

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 85/24B

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Sixteenth Session

Geneva, 1-12 July 1985

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

The Hague
25 March - 1 April 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Paragraph</u>
Introduction and Opening of the Session	1-2
Adoption of the Agenda	3
Appointment of Rapporteurs	4
Matters of Interest to the Committee.....	5-21
-Matters arising from Codex Sessions.....	5-12
-Matters arising from International Organizations.....	13-17
-FAO Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides	18
-Codex Classification of Food and Animal Feedstuffs	19-21, 185-188
Consideration of the Reports of the 1983 and 1984 JMPR.....	22-36
Report on Acceptances by Governments of Codex MRLs.....	37-45
Intake of pesticides and certain environmental contaminants	46-58
Consideration of Maximum Residue Limits:	59-162
095 Acephate	101
117 Aldicarb	121-123
122 Amitraz	138
129 Azocyclotin	148
137 Bendiocarb	158
004 Bromophos	63-66
008 Carbaryl	67
072 Carbendazim	86
011 Carbophenothion	68

	<u>Paragraph</u>
080 Chinomethionat	92
012 Chlordane	69
081 Chlorathalonil	93-94
017 Chlorpyrifos	70
067 Cyhexatin	85
118 Cypermethrin	124-132
135 Deltamethrin	154-157
092 Demeton	99-100
073 Demeton-S-methyl	87-88
098 Dialifos	102
082 Dichlofluanid	95
105 Dithiocarbamates	112-113
032 Endosulfan	71
034 Ethion	72
107 Ethiofencarb	114-115
123 Etrimfos	139-143
085 Fenamiphos	96
036 Fenchlorphos	73
037 Fenitrothion	74
038 Fensulfothion	75
040 Fentin	76
047 Inorganic Bromide	77-79
131 Isophenphos	149-151
048 Lindane	80
049 Malathion	81
102 Maleic hydrazide	106-109
138 Metalaxyl	159-162
100 Methamidophos	103
051 Methidathion	82
132 Methiocarb	152
126 Oxamyl	144-147
057 Paraquat	83
058 Parathion	84
059 Parathion-methyl	84
120 Permethrin	133-137
112 Phorate	116-120
103 Phosmet	110-111
101 Pirimicarb	104-105
086 Pirimiphos-methyl	97
075 Propoxur	89-90
063 Pyrethrins	84
089 sec-Butylamine	98
133 Triadimefon	153
078 Vamidothion	91
Consideration of Guideline Levels:	163
134 Aminocarb	174
068 Azinphos-ethyl	166
093 Bioresmethrin	169
139 Butocarboxim	167
071 Camphechlor	164
009 Carbondisulphide	164
010 Carbon tetrachloride	164
104 Daminoxide	171
023 1,2-Dibromoethane	164
024 1,2-Dichloroethane	164
087 Dinocap	168
106 Ethephon	172
149 Ethoprophos	178
108 Ethylene thiourea (ETU)	172
044 Hexachlorobenzene	165
094 Methomyl	170

	<u>Paragraph</u>
052 Methyl-bromide	164
140 Nitrofen	174
136 Procymidone	175
150 Propylenethiourea (PTU)	178
Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Development of Residues Data and Sampling	179-189
- Guidelines on Residue Studies on Products of Animal Origin	180-181
- Guidelines on Sampling of Agricultural Commodities in Residue Trials	182
- Guidelines on Sampling Meat for Residue Analysis	183-184
- Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feedstuffs	19-21, 185-188
Report of the Working Group on Methods of Analysis and Sampling	190-203
- Simplified Methods	191-193
- Analysis of PCBs	194-197
- Recommendations for methods of analysis	198-199
- Matters referred by the CCMAS	200-202
Report of the Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries	204-214
- Second Questionnaire	206
- International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides.....	207
- Recommendations of the Working Group	208-214
Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Regulatory Principles	215-221
- Recommended National Regulatory Practices	216
- Resolution on National Regulatory Practices	217-218
- Questionnaire on National Pesticide Regulatory Systems	219
- Acceptability of Codex MRLs in the Light of Possible Dietary Exposure	220
Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Priorities	222-228
Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on Contaminants	229-235
- Limits for PCBs	231-234
Other Business	236
Date and Place of the Next Session	237
Closure of the Session	238

