. GONZALEZ
Faculty of Agronomy, University of
Chile
P.O. Box 1004
Santiago, Chile

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TCHECOSLOVAQUIE
CHECOSLOVAQUIA

L. ROSIVAL
Director, Centre of Hygiene of
the Research
Institute for Preventive Medicine
Limbová ul. 14
Bratislava

V. BENES
Institute of Hygiene and
Epidemiology
10042 Prague 10

DENMARK
DANEMARK
DINAMARCA

K. VOLDUM-CLAUSEN
Head of Division of Pesticides and
Contaminants
National Food Institute
Moerkhoej Bygade 19
DK 2860 SOEBORG

M. GREEN LAURIDSEN
Scientific Officer
Pesticide Laboratory
National Food Institute
Moerkhoej Bygade 19
DK 2860 SOEBORG

EGYPT
EGYPTE
EGIPTO

NAZAR ALI ADHAM
Director of Food Control
Department
Ministry of Health
Cairo

M.H. DANIAL
Director
Water Department & Supervisor
Pesticide Residues Lab.,
Central Public Health Laboratories
Ministry of Health
Cairo

FINLAND
FINLANDE
FINLANDIA

JORMA RAUTAPÄÄ
Chief Inspector
National Board of Trade and
Consumer Interests
Box 9
00531 Helsinki 53

FINLAND (cont.)

PEKKA PAKKALA
Chief Inspector
National Board of Health
Siltasaarenkaty 12 A
00530 Helsinki 53

KIM WICKSTRÖM
Research Officer
Technical Research Centre of Finland
Food Research Laboratory
Biologinkuja 1
02150 Espoo 15

ARTO KIVIRANTA (M.Sc)
Head of Pesticide Section
Customs Laboratory
Box 512
00101 Helsinki 10

FRANCE
FRANCE
FRANCIA

M. RICHOU BAC
Directeur de recherches
Laboratoire d'Hygiène Alimentaire
43 Rue de Dantzig
65015 Paris

M. HASCOET
Directeur du Laboratoire
Phytosanitaire de l'INRA
Etoile de Choisy
Route de Saint-Cyr
78000 Versailles

M. JURIE DE LA GRAVIERE
Chambre Syndicale de la Phytopharmacie
et de la protection des plantes
2 Rue Denfert Rochereau
92100 BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT

M. L'HOTELLIER
Chambre Syndicale de la
Phytopharmacie et de la protection
des plantes
2 Rue Denfert Rochereau
92100 BOULOGNE BILLANCOURT

GABON
GABON
GABON

JEAN NGOUA-MBA
Directeur de l'Inspection du Contrôle
des Produits et Denrées Alimentaires
BP 551 - Libreville

EMMANUEL AKOGHE-MBA
Directeur de l'Inspection Phytosani-
taire
BP 551 - Libreville

GERMANY, Fed.Rep. of
ALLEMAGNE, Rép.féd.d'
ALEMANIA, Rep.fed. de

G. BRESSAU
Director und Professor
Bundesministerium für Jugend,
Familie und Gesundheit
Kennedy-Allee 105-107
D-5300 Bonn 2

E. GÜNTHER
Oberregierungsrat
Bundesministerium für Ernährung,
Landwirtschaft und Forsten
Postfach 14 02 70
D-5300 Bonn 1

H. BECK
Wissenschaftlicher Oberrat
Bundesgesundheitsamt
Postfach 33 00 13
D-1000 Berlin 33

G. BECKER
Oberregierungschemiker
Chemisches Untersuchungsamt für
das Saarland
Charlottenstrasse 7
D-6600 Saarbrücken

G. TIMME
Bund für Lebensmittelrecht und
Lebensmittelkunde
c/o Bayer AG
D-5090 Leverkusen, Bayerwerk

K. KOSSMANN
Industrieverband Pflanzenschutz
c/o Schering AG
Postfach 65 03 11
D-1000 Berlin 65

G. LEBER
Industrieverband Pflanzenschutz
c/o Celamerck GmbH & Co. KG
Postfach 200
D-6507 Ingelheim

GERMANY, Fed.Rep. of (cont.)

S. GORBACH
Industrieverband Pflanzenschutz
c/o Hoechst AG
Analytisches Labor
Postfach 80 03 20
D-6230 Frankfurt Am Main 80

D. EICHLER
Industrieverband Pflanzenschutz
c/o Celamerck GmbH & Co. KG
Postfach 200
D-6507 Ingelheim

GUYANA
GUYANE
GUYANA

REX.B. WOO-MING
Government Analyst/Commissioner of
Food and Drugs, Analyst Department
19-21 Evans & Lyng Streets
Georgetown

HUNGARY
HONGRIE
HUNGRIA

VILMOS CIELESZKY
Deputy Director and Professor
National Institute of Food and
Nutrition
Gyali - ut 3/a
Budapest IX

ARPAD AMBRUS
Head of Department, Plant Protection
and Agrochemistry Centre of the
Ministry of Agriculture & Food
1502 Budapest
P.O. Box 127

IRELAND
IRLANDE
IRLANDA

M. LYNCH
Pesticide Control Unit
Department of Agriculture
24 Merrion St.
Dublin 2.

IRELAND (cont.)

J.F. EADES
Head
P.R. and A.S. Unit
Agricultural Institute
Oak Park Research Centre
Carlow

ISRAEL
ISRAEL
ISRAEL

PAUL M. VERMES
Head of Pesticide Division
Department of Plant Protection
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 15030
Tel Aviv

ZEEV GOLLOP
Manager, Marketing and Development
Agricultural Chemicals
Bromide Compounds Ltd.
P.O. Box 180
Beer Sheba

ITALY
ITALIE
ITALIA

E. QUATTRUCCI
Ist. Nazionale Nutrizione
Via Ardeatina 546
Rome

JAPAN
JAPON
JAPON

SHIGEO IWANAGA
Deputy Director
Soil and Agricultural Chemicals
Division
Water Quality Bureau
Environment Agency
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku
Tokyo

NOBORU SAITO
Section Head
Planning and Survey, Plant
Protection Division
Agricultural Production Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry
and Fisheries
2-2-1, Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

KUWAIT
KOWEIT
KUWAIT

FAWZY FAHMY EL-ENANY
Ministry of Public Health
Environmental Protection Department
P.O. Box 35035 ALSHAAB
Kuwait

LAILA AL-OMRAN
Ministry of Public Health
Environmental Protection Department
P.O. Box 5 ALSHAAB
Kuwait

MEXICO
MEXIQUE
MEXICO

M.A. MARTINEZ MUNOZ
Head of the Pesticides Department
of the General Direction of Vegetal
Sanity
Regards (SARH)
Mexico

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAISES BAJOS

N. VAN TIEL
Cabinet Adviser
c/o Plant Protection Service
Geertjesweg 15
Wageningen

A.F.H. BESEMER
Head
Pesticides Division
Plant Protection Service
Geertjesweg 15
Wageningen

P.A. GREVE
Residue Laboratory
National Institute of Public Health
Postbus 1
Bilthoven

D.G. KLOET
Ministerie van Landbouw en Visserij
Postbus 20501
2500 EK DEN HAAG

A.G. DE MOOR
Directorate of Public Health
Kon. Julianaplein 3
DEN HAAG

NETHERLANDS (cont.)

