

# CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



World Health  
Organization

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

Agenda Item 14

CX/PR 21/52/18

July 2021

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

52<sup>nd</sup> Session

(Virtual)

26-30 July and 3 August 2021

### NATIONAL REGISTRATIONS OF PESTICIDES

(Prepared by the Electronic Working Group chaired by Germany and co-chaired by Australia)

#### BACKGROUND

1. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) is the subsidiary body of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) having competence on the establishment of maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pesticides in food and feed moving in international trade. The terms of reference also includes the preparation of schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR).<sup>1</sup>
2. The *Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues* provide the framework for the establishment of Codex MRLs for pesticides. The Principles address the roles of CCPR as risk management body and JMPR as risk assessment body and describe the process by which, each year, CCPR in cooperation with the JMPR Secretariat, agrees on a schedule of JMPR evaluations for the following year and considers prioritization of pesticides for future scheduling. This process is known as the *CCPR schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR* and constitutes the first step in the establishment of Codex MRLs (CXLs) for pesticides by CCPR.<sup>2</sup>
3. The Codex schedules and priority lists are composed of new compounds evaluations, new uses and other evaluations, and periodic reviews for compounds that have not been reviewed toxicologically for more than 15 years and/or not having a significant review of the CXL for 15 years (the so-called “old” compounds).
4. Table 2 in the schedules and priority lists relate to the periodic review process. Table 2A lists compounds for periodic review by JMPR. Table 2B lists compounds that have been last evaluated 15 years ago or more but not yet scheduled for period review. Pesticides listed in Table 2B should be considered for scheduling for periodic review when concerns, including public health concerns, are identified and nominated for inclusion in Table 2A. Compounds listed in Tables 2A and 2B are the so-called “old compounds” or “compounds subject to periodic review”.
5. The nomination requirements for scheduling of compounds in the schedules and priority lists require, amongst other relevant data, the status of national registrations for the pesticide. The schedules and priority lists seek to provide a balance of new compounds, new uses, other evaluations and periodic reviews.
6. The “old” compounds subject to periodic review add a considerable workload to the schedules and priority lists for evaluation by JMPR vis-à-vis the growing demand for evaluation of new compounds, new uses, other evaluations and the need to keep the balance between these evaluations (i.e. evaluations of “new” versus “old” compounds).
7. CCPR has long debated how to balance the evaluation of “new” and “old” compounds vis-à-vis public health concerns related to “old” compounds and the growing request for evaluation of “new” compounds and their related additional uses and other evaluations. For the unsupported pesticides subject to periodic review, CCPR has emphasized the need for all Codex members to review the compounds in Tables 2A and 2B for which support was either unknown or not provided by the manufacturer. In addition, a new table on “current national registrations for compounds listed in Tables 2A and 2B” currently lists the “orphan” compounds for which support has been withdrawn or was not known with a view to seeking Codex member input on whether or not a national registration is in place.

<sup>1</sup> [Codex Procedural Manual](#), 26<sup>th</sup> Edition, Section V: Subsidiary Bodies, Terms of Reference of CCPR

<sup>2</sup> [Codex Procedural Manual](#), 26<sup>th</sup> Edition, Section IV: Risk Analysis, Risk Analysis applied by CCPR

8. CCPR has made lots of progress in the past years to improve the administration and management of the schedules and priority lists to prevent situations where the evaluation workload exceeds available JMPR resources while keeping the balance between new compounds, new uses, other evaluations, and periodic reviews.
9. As part of these efforts, CCPR agreed to seek documented evidence of national registrations and approved uses for compounds subject to periodic review. In view of the magnitude of this task, CCPR supported the development of a database of national registrations for compounds listed in Tables 2A and 2B to aggregate the information on national registration provided by Codex members. Such information will be expanded and updated as necessary to inform the prioritization process of CCPR for nomination of compounds for the establishment of the schedules and priority lists and will provide a useful reference to Codex members interested in supporting compounds subject to periodic reviews.
10. The identification of compounds for which Codex members reported no registered use pattern will greatly assist CCPR in decreasing the list of compounds awaiting scheduling for evaluation by JMPR (in particular periodic reviews) and will therefore allow better management of the schedules and priority lists while keeping the balance between the different evaluations.
11. In order to facilitate the aggregation of information into a single database of those compounds subject to periodic review being hosted by the Codex Secretariat, it is essential that Codex members submit information in a standard format by using a standard excel spreadsheet/worksheet. In this regard, CCPR50 (2018) noted comments that the information in the excel worksheet should be simplified in order not to create unnecessary burden on Codex members. In addition, the excel spreadsheet should fit the purposes of the database i.e. to provide Codex members with a data source to facilitate support of commodities no longer supported in a periodic review and to determine the global registration status of unsupported compounds.
12. The database should be updated as additional compounds are listed for periodic review and/or there are changes to national registration. The frequency of updates; the appropriate number of compounds to be added to the database; the criteria for selecting/prioritizing compounds for inclusion in the database; and the further broadening of the database to include all compounds listed on the CCPR pesticide list should be determined. These points should take into account that this exercise could be resource-intensive for Codex members, the country leading the work as well as the Codex Secretariat as host of the database and could face the challenge that changes in the registration status may occur during the interval year(s).<sup>3</sup>
13. Further improvement was discussed during CCPR51 (2019) where it was agreed to provide an improved National Registration Database with about 20 compounds and to compile the data from all respondents. The compiled data should be compiled in view of the needs for the establishment of the Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR.<sup>4</sup>
14. During second half of 2019 a revised National Registration Database was set up based on a proposal made by the Netherlands in the framework of comments in reply to CL2018/50-PR. The results of the responses are summarized in Table 1. Overall 14 Members filled the new version of the National Registration Database. An Excel-table containing all answers and a short overview is available <sup>5</sup>
15. Beginning 2020 an additional topic was opened in the EWG working through the Codex online platform<sup>6</sup>. on following the limited response asking for the challenges with two responses by email.
16. A circular letter<sup>7</sup> will be issued following consideration of this paper at CCPR52 which will request comments on authorized uses of selected compounds including reporting problems with the current approach i.e. problems encountered with the spreadsheet, problems encountered with the spreadsheet, problems encountered with the number of substances, and other problems encountered in filling in the excel sheets.

---

<sup>3</sup> [REP15/PR](#), paras. 158-176, [REP16/PR](#), paras. 164-180, [REP17/PR](#), paras. 174-177, [REP18/PR](#), paras. 154-157

<sup>4</sup> [REP19/PR](#), paras. 216-233

<sup>5</sup> Please add footnote where to find the summary table.

<sup>6</sup> Codex forum.codex-alimentarius.net

<sup>7</sup> Circular letters are available on the Codex website:

<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/resources/circular-letters/en/>

Circular letters relevant to CCPR are specifically listed on the CCPR website:

<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/committees/committee/related-circular-letters/en/?committee=CCPR>

Recommendations

17. CCPR is invited to:

- (i) consider the information provided in the paper and provide comments, as needed, on the general approach to the development of the database for national registration of pesticides to support the periodic review of unsupported compounds with no public health concern which are no longer be supported by the manufacturer.
- (ii) encourage Codex members to reply to the circular letter (questions and compound (excel sheet)) having in mind the ongoing discussion on the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review, which required sufficient responses to support the national registration database.