APPENDICES

	<u>Page</u>
I - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	38
II - REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON ANALYSIS	53
III - REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON DEVELOPMENT OF RESIDUE DATA AND SAMPLING	56
IV - REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PESTICIDE RESIDUE PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	58
V - REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON REGULATORY PRINCIPLES	67
VI - REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITIES	72
VII - REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON CONTAMINANTS	77
VIII - OPENING SPEECH BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE MINISTRY OF WELFARE, HEALTH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS	79

INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues held its seventeenth Session in The Hague, The Netherlands, from 25 March - 1 April 1985. Mr. A.J. Pieters, Public Health Officer of the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs, 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	Oman, Sultanate of
Australia	Rep. (observer)	Philippines
Austria	Germany, Fed.Rep.of	Poland
Belgium	Greece	Spain
Brazil	Hungary	Sweden
Cameroon	India	Switzerland
Canada	Iran	Thailand
Chile	Ireland	Tunisia
China, People's Rep. of	Israel	United Kingdom
Cuba	Italy	United States of
Czechoslovakia	Japan	America
Denmark	Korea, Dem.People's	
Egypt	Rep.of	
Finland	Netherlands	
France	New Zealand	

The following International Organizations were also represented:

Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC)
Council of Europe (CE)
European Economic Community (EEC)
Economic Benelux Union
European Food Law Association (EFLA)
International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI)
International Federation of Grocery Manufacturers Association
(IFGMA)
International Federation of National Associations of Pesticide
Manufacturers (GIFAP)
International Organization of Legal Metrology (OIML)
International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC)

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

OPENING OF THE SESSION BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

2. The Seventeenth Session was opened by Mr. W. Lemstra, Secretary-General of the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs of The Netherlands. The opening speech is attached as Appendix VIII.

The Chairman thanked the Secretary-General for his introduction. He drew attention to the fact that it is more than regrettable that this meeting would not be able to discuss a great number of MRLs developed by the 1983 JMPR as the Evaluations were not available in time. He expressed the hope that FAO and WHO representatives would be able and prepared to commit themselves with regard to the availability of the documents so that a full discussion could take place during the 18th Session of the CCPR scheduled for April 20-28th 1986. Modern methods of reproduction should even allow the 1985 JMPR Evaluations to be available. The wish to accelerate the publication of Reports and Evaluations of the Joint Meeting had been expressed repeatedly by both the Committee and the JMPR.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3. The Chairman drew attention to a letter from Mr. Bressau of the Federal Republic of Germany. Mr. Bressau had taken early retirement for health reasons and would no longer be able to participate in the CCPR. The agenda was adopted without changes. The time schedule for the plenary session and for the working groups was rearranged as announced in CL 1985/15-PR.

APPOINTMENT OF RAPORTEURS

4. Ms. E. Campbell (United States of America) was appointed to act as rapporteur to the Committee.

MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE COMMITTEE

(a) Matters arising from Codex Sessions

5. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 85/3 containing matters arising from Codex Committees and other matters of interest to it.

It was informed about the recommendations of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) concerning the obligation falling on governments for accepting the various types of Codex methods of analysis as part of Codex standards (see ALINORM 85/23). The Committee agreed to refer the matter to the Working Group on Methods of Analysis for consideration.

6. The Committee was also informed that the CCMAS had expressed a preference for the concept of "limit of determination" rather than "limit of detection" but had agreed to reexamine the regulatory implications of these concepts at its next session.

7. The Committee noted that the CCMAS had agreed that, in principle, Codex should develop practical sampling procedures which could be used in normal food control practices. As regards the mandatory or advisory status of Codex methods this matter should be further examined. The question whether certain parts of Codex sampling procedures (e.g. lot acceptance criteria) should be mandatory should also be further discussed. The Committee also noted that the CCMAS was contemplating the development of guidelines on administrative aspects of sampling.