E.M. DEN TONKELAAR
Laboratory of General Toxicology
National Institute of Public Health
Postbus 1
Bilthoven

L.G.M.Th. TUINSTR
State Institute for quality control
of agricultural products
Bornsesteeg 45
6708 PD Wageningen

J. VAN DER HARST
Netherlands Association of Pesticide
Manufacturers
Shell Intern. Research My
P.O. Box 162
Den Haag

O.C. KNOTTNERUS
General Commodity Board on Arable
Products
Stadhoudersplantsoen 12
The Hague

M. MUTTER
Unilever Research Laboratory
Oliver van Noortlaan 120
Vlaardingen

O.R. OFFRINGA
Netherlands Association of Pesticide
Manufacturers
Duphar B.V.
Weesp

NEW ZEALAND
NOUVELLE-ZELANDE
NUEVA ZELANDIA

B.B. WATTS
Superintendent
Agricultural Chemicals Section
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Private Bag
Wellington

NIGERIA
NIGERIA
NIGERIA

S.C. OPARA
Assistant director Food and Drug
Administration
Federal Ministry of Health
Lagos

NORWAY
NORVEGE
NORUEGA

TOR H. SMITH
Head Engineer
National Institute of Public Health
Geitmyrsveien 75
Oslo 4

HAKON FRIESTAD
Head of Section
Chemical Analysis Laboratory-NLH
1432 As-NLH

PHILIPPINES
PHILIPPINES
FILIPINAS

CECILIA P. GASTON
Deputy Administrator, Pesticides
Fertilizer and Pesticide Authority
Raha Sulayman Bldg.
Bernavides St., Makati, Manila

THELMA A. ANTAZO
Chief, Pesticide Analytical Lab.
Bureau of Plant Industry
San Andres, Manila

EDWIN D. MAGALLONA
Head, Pesticide Toxicology and Chemistry
Laboratory
National Crop Protection Center
University of the Philippines at Los Banos
College, Laguna

POLAND
POLOGNE
POLONIA

KRISTYNA MAZURKIEWICZ
M.Sc of Chemistry
Ministry of Foreign Trade and Shipping
Quality Inspection Office
Zurawia Str. 32/34
00-15 Warsaw

PORTUGAL
PORTUGAL
PORTUGAL

ENG. ASSUNCAO VAZ
Ministerio da Agricultura e Pescas
Direccao Geral da Proteccao da
Producao Agricola
Quinta do Marqués - Oeiras

ROMANIA
ROUMANIE
RUMANIA

S.V. DENES
Research Institute for Marketing of
fruits and vegetables
Rue Linarieu 93-95
Bucarest

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPANA

E. CELMA
Jefe del Departamento de Plaguicidas
Laboratorio Agrario Regional Central
Ministerio Agricultura
Avenida Puerta de Hierro S/N
Madrid 3

M. MINGOT
Asesor Tecnico-Director General
Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones
Agrarias
Ministerio de Agricultura
Jose Abascal 56
Madrid

FERNANDO TOVAR HERNANDEZ
Ministerio Sanidad & S. Social
Subdireccion General
Higiene de los alimentos
P^o. Prado, 18-20-7^o PC.
Madrid

SWEDEN
SUEDE
SUECIA

A. ANDERSSON
Scientific Officer
Swedish National
Food Administration
S-75126 Uppsala

R. HENRIKSSON
Head of Department
Swedish National
Food Administration
S-75126 Uppsala

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

B. MAREK
Food Control Division
Federal Office of Public Health
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3008 Berne

T. AVIGDOR
Nestec
Case postale 88
CH-1814 La Tour-De-Peilz

G. DUPUIS
Swiss Society of Chemical Industry
c/o Ciba-Geigy AG
CH-4002 Basel

T. STIJVE
Nestec
Case postale 88
CH-1814 La Tour-De-Peilz

THAILAND
THAILANDE
TAILANDIA

S. EAMRUNGROJ
Technical Division
Food and Drug Administration
Ministry of Public Health
Bangkok

O. SILAPANAPAPORN
Office of National Codex Alimentarius
Committee
Thai Industrial Standards Institute
Ministry of Industry
Bangkok

UNITED KINGDOM
ROYAUME-UNI
REINO UNIDO

J.D. GARNETT
Principal
Environmental Pollution, Pesticides
and Infestation Control Division,
Branch A
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1P 2AE

UNITED KINGDOM (cont.)

D.S. PAPWORTH
Senior Principal Scientific Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
and Food
Pesticides Registration Department
Harpenden Laboratory
Hatching Green
Harpenden
Hertfordshire

A.F. MACHIN
Senior Research Officer II
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
and Food
Biochemistry Department
Central Veterinary Laboratory
New Haw
Weybridge
Surrey KT15 3NB

S. BAILEY
Principal Scientific Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
and Food
Pesticide Chemistry Department
Government Buildings (Toby Jug Site)
Hookrise South
Tolworth
Surbiton
Surrey KT6 7NF

D.C. ABBOTT
Deputy Director (Customer-Services)
Laboratory of the Government Chemist
Cornwall House
Stamford Street
London SE1 9NQ

F.A. CHANDRA
Senior Medical Officer
Department of Health and Social
Security
Market Towers
1 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5NQ

G. PICKERING
Principal Scientific Officer
Tropical Products Institute
56-62 Grays Inn Road
London WC1X 8LU

UNITED KINGDOM (cont.)

G.H. TELLING
Food and Drink Industries Council
25 Victoria Street
London SW1H OEX

R.C. TINCKNELL
Britisch Agrochemicals Association
Alembic House
Albert Embankment
London SE1 7TU

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA

STANFORD N. FERTIG
Chief, Pesticide Impact Assessment
Staff
Agricultural Research
Science and Education Administration
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Building 1070, BARC-EAST
Beltsville, Maryland 20705

N. FRED IVES
Office of Pesticide Programs
Hazard Evaluation Division TS-769
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1921 Jefferson Davis Hyw. CM 2
Arlington, Virginia 22180

EDWIN L. JOHNSON
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20460

RALPH T. ROSS
Assistant to Administrator
Agricultural Research
Science and Education Administration
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Room 307-A, Administration Building
Washington, DC 20250

JOHN R. WESSEL
Office of Regulatory Affairs
Food and Drug Administration
Department of Health and Human Services
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (cont.)

GLENN CARMAN
President, California Citrus Quality
Council
953 West Foothill Boulevard
Claremont, California 91711

JOHN P. FRAWLEY
Director of Toxicology
Hercules Incorporated
910 Market Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19899

DONALD D. McCOLLISTER
Director, International Regulatory
Affairs
Health and Environmental Sciences
The Dow Chemical Company
1803 Bldg
Midland, Michigan 48640

BRUCE McEVOY
European Representative
California-Arizona Citrus Industry
24 Old Burlington Street
London W 1

RALPH W. LICHTY
Executive Secretary
California Citrus Quality Council
953 West Foothill Boulevard
Claremont, California 91711

VENEZUELA
VENEZUELA
VENEZUELA

LIBERTAD BRITO DE SAUME
C.E.N.I.A.P.
Laboratorio de Sanidad Vegetal
Edificio no. 7
El Limon
Maracay - Edo Aragua

CARLOS LUIS CASTRO
Ministerio de Agricultura y Cria
Direccion de Sanidad Vegetal
Division de Control de Productos
Quimicos
Piso 13, Torre Norte, Centro Simon
Bolivar, Caracas

EUTIMIO GONZALEZ GONZALEZ
Universidad Central de Venezuela
Facultad de Agronomia
Departamento de Quimica
Maracay

YUGOSLAVIA
YUGOSLAVIE
YUGOSLAVIA

FRANJO COHA
dipl.hem.
Yugoslav Institution for Standardiza-
tion
Slobodana Penezica Krcuna br. 35
Postanski pregradak 933
Beograd

OBSERVER COUNTRIES
PAYS OBSERVATEURS
PAISES OBSERVADORES

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC
REPUBLIQUE DEMOCRATIQUE ALLEMANDE
REPUBLICA DEMOCRATICA ALEMANA

WERNER RAFFKE
Ministry of Public Health
DDR 1020 Berlin
Rathausstrasse 3

SOUTH AFRICA, Rep. of
AFRIQUE DU SUD, Rép. d'
SUDAFRICA, Rep. de

J. BOT
Technical Advisor of the Research
Institute for Plant Protection
Private Bag X134
Pretoria 0001

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR
STANDARDIZATION (ISO)

R.J. ZWART
Nederlands Normalisatie Instituut
Kalfjeslaan 2
2623 AA Delft - Netherlands

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF
CONSUMER UNIONS (IOCU)

MISS. DAPHNE GROSE
Head of Representation
14 Buckingham Street
London WC2N 6DS
England

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (contd.)

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

G. HUDSON
Administrateur principal à la
Direction Générale de l'Agriculture
"Legislation dans le domaine des
produits végétaux et des aliments
des animaux"
Rue de la Loi 200
B 1049 Bruxelles - Belgium

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

GILLY GOBINET
Administrative Officer
Council of Europe
67006 Strasbourg - Cedex
France

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT
(OECD)

LOWELL E. MILLER
2243 Double Eagle Court
Reston
Virginia 22091

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF PURE
AND APPLIED CHEMISTRY (IUPAC)

H. FREHSE
Sparte Pflanzenschutz,
Anwendungstechnik CE
Metabolismus und Rückstände,
Gebäude W 7
D-5090 Leverkusen-Bayerwerk
Federal Republic of Germany

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF
NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF
PESTICIDE MANUFACTURERS (GIFAP)

R.J. LACOSTE
Foreign Regulatory Affairs
Rohm & Haas Co
Independence Mall West
Philadelphia - USA
Pennsylvania 19105

H. REGENSTEIN
Pflanzenschutzmittel-Registrierungen
BASF Aktiengesellschaft
Landwirtschaftliche Versuchsstation
D-6703 Limburgerhof
Federal Republic of Germany

GIFAP (cont.)

R. BLINN
Manager, Registration & Technical
Information
International Plant Industry
American Cyanamid Company
P.O. Box 400
USA-Princeton
New Jersey 08540 USA

G.B. FULLER
Manager
International Registrations
Crop Protection Chemicals
Uniroyal Chemical
Division of Uniroyal, Inc.
74 Amity Road
Bethany, Connecticut 06525 USA

L.R. HODGES
Manager, International Registrations
Union Carbide Agri. Products Co. Inc.
2001 Jefferson Davis Highway
Suite 401
Arlington VA 22202 USA

G.A. WILLIS
ICI Plant Protection Division
Registration & Technical Literature
Section
Fernhurst, Haslemere
GB - Surrey

W. GRAHAM
Registration Manager
Agricultural Chemicals
Europe/Africa/Middle East
Uniroyal Chemical
Division Uniroyal Limited
Brooklands Farm
Cheltenham Road
Evesham Worcs, WR 11 6LW
England

S.F. RICKARD
Supervisor
International Registrations
Agricultural Chemicals Division
Daimond Shamrock Corporation
1100 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114 USA

J.L. REED
Manager
International Registration
Product Safety & Compliance
Health, Safety & Environment
Shell Oil Company
One Shell Plaza
P.O. Box 4320. Houston, Texas 77210 US

GIFAP (cont.)

K.E. McNEILL
Manager
Elanco International Agrichemicals
Regulatory Services
740 S. Alabama Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46285

H.C.C. WAGNER
Merck Sharp & Dohme
Waardegeweg 39, P.O. Box 581
2003 PC Haarlem - Netherlands

B.B. HODGDEN
Coordinator, Intern. Product
Registr. Biochemicals Department
E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.
12261 Brandywine Building
Wilmington, Delaware 19898, USA

G. CHIESA
Farmoplant SpA ("Registrazioni")
Centro Ricerche Antiparassitari
Via Bonfadine 148
Milano - Italy

J.J.H. HOUBEN
Product Development
Agricultural Chemicals
Union Carbide Europe S.A.
Rue Pedro-Meylan 1211 Geneve 17
Switzerland

H. LANGE
Schering AG
Müllerstrasse 170-172
1 Berlin 65
Germany, Fed.Rep. of

TAKASHI KATO
Sumitomo Chemical Co., Ltd.,
15, 5-Chome, Kitahama, Higashi-Ku
Osaka, Japan

M. KIKUCHI
Nippon Soda Co., Ltd.,
Shin Ohtemachi Bld.No. 2-1,2-Chome,
Ohtemachi, Chiyodaku, Tokyo - Japan

GIFAP (cont.)

SABURO TAKEI
Takeda Chemical Industries Co., Ltd.,
Nihonbashi 2-12-10, Chuoku
Tokyo - Japan

H.G. VERSCHUUREN
DOW CHEMICAL EUROPE
Postbus 1310
Rotterdam - Netherlands

DEBORAH LAHODA
Velsicol Chemical Corporation
Manager, International Registrations
341 East Ohio St.
Chicago Illinois 60611 - USA

G. RONALD GARDINER
Technical Director
Avenue Hamoir, 12
1180 Bruxelles - Belgique

GERARD DE CACQUERAY
Rohm and Haas
Tour de Lyon
185 rue de Bercy
75012 Paris - France

EUROPEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION
(EPPO)

G. MATHYS
1 Rue de Notre
75016 Paris - France

INTERNATIONAL DAIRY FEDERATION (IDF)

L.G.M.Th. Tuinstra
(see under Netherlands)

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF MARGARINE
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATIONS (IFMA)

G. ZWERENZ
Wiener Strasse 58
2340 MODLING
Austria

NORDIC COMMITTEE ON FOOD ANALYSIS (NMKL)

KNUD VOLDUM-CLAUSEN
(see under Denmark)

FAO PERSONNEL
PERSONNEL DE LA FAO
PERSONAL DE LA FAO

J.A.R. BATES
Pesticide Residue Specialist
Plant Protection Service
FAO, 00100 Rome - Italy

WHO PERSONNEL
PERSONNEL DE L'OMS
PERSONAL DE LA OMS

G. VETTORAZZI
WHO Joint Secretary of JMPR
World Health Organization
CH-122 GENEVA
Switzerland

SECRETARIAT

L.G. LADOMERY
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards
Programme
FAO, 00100 Rome - Italy

N. RAO MATURU
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards
Programme
FAO, 00100 Rome - Italy

L.J. SCHUDEBOOM
Directorate of Public Health
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam - Netherlands

J. VAN DER KOLK
Directorate of Public Health
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam - Netherlands

M. VAN DIEPEN
Directorate of Public Health
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam - Netherlands

ORGANIZATIONAL SECRETARIAT

I.A. ALKEMA
Directorate of Public Health
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam - Netherlands

P. HAKKENBRAK
Directorate of Public Health
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam - Netherlands

ALINORM 83/24
APPENDIX II

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS ^{1/}

1. Membership

The Ad Hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis consisted of the following persons:

D.C. Abbott	- United Kingdom	M. Green Lauridsen	- Denmark
A. Ambrus	- Hungary	P.A. Greve (Chairman)	- The Netherlands
A. Andersson	- Sweden	S. Gorbach	- Fed.Rep.of Germany
S. Bailey	- United Kingdom	M. Hascoët	- France
J.A.R. Bates	- FAO	N.F. Ives	- USA
H. Beck	- Fed.Rep.of Germany	A. Kiviranta	- Finland
G. Becker	- Fed.Rep.of Germany	M.R. Lynch	- Ireland
R.S. Belcher	- Australia	M.A. Martinez	- Mexico
R. Blinn	- GIFAP	M. Mutter	- The Netherlands
G. Bressau	- Fed.Rep.of Germany	G.B. Pickering	- United Kingdom
E. Celma	- Spain	N. Saito	- Japan
V. Cielezsky	- Hungary	L.B. de Saume	- Venezuela
W.P. Cochran	- Canada	T. Stijve	- Switzerland
M.H. Danial	- Egypt	S. Takei	- GIFAP
W. Dejonckheere	- Belgium	G.M. Telling	- United Kingdom
S.V. Denes	- Romania	G. Timme	- Fed.Rep.of Germany
J.F. Eades	- Ireland	R. Tincknell	- GIFAP
D. Eicler	- Fed.Rep.of Germany	L.G.M. Th.Tuinstra	- The Netherlands
H. Frehse	- IUPAC	M.P. Vermes	- Israel
H.O. Friestad	- Norway	J.R. Wessel	- USA
C.P. Gaston	- Philippines	K. Wickström	- Finland

2. Agenda

The Working Group discussed the following points:

- Recommendations for methods of analysis for pesticides for which Codex MRLs are under discussion;
- draft standard format for reporting analytical results of field trials;
- methods of expression of residues relating to analytical practice;
- confirmation of identity of residues;
- analytical methodology for cartap;
- general references to pesticide residue analysis;
- role of analytical variability in the decision whether a Codex MRL has been exceeded or not;
- publication of documents finalized by the Working Group.

3. Recommendations for methods of analysis

The Working Group undertook the up-dating and reviewing of the recommendations given in the previous report (ALINORM 81/24, Annex I to Appendix II). To this list were added: guazatine, phosmet, tecnazene and triforine. The list of **methods recommended by the WG** covers the pesticides mentioned in the "Draft Part II of the Guide to Codex MRLs for Pesticide Residues" (CX/PR 2-1980) and supercedes previous lists of recommended methods ^{2/}. At the next Session of the CCFR, the Working Group will again review the recommendations. To the list will be added: aldicarb, azocyclotin, cypermethrin, fenvalerate, permethrin and 2,4,5-T. Contributions or amendments to the list should be sent to the Chairman of the Working Group, not later than February 1, 1982.