8. The Committee noted that the sampling plans which it had elaborated and which had been adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, did in fact represent a practical sampling plan, and that this was in conformity with the current views expressed by the CCMAS. Furthermore the sampling plans, including the criteria for the acceptance of consignments, were advisory. This arrangement appeared to meet with the approval of member governments and of the Commission.

9. The Committee was informed that the Coordinating Committee for Africa had discussed matters relating to pesticide residues and had endorsed the Resolution contained in the report of the Meeting of Developing Countries on Pesticide Residues (Phetchburi, Thailand, ALINORM 85/31) concerning the acceptance of Codex MRLs. It had also agreed that it was important for developing countries to establish an appropriate legal framework and regulations for the control of pesticide residues. This was thought to act as a deterrent against the marketing of food with excessive pesticide residues, even in the absence of adequate food control facilities. This was so since exporting countries and the industry could be expected to comply with the regulations of the importing countries even in the absence of enforcement mechanisms.

10. The Chairman of the Committee suggested, and the Committee agreed, that the Secretariat should solicit information on whether the marketing of food containing excessive residues in developing countries as suggested by the Coordinating Committee for Africa did, in fact, represent a real problem and, if possible, determine the extent of the problem.

11. The Committee noted that the Coordinating Committee for Africa had endorsed the Recommendations of the Working Group on Pesticide Problems in Developing Countries (see Annex I to Appendix IV, ALINORM 85/24A).

12. The Committee was informed about the work of the Swedish National Food Administration on a revised manual on pesticide residues in food which would contain information similar to that requested by Working Group 3. The Manual was expected to be finalized in the near future. The Codex Secretariat suggested that with inputs from FAO and WHO, and possibly other organizations, the manual could be expanded to contain exactly the information requested by developing countries. The Chairman of the Committee stated that he would welcome such a cooperation between Sweden, FAO and others.

(b) Matters arising from International Organizations

13. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was proposing that Codex should elaborate maximum residue limits for some fumigants, ripening agents and other substances used with fresh and dried fruits and vegetables. The request by OECD will be submitted to the Commission in document ALINORM 85/11.

14. The representative of the Council of Europe informed the Committee about the 6th edition of the well-known booklet "Pesticides" which was published last November and is available in English and French. The up-dated version takes into account recent scientific developments in the various areas covered. Several chapters have undergone major revisions. Special attention was directed to Chapter 6,

comprising the recommendations on the registration of biological agents used as pesticides, to Chapter 7 on efficacy data, both chapters having been revised, and to Chapter 9 on the classification and labelling of formulated pesticides. Recommendations and conclusions of the WHO, FAO, EPPD and GIFAP on these subjects had been taken into account. The Committee was also informed about the progress on draft resolutions of the Council of Europe regarding wood preservatives, aerial spraying of pesticides, guidelines to reduce the risk of contamination of food of animal origin as a result of the use of pesticides on animals and in livestock premises, and pesticides used for the protection of cereals after harvesting. In the future the Expert Committee of the Council of Europe will give special attention to the field of the non-agricultural use of pesticides with the following priorities:

wood-protecting products, pesticides used in premises for food-storage, and pesticides for domestic use.

15. The representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that a new pamphlet "Guidelines for Emergency Measures in Cases of Pesticide Poisoning" had been developed by the industry. The Guidelines were available in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese and could be obtained from GIFAP, Avenue Hamoir 12, 1180 Brussels, Belgium.