^{1/} See paras 160-175, ALINORM 83/24.

^{2/} Will be published separately in due course.

4. Draft Standard format for reporting analytical results of field trials (of ALINORM 81/24, Appendix II, part 9)

The Working Group had before it a proposed format for reporting analytical results of field trials, for eventual inclusion in the Guidelines on Pesticide Residue Trials. The members felt the necessity to include further details in the format. Mr. Bates (FAO) agreed to circulate a revision of this document among the members of the Working Group for comment. It is expected that the document can be finalized at the next Session of the CCPR.

5. Methods of expression of residues relating to analytical practice

In previous years, the Working Group commented on the expression of residues in the light of analytical practice (see ALINORM 79/24, Appendix III, Para 7(1), ALINORM 79/24-A, Appendix V, Para 4 and ALINORM 81/24, Appendix II, Para 5). It was agreed at the Twelfth Session of the CCPR (ALINORM 81/24, para 149) that the expression of residues of all pesticides of interest to the CCPR be checked for compliance with the general recommendations given in the 1979 Report of the JMPR, so that consistent expressions for all residues could be given. A working paper by J.A.R. Bates (FAO) dealing with this subject was discussed by the Working Group; a revised version of this paper will be circulated by Mr. Bates among the members of the Working Group with the aim that it can be finalized at the next Session of the CCPR.

6. Confirmation of Identity of Residues

The Working Group had before it a working paper prepared by S. Bailey on confirmatory techniques for pesticide residues (see ALINORM 81/24, Appendix II, Para 7). As a result of the discussions, a revised version was drafted which will be sent to the members of the Working Group by Mr. Bailey for comment. It is expected that the document will be finalized at the next Session of the CCPR and appended to the list of recommended methods.

7. Analytical methodology for cartap

As was discussed at the Twelfth Session of the CCPR (ALINORM 81/24, para 114-115), the analytical methodology for residues of cartap posed problems due to the instability of the standards. Supplementary information given by the Takeda Company to the Chairman of the Working Group was checked experimentally at the National Institute of Public Health in The Netherlands and was found to adequately describe the precautions necessary to make the method, as described in the reference given in the list of recommended methods, acceptable.

8. General references to pesticide residue analysis

It was felt desirable that the list of recommended methods of analysis compiled and revised regularly by the Working Group be expanded with a list of references on general problems in pesticide residues analysis. As examples of such references, papers by Frehse and Timme (Residue Rev., 73, 27-47 (1980)), Gunther (Residue Rev., 76, 155-172 (1980)), IUPAC (Pure Appl.Chem., 53, 1039-1049 (1981)) and VDLUFA (Interne Labor-kontrolle in der Rückstandsanalytik von Chlorkohlenwasserstoffen, Darmstadt, 1980) were mentioned. The Chairman undertook to make a compilation of such references for the next Session of the CCPR. Contributions to this compilation can be sent to the Chairman not later than 1 February 1982.

9. Role of Analytical Variability in decision-making with regard to compliance with Codex MRLs

It is a well-established fact that analytical results at residue levels can be subjected to considerable variations inherent in the methodology used, and decisions regarding compliance with Codex MRLs must take such variations into account. Various methods for such decision-making are under discussion now in different international groups and it will also be necessary for the CCPR to form an opinion on this matter in the course of the next years. The Chairman undertook to make a compilation of the systems under discussion for the next Session of the CCPR. Deadline for contributions is again 1 February 1982. It is realised that decision-making in regulatory situations has, in addition to analytical aspects, sampling and administrative aspects which lie outside the terms of reference of this Working Group. A cooperation with the Working Group on Sampling and on Regulatory Principles was agreed.

10. Publication of documents finalized by the Working Group

The Working Group expressed the opinion that many documents adopted by the Group would more effectively reach the audience to which they are directed if they could, apart from inclusion in the Reports of the Sessions of the CCPR and in the Guides to Codex MRLs, also be published in readily available scientific journals. The Chairman will, in the course of next year, explore this possibility.

- - - - -

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON SAMPLING^{1/}

Membership (see Appendix I for addresses)

D.C. Abbott	- United Kingdom	M. Green Lauridsen	- Denmark
A. Ambrus	- Hungary	E. Gonzalez	- Venezuela
A. Andersson	- Sweden	S. Gorbach	- Fed.Rep.of Germany
S. Bailey	- United Kingdom	R. van Havere	- Belgium
J.A.R. Bates (Chairman)	FAO	M. L'Hotellier	- France
H. Beck	- Fed.Rep. of Germany	N. Fred Ives	- USA
J. Benstead	- Australia	S. Iwanaga	- Japan
R. Blinn	- GIFAP	A. Kiviranta	- Finland
G. Bressau	- Fed.Rep. of Germany	M. R. Lynch	- Ireland
G.L. Castro	- Venezuela	L.G. Ladomery	- FAO
E. Celma	- Spain	M.A. Martinez	- Mexico
W.P. Cochrane	- Canada	M. Mutter	- Netherlands
W. Dejonckheere	- Belgium	G.B. Pickering	- United Kingdom
S.V. Denes	- Romania	G.M. Telling	- United Kingdom
J.F. Eades	- Ireland	R.C. Tincknell	- GIFAP
H. Frehse	- IUPAC	L.G.M. Th.Tuinstra	- Netherlands
H.O. Friestad	- Norway	P.M. Vermes	- Israel
Cecilia P. Gaston	- Philippines	J.R. Wessel	- USA
Jurien de la Gravière	- France	K. Wickström	- Finland

Portion of the Commodity to which Codex limits apply and which is analysed

The Working Group considered comments from Member Countries on the document "Portion of the Commodity to Which Codex Limits apply and which is Analysed", as detailed in Appendix III to ALINORM 81/24. Several countries indicated that for some commodities, in particular those with inedible peel e.g. bananas, pineapples and citrus fruit, their national limits apply to the edible portion of the commodity. After discussion, the Group reaffirmed its view that the objective of residue analysis in monitoring good agricultural practice was best served by considering the whole commodity as it moved in trade and as described in the document previously advanced to Step 5. However, the Working Group recognized that knowledge of the residue level in the portion of the commodity actually consumed did play an important part in evaluating the possible risk to public health and hence in the acceptance of an MRL on the whole commodity. In addition, such an approach may help the analyst and the Group agreed to discuss this topic in detail at its next Session.

^{1/}See paras 176-182, ALINORM 83/24.

APPENDIX III (Cont'd.)

Guidelines on Pesticide Residue Trials

The Working Group noted with satisfaction that the finalized guidelines were being distributed by FAO as an advisory document and would be a working paper for the Ad Hoc Government Consultation on the Harmonization of Pesticide Registration Requirements planned by FAO for October 1982. The International Federation of National Associations of Pesticide Manufacturers (GIFAP) had also distributed the guidelines with the April 1981 issue of the GIFAP Bulletin. The Ad Hoc Group agreed to start work on the preparation of guidelines on trials in which treated crops are fed to animals or the pesticide is applied directly to the animal.

- - - - -

APPENDIX IV

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PROBLEMS
IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES RELATED TO PESTICIDE RESIDUES 1/

1. The above Working Group held its Session during the Thirteenth Session of the CCPR (15-21 June 1981, The Hague). It had before it documents WG-DC/PR 81/1 which contained the provisional agenda and WG-DC/PR 81/2 which contained a report of the Working Group since the last Session of the CCPR. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following countries and International Organizations:

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Victoriano C. Tolosa | -Argentina | A.F.H. Besemer | -Netherlands |
| J.C. Benstead | -Australia | C.P. Gaston | -Philippines |
| J.T. Snelson | -Australia | S.V. Denes | -Romania |
| A. Furtado Rahde | -Brazil (Chairman) | E. Celma | -Spain |
| J.M.C. Coelho | -Brazil | O. Silapanapaporn | -Thailand |
| D.H. da Silva | -Brazil | S. Famrungroj | -Thailand |
| H.V. Morley | -Canada | J.D. Garnett | -United Kingdom |
| J.M. Stalker | -Canada | G.B. Pickering | -United Kingdom |
| M.H. Danial | -Egypt | Stanford N. Fertig | -USA |
| B. Jurien de la Gravière | -France | D. la Hoda | -USA |
| M. l'Hotellier | -France | Libertad de Saume | -Venezuela |
| P.M. Vermes | -Israel | Eutimio Ganzález G. | -Venezuela |
| M.A. Martinez | -Mexico (Rapporteur) | Carlos Luis Castro | -Venezuela |
| Roger C. Blinn | -GIFAP - USA | L.G. Ladomery | -FAO, Rome (Secretary) |
| L.R. Hodges | -GIFAP - USA | N. Rao Maturu | -FAO, Rome (Rapporteur) |
| George B. Fuller | -GIFAP - USA | G. Vettorazzi | -WHO, Geneva |
| S.F. Rickard | -GIFAP - USA | | |
| Kenny E. McNeill | -GIFAP - USA | | |
| H. Regenstein | -GIFAP - FRG | | |
| William Graham | -GIFAP - UK | | |
| Lowell E. Miller | -OECD - USA | | |
| D. Grose | -IOCU - UK | | |
| J.A.R. Bates | -FAO - Rome | | |

1/ See paras 183-188, ALINORM 83/24.