ASSOCIATION OF OFFICIAL ANALYTICAL CHEMISTS

16. The representative of AOAC (Mr. D.C. Abbott) informed the Committee that AOAC had offered to promote the publication of the results of collaborative studies by international organizations on methods of analysis in the Journal of the AOAC. This new development was considered to be of interest to the Committee and especially to the Working Group on Analysis.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR LEGAL METROLOGY

17. Mr. Abbott informed the Committee that OIML was in the process of preparing recommendations on pollution measuring instruments and GCMS data systems; these recommendations described the performance of the instruments to be used with standard methods of residue analysis such as those developed by the ad hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis. OIML will in the future also deal with HPLC and atomic absorption spectrometry.

(c) FAO Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides

18. The Committee noted that the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) was considering a draft Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides. The Secretariat undertook to inform the Committee on the conclusions of COAG during the Session. The Committee on noted that a progress report on the Code would be received at a later agenda item (see para 207).

(d) Codex Classification of Food and Animal Feedstuffs

19. The Committee had before it document CAC/PR 4-1984, the Codex Classification prepared by Mr. Besemer as a Codex consultant. In introducing this document Mr. Besemer pointed out that this classification is in principle the same as the original classification included in the Guide to Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues

CAC/PR 1-1978, and known as the "Duggan Classification". It distinguishes 5 classes of commodities (3 classes of primary food commodities and 2 classes of processed food) in a total of 19 "types" of commodities. Types are subdivided into groups. For all commodities the "true" English name is mentioned. It is marked with a 4-digit number and the group in which it is classified is indicated by two letters. Some changes have also been made in the existing food groups. Kumquats were removed from the citrus fruit group because of the very small size of the fruit and the fact that the whole fruit is consumed, including the peel. The group "fruiting vegetables" was rearranged because the demarcation between the former sub-groups was not clear. Brassica leafy vegetables were divided into "leafy vegetables" and "head cabbages", which seemed more logical from a residue point of view. The legume vegetable group was divided into two groups, "legume vegetables" and "pulses", to avoid existing uncertainties with regard to commodity names. Processed foods of both plant and animal origin were divided into 4 types: secondary food commodities, derived edible products, and manufactured single- and multi-ingredient foods.

Many MRLs will not be affected by the changes in the new classification, but for some commodities it will be necessary to reexamine the original data to determine exactly what was meant when the MRL was proposed.

Mr. Besemer remarked that he had enjoyed his task very much although it was sometimes frustrating to eat in foreign countries wondering whether the commodity consumed was incorporated in the classification.

20. The Chairman thanked Mr. Besemer for the enormous task he had performed and suggested that the Working Group on Sampling be asked to consider the classification. The Secretariat stressed the importance of the classification to facilitate the work of the CCPR. Changes that will have a profound effect on MRLs and on previous government acceptances will need to be considered by the JMPR and/or governments. Changes in names and code numbers, however, do not effect previous recommendations. The former classification, "the Duggan list", had no official status, but it will be appropriate to consider providing official status for the present one. It is especially necessary that the commodities included in the group for which an MRL is established are clear. The classification will also be very helpful in computerizing the responses of governments to Codex proposals.

21. The Committee decided to allow delegates an opportunity to examine the classification during the week and to discuss the document again at the end of the Session after the ad hoc Working Group on Development of Residues Data and Sampling had given it some consideration. This might enable the Secretariat to introduce the system next year (see paras 185-188).

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORTS OF THE 1983 AND 1984 JOINT FAO/WHO MEETING ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES (JMPR)

22. The Committee had before it the Report of the 1983 JMPR (FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper no. 56) and an advance copy of the Report of the 1984 JMPR.

23. In considering the Report of the 1983 JMPR the Committee noted that toxicological information on tecnazene and 2-phenylphenol, considered by the 1983 JMPR, were not presented in the "Evaluations".

24. The Committee was informed by the WHO Joint Secretary that the evaluations did not contain toxicological information on tecnazene since no new data had been presented to the meeting and that the reevaluation of the compound was entirely based on data available to it in 1981. As regards 2-phenylphenol, the compound had been included for consideration by the Joint Meeting at a very late stage. The Joint Meeting had considered only one study which was made available to it and which in its view was rather incomplete. Only preliminary results were available which were not considered suitable for publication in the evaluations. The Committee noted that the compound had been included in the agenda for the 1985 JMPR for reevaluation.