APPENDIX IV (Cont'd.)

2. The Working Group was informed that Prof. W.F. Almeida (Brazil) who chaired this Working Group for the last several Sessions, had retired from his position in the Government of Brazil and, hence, could not be present to chair the present meeting of the Working Group. The Committee recalled the valuable guidance of Dr. Almeida to this Working Group and wished him success in his new position as Professor at the University of Campinas, Sao Paulo.

3. The Working Group elected Dr. A.F. Rahde (Brazil) as Chairman of the Working Group and Dr. M.A. Martinez (Mexico) and Dr. N. Rao Maturu (FAO) as rapporteurs. It then adopted the provisional agenda without change.

4. Statements were made by representatives from Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela on the progress or status of work on pesticide residues in their countries. These are attached in the Annex to this Appendix.

5. The document WG-DC/PR 81/2 prepared by Dr. Almeida contained replies received from Argentina, Brazil, Dominican Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Spain, Thailand, Venezuela and Yugoslavia to the questionnaire on facilities available for residue analysis and for toxicological assay of pesticides and facilities for manpower development. The Working Group considered this document as being for information and noted that Argentina had made some proposals relating to pesticide residues and pesticide registration.

6. The delegations of Canada, France, the United Kingdom and United States of America informed the Working Group about the availability of facilities in their countries for residue analysis, toxicological assays in relation to the development of manpower for developing countries and indicated that they had not responded since the questionnaire had not been received by them.

Mr. R.C. Blinn of GIFAP-USA agreed to coordinate the replies that will be received from countries to a second questionnaire to be distributed by the Secretariat and to prepare a report for the next Session of the Working Group. The questionnaire and report would distinguish between official bilateral governmental assistance, technical assistance by the various UN agencies and other available or potential assistance.

7. The Working Group then discussed, in the light of the replies received from Governments to the above questionnaire (Document WG+DC/PR 81/2), the problem of how the capabilities of developing countries in residue analysis and toxicological evaluation could be improved.

8. As regards the question of safety of pesticides and their residues, the Working Group concluded, after detailed discussion that, as a matter of priority, developing countries should, through international or bilateral assistance,

- (a) improve their capabilities to ensure the safe and effective application of pesticides in conformity with Good Agricultural Practice,
- (b) establish the legal framework within which the proper marketing and use of pesticides can be ensured,
- (c) improve their facilities and capabilities to carry out residue analysis in order to be in a position to monitor residues in foods for consumer protection and to ensure the unhindered movement of food in their export trade, and
- (d) secure the training of personnel in order to realize the above objectives.

9. As regards safety evaluation, it was not considered essential that all countries, whether developed or not, have the capacity to carry out toxicity testing and evaluation.

It was recognized that toxicity testing was a matter for a limited number of experienced laboratories throughout the world and that the results of such testing were generally valid for judging the safety of pesticides and their residues. This was not to say that developing countries should not have trained personnel as part of the infrastructure designed to take care of any health and environment problems, associated with the use of agrochemicals and who advised the authorities of each country in interpreting or verifying the available toxicological data.

10. On the other hand, the Working Group stressed that residue data in support of Good Agricultural Practices were necessary in order to ensure that Codex MRLs take into account pest control needs in countries. While it is the responsibility of industry (under pesticide registration systems) to carry out supervised trials, in order to generate such data, the Working Group stressed the need to train personnel to ensure that such trials are carried out and that the results obtained are channelled through the appropriate bodies concerned (e.g. JMPR, CCPR, etc.). It is also important to develop a capability to monitor the use of pesticides in order to ensure that Good Agricultural Practices are followed and that imported pesticides are of an acceptable quality with respect to formulation and impurities.
11. On the subject of the possible variation of the toxicological properties of pesticides formulated in different ways, the Working Group agreed that this did not represent a problem of such proportions as to warrant immediate attention. Furthermore, this was considered to be a general problem and not particular to developing countries.
12. The Working Group concluded that one of the main obstacles to the development of adequate infrastructures and capabilities in pesticide control is the low priority and budgetary support given to this matter by governments themselves. In this connection, it was also stated that it is up to governments to formulate requests for technical assistance by FAO, WHO and other interested Organizations.
13. The Working Group was informed that there had been a follow-up of certain recommendations made at the last Session, especially item 2.1 (Appendix V, ALINORM 81/24). FAO was organizing an ad hoc Government Consultation in October 1982 on the harmonization of pesticide registration. The FAO model scheme for the registration of pesticides was being totally revised and would recognize that the needs and capabilities of each country are not the same. Registration requirements for the assessment of environmental effects had been discussed by an FAO Expert Consultation in May 1981. Guidelines for labelling, packaging, storage and biological evaluation were being developed and the complete documentation would be available for the 1982 Consultation.
14. The Working Group was also informed that the IUPAC Commission on Pesticides had published a report on a simplified approach to residue analysis and a number of procedures had been recommended that did not require sophisticated instrumentation and that could prove useful to developing countries. Many of these faced problems from the non-availability of stable electricity supplies, suitably purified gases for GLC and difficulties with servicing instruments.
15. The Working Group was further informed that the WHO Regional Office for Europe (EURO) was assuming a global role for manpower development within the framework of the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS). In September 1981 a course on the toxicology of pesticides would be held in Sofia, Bulgaria. FAO was planning to organize a course on pesticide residue analysis in April 1982.
16. In relation to recommendation 2.7 made in its report at the last Session, the Working Group noted that the Codex Regional Coordinating Committees for Latin America, Africa and Asia provided a suitable forum for consultation among the developing countries in order to study problems relating to pesticides and means of resolving them.

APPENDIX IV (Cont'd.)

17. The Working Group concluded that the recommendations made at the last Session (Appendix V, ALINORM 81/24) were still valid and resolved that the developing countries themselves, the interested International Organizations and developed countries which can assist through bilateral programmes should follow up the recommendations in order that the objectives formulated in the recommendations be achieved.

18. The following points among others emanated:

(a) There is an increasing interest and need felt to promote regional meetings on pesticide residues, at least three months earlier to the regular CCPR Sessions, aiming at technical cooperation and to evaluate common problems in the area. Such a regional meeting will take place in Argentina or Brazil, in March 1982, for which all involved developing countries will be invited. The topics that will be discussed at this meeting relate to:

- i) registration
- ii) analytical methods
- iii) good Agricultural Practice; and
- iv) Codex MRL acceptances.

The assistance of FAO/WHO to this meeting is requested and is most welcome.

(b) The need is increasingly felt that governments must clearly identify the department(s) in charge of national programmes of pesticide residues, to whom policy matters and documents could be referred.

(c) There is a need for a fresh questionnaire to be sent to all governments to elicit information on:

- i) available technical facilities;
- ii) infrastructure;
- iii) instrumental diagnosis, control and toxicological aspects of pesticides; and
- iv) availability of expert manpower in the area.

ANNEX TO APPENDIX IV

Statement from the Representative of Argentina

The Argentine delegation informed the Group about activities developed during the years 1980/81 concerning the suggestions given in recommendation 2.8 of ALINORM 81/24, Appendix IV. Argentina had started an evaluation of centres, organizations and institutions, private and public, which dealt with the development, control and analysis of pesticides. This evaluation covered consultations of:

- a) authorities of public health and agriculture in the main provinces of food producers and in the regional universities;
- b) the advisory centre of the National Institute for Agricultural Technology (INTA);
- c) private institutions, such as commercial institutions dealing with refrigeration plants and milk products;
- d) private scientific institutions such as Instituto Nacional de Bromatología y Farmacología, Instituto Nacional, Malbran Instituto de Biología La Plata,

Centro Industrial de Tecnología Lechera (C.I.T.L.), Instituto de Tecnología Lechera Universidad Nacional de Rosario, Cátedra de Toxicología Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires, Centro de Desarrollo Bioquímico - Universidad Nacional del Sur, Centro de Investigaciones Bioquímicas "Org. Campomar", Servicio Nacional de Laboratorios de Productos Ganaderos, Instituto de Sanidad de Buenos Aires, etc.

So far, 80% of the evaluations had been finished.

Statement of the Representative of Brazil

Brazil, last year, developed a number of programmes with the aim of preventing the occurrence of pesticide poisoning and to avoid high residue levels in food. Among the different programmes the following may be mentioned:

- a) initiation of courses for certification or licensing of private and commercial pesticide applicators (Ministries of Work and Agriculture);
- b) pesticide sale and line of credit (Bank of Brazil) controlled by a prescription issued by an agronomist;
- c) restricted use of highly hazardous pesticides permitted only to commercial applicators or to farmers after a prescription issued by an agronomist (Ministry of Agriculture);
- d) a programme, carried out by the Ministry of Health, of collecting information as well as furnishing data about chemicals, drugs and pesticides to the general population, farmers, agronomists and health personnel.

Statement from the Representative of Mexico

As a follow-up of the recommendations contained in the Twelfth Session Report of the CCPR (ALINORM 81/24, Appendix V), two meetings were held:

a) Mexico, November 1980 - A Workshop about pesticide contamination in Food

This meeting was attended by government representatives of the Ministries of Health and Agriculture of the following countries: Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico and Panama. The meeting devoted special attention to methods of analysis and to good agricultural practices;

b) Miami, February 1981

A group of government representatives from Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico and Venezuela discussed with a GIFAP group problems related to agricultural practices and to pesticides registration.

Furthermore, concerning methods of analysis, a group of pesticide laboratories from Mexico and USA (FDA, EPA, USDA, SARH) agreed to an exchange of information on technology and of samples and to training of personnel. Representatives of Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala and Venezuela will be invited as observers to annual meetings of the Group.

Statement from the Representative of Venezuela

Venezuela is facing a number of problems related with environmental contamination and residues of pesticides in food; the Government has generated action to solve these problems:

- a) the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock is increasing their agrotechnical staff and has approved a project for implementation at the National Pesticide Laboratory for planning of pesticide residue monitoring. This project will be completed by the end of 1982. The inspection system with relation to pesticide use, formulation and distribution will be improved.

A revision of regulations on pesticide labelling, packing, transport, storage, etc., is foreseen;

- b) the universities and the Agricultural School depending on the Central University of Venezuela are developing pesticide projects jointly with the government and are developing programmes relating to assistance to farmers;
- c) the Ministry of Health is carrying out studies which reflect the real situation on pesticide exposure of the human population;
- d) the Ministry of the Environment and National Resources is:
 - evaluating the effect on the environment of wastes produced by pesticide formulation plants
 - designing ways for pesticide waste disposal, jointly with the Ministries of Agriculture and Health.

APPENDIX V

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON REGULATORY PRINCIPLES ^{1/}

1. Membership (see Appendix I for addresses).

The following persons took part in the discussions of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Regulatory Principles:

D. Abbott	- United Kingdom	L. Hodges	- GIFAP
H. Ambrus	- Hungary	F. Ives	- United States of America
A. Andersson	- Sweden	L. Lodomery	- FAO
P. Bennett	- Canada	D. Lahoda	- GIFAP
R. Belcher	- Australia	M. Lauridsen	- Denmark
R. Blinn	- GIFAP	M. Lynch	- Ireland
G. Bressau	- Fed.Rep. of Germany	M. Martinez	- Mexico
C. Castro	- Venezuela	N. Maturu	- FAO
E. Celma	- Spain	K. McNeill	- GIFAP
V. Cieleszky	- Hungary	L. Miller	- OECD
W. Cochrane	- Canada	H. Morley	- Canada
J. Coelho	- Brazil	D. Papworth	- United Kingdom
J. Eades	- Ireland	G. Pickering	- United Kingdom
S. Famrungrroj	- Thailand	A. Rahde	- Brazil
S. Fertig	- United States of America	H. Regenstein	- GIFAP
H. Friestad	- Norway	S. Rickard	- GIFAP
G. Fuller	- GIFAP	L. de Saume	- Venezuela
J. Garnett	- United Kingdom	J. Snelson	- Australia
C. Gaston	- Philippines	D. Silapanapaporn	- Thailand
E. Gonzales	- Venezuela	G. Telling	- United Kingdom
W. Graham	- GIFAP	V. Tolosa	- Argentina
D. Grose	- IOCU	N. van Tiel	- Netherlands
M. Hascoet	- France	P. Vermes	- Israel
R. van Havere	- Belgium	B. Watts	- New Zealand
		J. Wessel(chairman)	USA

^{1/} See paras 189-192, ALINORM 83/24.

APPENDIX V (cont'd.)

2. Agenda

The Working Group discussed the following topics:

- a) responses to the questionnaire on national systems for regulating pesticide residues in food;
- b) impediments to governments' acceptance and use of Codex MRLs and related procedures; and
- c) reconsideration of Codex definition of terms.

3. Questionnaire on National Systems for Regulating Pesticide Residues in Foods

At its Twelfth Session, the CCPR requested the Working Group to undertake sending a questionnaire to Member Countries to obtain information on their national regulatory systems for pesticide residues in food. It was felt that this information would help identify and better define differences in national regulatory systems which present obstacles or impediments to individual government's acceptance and use of Codex recommended MRLs and related procedures. This information would then be used to develop guidelines to harmonize where possible these differences in order to facilitate governments' acceptance and application of Codex MRLs. Such guidelines were suggested in a paper prepared by the Codex Secretariat (CX/PR 79/17) and were considered desirable by the CCPR (para 181, ALINORM 81/24).

The questionnaire prepared by the Working Group consisted of 60 questions on the main aspects of pesticide regulation. It was sent in January 1981 to the Codex Contact Points in 117 countries and to all participants of the Twelfth Session of the CCPR. As of May 1981, only 26 countries had responded and for this reason, the Working Group decided to provide the Thirteenth Session of the CCPR with only an interim report on the questionnaire. It was noted that Belgium, Chile, Ethiopia, Greece, Hungary, Jordan, The Netherlands, Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Trinidad and Tobago responded to the questionnaire, but regretfully, time did not allow for their inclusion in the interim report. The Working Group agreed that the information obtained from the questionnaire was useful in better understanding the pesticide regulatory systems of the responding countries and, in particular, the problems these countries have in meeting the objectives of the CCPR. The Working Group further agreed that having completed responses from other countries would be more useful and recommended that the CCPR request Member Countries to submit their completed questionnaires to the Working Group as soon as possible. It was recommended that a deadline of October 1981 be set for these countries and that the additional responses received, as well as those submitted since the interim report was prepared, be incorporated into a final report on the questionnaire which would be presented by the Working Group at the next CCPR.

4. Impediments to Government Acceptance and Application of Codex Recommended MRLs and Related Procedures

The Working Group discussed the information obtained from the completed questionnaires. Although it was desirable to have this type of information from a larger number of countries, the Working Group was able to reach several basic conclusions:

- (1) The types of legal systems for regulating pesticides followed by responding countries do not in themselves prevent governments from accepting CCPR recommendations.
- (2) There are a number of procedural and policy matters, that are followed or not followed under these systems which do serve as obstacles to governments accepting and using Codex MRLs.