25. The Chairman expressed the opinion that the presentation of the 1983 evaluations could have been improved by mentioning the name of the compound at the top of each page, a system which had been followed in the 1982 evaluations.

26. In considering the report of the 1984 JMPR the Committee's attention was drawn to corrigenda to the 1983 JMPR report contained in the 1984 report (p. 78). The Chairman of the Committee also drew attention to sections 2.6 of the report dealing with the purity of pesticides, which may influence the toxicity of the compound; 2.4. dealing with the need to review the toxicological data base of compounds evaluated more than 10 years ago; and 3.1. dealing with ways and means of expediting the work of the JMPR.

27. The Committee was informed that the question of the hydrazine content of maleic hydrazide had been referred to the appropriate Division of FAO. It was expected that this matter would be considered by the FAO Panel of Experts on Specifications in September 1985. The Representative of the AOAC stated that CIPAC would also discuss the analytical problems in the determination of hydrazine in maleic hydrazide. It was noted that the FAO Secretariat had discussed ways to coordinate work on specifications and the work of the JMPR and CCPR. This general issue would also be discussed by the FAO Panel of Experts on Specifications.

28. The delegation of the United States of America considered that the statement concerning fenvalerate levels in meat and milk (section 4.28) needed clarification in relation to the MRLs listed in Annex I.

29. As regards section 2.3 of the 1984 report the delegation of The Netherlands was of the opinion that the assumption that a realistic consumer intake would be one hundredth of the maximum theoretical daily intake was too simplistic (see Room Document 7). The delegation gave various examples to justify this view. It also pointed to the work of the ad hoc Working Group on Regulatory Principles, which was developing guidelines on ways of estimating pesticide residue intake. The delegation of Canada was in general agreement with the views expressed by the delegation of The Netherlands. The delegate from Austria also expressed concern about the general use of the factor of 100. The delegation of the United Kingdom said that the factor of 100 represented only an indication of the order of magnitude of a safety factor which had been observed in many but not in all cases. The JMPR had not proposed its use in the absence of additional information.

30. The delegation of India pointed out that technical BHC was still used in that country and also in other developing countries and that this compound should be examined with a view, possibly, to proposing MRLs. The Committee recalled that it had previously recommended that technical BHC should not be used in connection with food.

31. The delegation of Finland expressed concern about the use of several pesticides on the same crop leaving a variety of residues in the food. This practice posed the problem of the interaction of residues. The Committee noted that the JMPR evaluated pesticides individually and that the possible interaction between pesticides was a field in which little was known, except for the acute toxicity of some mixed formulations. The delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that long-term animal studies carried out in the United States of America on mixtures of pesticides did not reveal any potentiation. Additive effects within classes had been observed. There appeared to be no evidence of serious concern. The Codex Secretariat pointed out that it might be possible to consider the additive effects of certain groups of pesticides which are known to have an effect on the same target in the test animal. The delegation of the United Kingdom drew attention to the JMPR views on this matter, expressed in the 1981 JMPR Report.

32. The delegation of The Netherlands supported the need to review the toxicological data base for older pesticides as suggested in section 2.4 of the 1984 JMPR report. It stressed the need for the JMPR to pay attention to evaluations carried out by countries and groups of countries in the case of older out-of-patent pesticides, rather than using only full raw data.

33. The delegation of France stated that the specification that diphenylamine was 99.5% pure ignored the fact that there was a need for a maximum limit to the strong animal carcinogen 4-aminobiphenyl (e.g. 2 mg/kg). The delegation of the United States of America confirmed that impurities in diphenylamine (2- and 4-aminobiphenyl and aniline) varied considerably from one product to another. Additional information would be given in the 1984 Evaluations. The delegation of Switzerland wished to be informed about the source of the information that apples contained diphenylamine as a naturally occurring component.