It was noted that the above conclusions of the Working Group confirmed the discussion at the Twelfth Session of the CCPR regarding the type of guidelines that should be developed for international regulation of pesticide residues in food (para 179, ALINORM 81/24). Specifically, the guidelines should not represent a recommended model pesticide regulatory system, but rather should address procedural and policy issues which require an internationally harmonized approach to facilitate acceptance of CCPR recommendations. Based on the information obtained from the questionnaire, the Working Group agreed that such guidelines were needed on a number of issues relating to the work of the CCPR. Although certain technical aspects of pesticide regulation were included in these issues, the underlying basis for them, being an issue in so far as Codex objectives are concerned, were political in nature. For example, countries find it difficult or impossible to give full or limited acceptance to a Codex MRL for a pesticide not approved for use in their country because it can be viewed as discriminatory to domestic producers, i.e. they cannot use the pesticide, but foreign producers can, which may be interpreted as providing them a production and trade advantage.

Another issue concerns accepting Codex MRLs which are higher than existing national MRLs. Because this may be interpreted as exposing consumers to additional pesticide residues, many countries find this issue an impediment to acceptance of such Codex MRLs. Other impediments involve national policies and practices that are divergent from those of Codex. Some countries state their MRLs in terms of "edible portions of commodities", and for this reason are unable to adopt Codex MRLs which normally relate to whole commodities unless qualified.

Another situation concerns the method of sampling. Some countries use the approach that any unit of food in a consignment should comply with an MRL, rather than the CCPR recommended approach of drawing a sample that is representative of the consignment and determining the "average residue content" of the sample and thus, the consignment. Although divergences from the Codex sampling approach does not prevent a Government from accepting a Codex MRL, it does affect the application of Codex MRLs to food in international trade.

An additional problem is that many countries require full supporting data for national evaluation of Codex recommended MRLs before acceptance can be granted. However, countries do not always have access to all the same data that JMPR evaluated.

The Working Group believes that these types of issues should be addressed in a guideline which would serve to explain the basis for the procedures, policies and overall philosophy of a pesticides regulatory system that is consistent with the objectives of the CCPR. This Codex guideline would bring together in one document all relevant points of principle that have been adopted and followed by the CCPR over the years. It is envisioned that the proposed guideline would take the form of a model statement of policy for governments to consider adopting into their national pesticide regulations. Use of this form of a policy guideline by governments would serve to establish or affirm their commitment to accepting and following CCPR recommendations. The guideline would contain explanatory information to assist governments in addressing those factors which they believe are obstacles to acceptance of Codex MRLs. If the CCPR agrees with this proposed form of a guideline, the Working Group plans to develop such a guideline for presentation to the CCPR at its next session.

5. Reconsideration of Codex Definitions of Terms

The Working Group briefly discussed the Secretariat's paper that described the differences between the JMPR and the CCPR definitions and proposed a number of changes in the CCPR definition of terms (CX/PR 80/21). This paper was prepared at the request of the CCPR and after limited discussion at the Twelfth Session, the CCPR referred the

APPENDIX V (cont'd.)

reconsideration of the definitions to the Ad Hoc Working Group on Regulatory Principles. The CCPR also requested that governments submit comments on the proposed definitions to the Working Group. In light of the fact that only one country had submitted comments and time at this session did not permit the Working Group to conduct a detailed discussion of the proposals in the Secretariat's paper or the comments received, the Working Group decided to defer action on this topic for the coming year. In doing so, the Working Group plans to perform a fundamental review of the definitions of terms used by the CCPR and based on this review, develop a glossary of terms with proposed definitions. Every effort will be made to have the proposals of the Working Group circulated through the Secretariat to Member Countries for review and comment prior to the 14th Session of the CCPR.

APPENDIX VI

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITIES 1/

Membership:

J.A.R. Bates	-	FAO
S. Bailey	-	United Kingdom
J. Benstead	-	Australia
A.F.H. Besemer	-	The Netherlands (Chairman)
G. Bressau	-	Federal Republic of Germany
Carlos Luis Castro	-	Venezuela
G. Dupuis	-	Switzerland
M. l'Hotellier	-	France
G. Mathys	-	EPPO
Ralph T. Ross	-	United States of America (Rapporteur)
Jean Stalker	-	Canada (Secretary)
J.T. Snelson	-	Australia
P.M. Vermes	-	Israel
G. Vettorazzi	-	WHO
B.B. Watts	-	New Zealand
Geoffrey Willis	-	GIFAP

1. INTRODUCTION

The agenda was adopted. The Chairman thanked the Canadian delegation for putting together the work for the Group to review and reminded the Group of its charge, indicating that even though this was stated in the 1980 report, it should be reflected in the current report for emphasis. The terms of reference are as follows:

- (a) to assist the CCPR for making recommendations on priority compounds to be submitted to the JMPR for evaluation;
- (b) to review priority lists as delineated in the report from the Twelfth Session (Appendix IV, ALINORM 81/24) for reassessment of their order of priority;
- (c) to make a final report to the CCPR based on the final determination of the compounds in the existing lists as well as the introduction of new priority proposals.

1/ See paras 193-200, ALINORM 83/24.

2. CRITERIA FOR PRIORITY COMPOUNDS

The Working Group noted that prerequisites for consideration of a compound by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Priorities are that the compound:

- (a) must be available for use as a commercial product;
- (b) must not have already been accepted for consideration.

The Working Group confirmed the established criteria for placing compounds on the priority list. The compound:

- (c) must result in residues in or on the food commodity;
- (d) must affect international trade to a significant degree;
- (e) must be a matter of public health concern be creating or have a potential for creating commercial problems.

Member countries submitting proposals according to the above criteria should attend the Ad Hoc Working Group and ensure the availability of data in support of their proposals.

3. NEW COMPOUNDS FOR THE 1981 JMPR

The Group noted the provisional agenda for the 1981 JMPR. Compounds to be evaluated for the first time are:

diflubenzuron
isofenphos
methiocarb
procymidone

4. ESTABLISHMENT OF 1981 PRIORITY LISTS

The Group considered the chemicals which had been proposed for addition to the priority lists. It was agreed that the most useful way of presenting confirmation on priorities to the CCPR was by the compilation of three lists as in previous years.

(a) List I This list consists of compounds judged to meet the selection criteria and that can be considered for review by the JMPR in 1982.

ethoprophos	fenarimol
phoxim	triazophos
isoprocarb	metalaxyl

(b) List II This list consists of compounds judged to meet the selection criteria, and which could be considered for review in the succeeding year (1983) or later, by the JMPR, depending upon the availability of adequate scientific and technical data on the individual compounds. Current expectations are that information will be available for some compounds while others may have to be deferred to subsequent years.

glyphosate	nitrofen
thiofanox	butocarboxim
vinclozolin	oxycarboxin

(c) List III This list consists of compounds identified from various sources that were tentatively judged to meet the selection criteria and are drawn to the attention to countries and manufacturers.

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

5. COMPOUNDS REMOVED FROM THE PRIORITY LIST

The Chairman called to the attention of the Group the compounds in List III in the report from the Twelfth Session (Appendix IV, ALINORM 81/24). These compounds had been identified from various sources and been tentatively judged to meet the selection criteria and, therefore, drawn to the attention of Member Countries and manufacturers. The compounds were as follows:

dalapon	pentachlorophenol
famphur	propyzamide
metaldehyde	pyrazophos
naled	quinalphos

Since no responses were received from Member Countries and manufacturers for the 1981 meeting, the Group agreed that these compounds should be removed from the List. However, the Group acknowledged that Member Countries should be given another opportunity to review these compounds and if a Member Country or manufacturer has an interest, submissions which satisfied the criteria should be submitted to the group.

6. 1981 REPORT ON THE SURVEY ON GOOD AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE (GAP)
(CX/PR 81/8)

The Canadian delegation gave an overview of the new survey conducted on GAP. It was pointed out that the original survey had been made in 1971. The purpose of the GAP survey is to identify the use of agricultural compounds on agricultural commodities moving in international trade and to develop new recommendations for priorities, based on these data. The Canadian delegation offered to update the GAP report in 1982, combine it with the 1981 report and proposed that the combined reports be considered for update at intervals of five years thereafter.

7. COMPOUNDS REPORTED BY COUNTRIES IN THE 1981 GOOD AGRICULTURAL PRACTICE REPORT (CX/PR 81/8)

The following compounds (a) were reported by countries in the 1981 GAP Report as being used on a major food crop; (b) have not been reviewed by the JMPR; (c) are not on existing priority lists; (d) were not considered for addition to priority lists within the past three years; and (e) may result in residues of 0.1 mg/kg or greater:

chlorthiophos
kitazin-P (O,O-diisopropyl-S-benzyl thiophosphate)
n-acetylguanidine acetate
neo-asozin (ferric monomethylarsenate)
nitrothal-isopropyl
promecarb
propamocarb

The Group decided that there was not sufficient information on these compounds to determine if they met the criteria for addition to the priority lists. Member countries and manufacturers are requested to review this list for possible interest. Submission for candidate compounds should follow the criteria as outlined in paragraph 2 of this report.

8. CONFIDENTIALITY AND EXCLUSIVITY OF DATA

The Group, in its last report (Appendix IV, para 9, ALINORM 81/24) stated that, in general, there has been excellent support by industry for submission of data. How-

APPENDIX VI (contd.)

ever, the Group expressed concern about reluctance of some members of industry to agree to evaluation of their compound(s) because of possible difficulties in protecting confidentiality and exclusive rights to data.

9. REVIEW OF OLD COMPOUNDS IN OR WHICH HAVE BEEN IN THE CODEX SYSTEM

The Chairman of the Plenary session requested that the Ad Hoc Working Group on Priorities consider giving priority to those compounds with a temporary ADI and/or ADI which have been removed from the Codex system or are about to be removed from the system due to the lack of data to support an established ADI or where new data has been developed which can no longer support the existing ADI. The Group felt that the mechanism already exists, in principle, for establishing priority for these compounds and that this mechanism may have been overlooked or not recognized. It was concluded that if such a list is submitted, the Priority Group could be of assistance but emphasized it would utilize the same criteria as outlined in paragraph 2 of this report.

APPENDIX VII

MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS SUBMITTED TO THE COMMISSION
FOR ADOPTION AS CODEX MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS

Introduction

The maximum residue limits contained in this Appendix have been advanced either to Step 8 of the Procedure or to Step 5, with the recommendation that Steps 6 and 7 be omitted. They will be considered by the Fifteenth Session of the Commission in July 1983 in the light of any amendments proposed by governments in writing.

The draft maximum residue limits advanced to Step 5 will be included in document CX/PR 82/3 and distributed for comments, in accordance with the new Procedure adopted by the Fourteenth Session of the Commission (see also para 37 of this Report). Other maximum residue limits moved to or held at Steps 6 or 7 of the Procedure will be included in document CX/PR 82/2 and sent to governments for comments as appropriate.

Draft Maximum Residue Limits ^{1/}

11. CARBOPHENOTHION: JMPR 1972, 1976, 1977, 1979

Residue: carbophenothion or, in case of animal products, carbophenothion, its sulphoxide and its sulphone, together with their corresponding oxygen analogues, if present.

^{1/} MRL = Maximum Residue Limit; E = Extraneous Residue Limit;
T = Temporary (e.g TMRL).

APPENDIX VII (cont'd.)

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>MRL (mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
B07.2800	Milk	0.1 (on a fat basis)	8	71
C	Milk Products	0.1 (on a fat basis)	8	71
A05.1917	Pecans	0.02(*) (on a shell-free basis)	8	71
A01.0128	Potatoes	0.02(*)	8	71
A05.2011	Rapeseed	0.02(*)	8	71
A01.0136	Sugar Beet	0.1	8	71
A05.1922	Walnuts	0.02(*) (on a shell-free basis)	8	71

37. FENITROTHION: JMPR 1969, 1974, 1976, 1977, 1979

Residue: Sum of fenitrothion and its oxygen analogue

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>MRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
A02.1106	Peaches	1	8	79
A02.1004	Pears	0.5		

48. LINDANE (Syn: gamma-BHC or gamma-HCH): JMPR 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1977, 1978, 1979

Residue: gamma-HCH

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>MRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
A01.0713	Tomatoes	2	8	85

74. DISULFOTON: JMPR 1973, 1975

Residue: Determined as disulfoton, disulfoton sulphoxide, disulphoton sulphone, demeton-S, demeton-S sulphoxide and demeton-S sulphone, expressed as disulfoton.

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>MRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
A01.0128	Potatoes	0.5	8	89

81. CHLOROTHALONIL: JMPR 1974, 1979

Residue: Sum of chlorothalonil and 4-hydroxy-2,5,6-trichloro-1,3-benzenedi-carbonitrile, expressed as chlorothalonil.

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>TMRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
A02.1403	Banana (Whole)	0.2	8	92
A02.1403	Banana (Pulp)	0.05	8	92

(*) Level at or about the limit of determination.

APPENDIX VII (contd.)

89. sec-BUTYLAMINE: JMPR 1975, 1977, 1978, 1979

Residue: sec-butylamine base

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>TMRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
B07.2700	Kidney of cattle, goats, pigs, sheep	3	8	98
	Liver of cattle, goats, pigs, sheep	0.2	8	98

91. CYANOFENPHOS: JMPR 1975, 1978

Residue: cyanofenphos

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>TMRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
C	Rice(hulled)	0.2	8	101

95. ACEPHATE: JMPR 1976, 1979

Residue: acephate((the metabolite O,S-dimethyl phosphoramidothioate is methamidophos (No.100) which has separate recommendations)).

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>MRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
A01.0614	Soybeans	0.5	8	104

96. CARBOFURAN: JMPR 1976, 1977, 1979

Residue: carbofuran and 3-hydroxycarbofuran, expressed as carbofuran.

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>TMRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
A01.0347	Sugarbeet leaves	0.2	8	106
A01.0706	Eggplants	0.1	5 1/	107
A01.0410	Kohlrabi	0.1	5 1/	107

97. CARTAP: JMPR 1976, 1978

Residue: cartap expressed as free base

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>MRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
A01.0404	Cabbage	0.2	8	108
A05.1906	Chestnuts(seed in- cluding pericarp)	0.1		
A01.0405	Chinese Cabbage	2		
A06.2317	Ginger	0.1		
A02.1211	Grapes	1		
C	Hops(Dried)	5		
A02.1431	Persimmons	1		
A01.0128	Potatoes	0.1		
A01.0129	Radishes	1		
C	Rice (Hulled)	0.1		
A01.0810	Sweet Corn	0.1		
A06.2402	Tea, Green(Dried)	20		

1/ The Committee has recommended the omission of Steps 6 and 7.

APPENDIX VII (contd.)

99. EDIFENPHOS: JMPR 1976, 1979

Residue: Edifenphos

<u>Classification No.</u>	<u>Commodity</u>	<u>TMRL(mg/kg)</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
C	Rice(Hulled)	0.1)	8	109
C	Rice(Polished)	0.02(*))		

(*) Level at or about the limit of determination.

APPENDIX VIII

AMENDMENTS TO CODEX (*) MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS

A. Substantive Amendments

	<u>Codex MRL</u>	<u>Proposed Amendment</u>	<u>Step</u>	<u>Para</u>
4. BROMOPHOS	Blackberries 0.5 mg/kg	1 mg/kg	6	60(a)
37. FENITROTHION	Wheat flour (white) 1 mg/kg	3 mg/kg	1(**)	60(b)
65. THIABENDAZOLE	Tomatoes 0.1 mg/kg	2 mg/kg	1(**)	60(b)

B. Non-substantive Amendments

	<u>Codex MRL</u>	<u>Proposed Amendment</u>	<u>Para</u>
6. CAPTAFOL	Onions 0.5 mg/kg in the bulb	Onions(bulbs) 0.5 mg/kg	61(b)
17. CHLORPYRIFOS	Celery, cottonseed, cottonseed oil(crude), mushrooms, onions, sugar-beets 0.05 mg/kg	Add: "at or about the limit of determination"	61(d)
51. METHIDATHION	Milk and milk products) 0.02 mg/kg	Add: "at or about the limit of determination"	61(b)
77. THIOPHANATE-METHYL	raspberries 10 mg/kg	5 mg/kg 1/	60(e)
82. DICHLOFLUANID	sweet peppers 2 mg/kg barley) oats) rye) wheat)	peppers 2 mg/kg cereal grains 0.1 mg/kg	60(c)
85. FENAMIPHOS	tomatoes 0.2 mg/kg	change temporary MRL into MRL	61(b)
	Citrus fruit(except oranges)	delete TMRL	61(b)

(*) The term "Codex Maximum Residue Limit" refers to maximum residue limits adopted by the Commission at Step 8 of the new Codex Procedure and submitted to Governments for acceptance.

(**)The Commission has been requested to initiate the amendment procedure.

1/ This change is a corrigendum.