34. The delegation of Sweden was of the opinion that the summaries of evaluations contained in reports of the JMPR were not adequate and proposed that the report and evaluations should be published together in one volume. It gave examples of how insufficient the information was by quoting certain statements in the 1984 JMPR report in relation to amitraz, captan, DDT and others.

35. The representative of WHO indicated that the evaluations, which were around 500 pages long, were difficult to produce and required considerable time and effort. This is why reports summarizing essential information were issued separately. The Chairman of the Committee invited the Secretariat to develop an approach to the streamlining and rationalization of the publications of the JMPR.

36. The Committee noted a written statement by The Netherlands (see Room Document no. 7) as follows:
"At several occasions, attention has been drawn to the very unhappy situation, that evaluations of a same compound, carried out by different members of the same WHO family, may reach very different

conclusions. This is sometimes the case with Evaluations from IARC, IPCS and the JMPR. A striking recent example is the IPCS criteria document on 2,4-D. Although the WHO-part of the JMPR is part of IPCS, the criteria document hardly mentions the JMPR and does not even cite its conclusion on a full ADI, allocated in 1975.

On the contrary, for virtually every possible toxicological effect it is stated that data were insufficient for a proper evaluation. Moreover, the terminology used, e.g. for the term "safety factor" is quite different from that in the JMPR. We would like to make an urgent plea to WHO to see to it, that such situations are carefully avoided in the future and that appropriate amendments be made to the criteria documents which have appeared so far."

The Committee was informed that The Netherlands had discussed this matter with the manager of the IPCS and had received an assurance that this matter would be looked into with a view to preventing contradictory recommendations being issued by WHO.

REPORT ON ACCEPTANCES BY GOVERNMENTS OF CODEX MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS

37. The Committee had before it CAC/ACCEPTANCES part II Rev. 2, which gave a summary of the position Governments had taken with regard to Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues, as of September 1983 (Series 1-6). It was noted that in addition to the above document, Volume XIII of the Codex Alimentarius, containing Codex MRLs, had recently been issued in the three official languages of the Commission; the two documents constituted the "Codex Alimentarius" with regard to recommendations and acceptances in the field of pesticides. A form for the declaration of acceptance or non-acceptance of MRLs had been developed for and distributed to governments.

38. The Secretariat informed the Committee that information on MRLs was now being computerized with the generous assistance of the Government of The Netherlands. Governments would need time to consider the various MRLs in Volume XIII and would be assisted by the Guidelines (ALINORM 85/24A, Add. 2) which had been prepared by the Working Group on Regulatory Principles in formulating their replies. It was anticipated that complete notification, positive or negative, could amount to some 5,000 pages of documentation. Publication of the information received will be greatly accelerated by the use of word processors and computerization. The Codex list of MRLs and Government positions would thus be more rapidly available for use in international trade.

39. The Committee noted that since its last Session, Sweden had notified its position with regard to MRLs published in Series 1-6. Some had been given full acceptance, for others where non-acceptance had been notified free circulation of products conforming to Codex MRLs was allowed. Where possible national group tolerances were being adjusted to bring them into line with individual Codex MRLs.

40. The Committee noted information from the following countries.

Finland

41. The Ministry of Trade and Industry had issued national MRLs which included limits for PCBs and heavy metals, mostly for commodities of plant origin. Those of animal origin would be dealt with later. Some Codex MRLs would also be included in national legislation.

Czechoslovakia

42. The delegation stated that consideration of acceptance of MRLs had now been completed and the form of notification would be sent to the Codex Secretariat in the near future.

Norway

43. Codex MRLs were already being applied as legal limits but the type of acceptance to be given for some of them was under consideration. A comprehensive notification of acceptances would be returned when the work was completed.

EEC

44. Information sent in 1981 with regard to acceptances of series 4, 5 and 6 would be updated. A report on 29 pesticides and 288 crop/pesticide combinations was in preparation. It was expected that a number of qualified acceptances would be communicated which would permit circulation of commodities complying with Codex MRLs within the EEC.

United States of America

45. Acceptance responses for several pesticides have been considered.

The United States of America has announced its intention of revoking U.S. tolerances for selected pesticides for which uses have been discontinued in the U.S.A. In those cases where residues still occurred from previously registered uses, it was the intention to replace the revoked tolerances with action levels which would reflect only those residues resulting from continued environmental contamination, not from continued use in its country. The concept and effect would be much the same as for Codex ERLs.

Consideration of tolerance revocation for several pesticides ranged from early assessment to completion. The most advanced was BHC for which proposed revocations had already been published (FR Vol. 50, No.1, p.150 and p.123, January 2, 1985). Others under consideration included:

Aldrin/dieldrin	*Heptachlor
Chlordane	*Mirex
Chlorobenzilate	Nitrofen (TOK)
DBCP ¹ /	*OMPA (Schradan)
DDT	Pirimicarb
Endrin	*Strobane

* No Codex limits

¹/No Codex limit except as inorganic bromide residue.

There were no Codex limits for some of these. However, it was U.S. policy to give consideration to harmonizing proposed or remaining action levels with Codex limits where possible. This would probably be easier for Codex ERLs than for MRLs. Early assessments indicate that harmonization would be possible in many cases.

There might be cases where monitoring data supporting U.S. action levels can also contribute to international harmonization. Such has been the case before, most recently for chlordane, and future actions would probably be more likely where Codex ERLs were proposed.

It was possible that some countries' exports to the United States of America could be affected by some of these or future U.S. pesticide tolerance revocations. Action would be taken through the GATT notification mechanism to alert countries to these proposals. In order that countries which might be affected have an opportunity to comment on proposed tolerance revocations on the basis of more information than typically available in GATT notifications, the United States of America intended to supplement GATT notifications by providing Codex Contact Points with copies of the more informative Federal Register notices which propose the revocations. Countries would therefore have the opportunity to have their views taken into consideration. On receipt of such a notification, the U.S.A. would appreciate being informed by countries whether they wished to continue receiving such Federal Register notices.

The Committee noted with appreciation the offer to provide Codex Contact Points with up-to-date information from the Federal Register and encouraged member countries to maintain contact with the U.S. authorities so that they could study carefully the impact of tolerance revocations on their export trade.

INTAKE OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES AND CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINANTS

(a) Report on pesticide residue and PCB intake studies through the Joint UNEP/FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring Programme (JFCMP)

46. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 85/4 containing a review of the 1980-1983 dietary intakes data received from five of the 22 Collaborating Centres participating in the Programme: Australia, Guatemala, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The document was introduced by Mrs. G. Gorchev, WHO. Obviously, the data received are by no means representative of the global situation and more specifically of countries where extensive use of pesticides is known to occur.

47. Dietary intake data had been requested for PCBs and the following organochlorine and organophosphorus pesticides: aldrin and dieldrin, DDT complex, total endosulfan, HCB, total HCH isomers, gamma-HCH, heptachlor and heptachlor epoxide, diazinon, malathion, parathion and parathion-methyl. Dietary intake data expressed in $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$ body weight were compared with ADIs established by the JMPR to assess the significance of exposure to pesticide residues through the diet. No data had been received on endosulfan intakes.

48. In most cases, dietary intakes of aldrin and dieldrin represented an appreciable percentage of the ADI. Median intake values ranged from 5% to 44% of the ADI while 90th percentile values ranged from 16% to 105% of the ADI. Such exposure levels should be viewed with some concern since dietary intake data were derived for the "average" consumer and certain segments of a population may be more highly exposed because of dietary habits departing from the average pattern.

49. Dietary intakes of DDT, gamma-HCH, and heptachlor and its epoxide constituted small percentages of the respective ADIs, the 90th percentile values never exceeding 10%.

50. Reported dietary intakes of residues of organophosphorus pesticides were very low, usually less than 1% of the ADI.

51. In the absence of acceptable/tolerable intake levels established by JMPR, no attempt was made to assess the reported levels of exposure to technical HCH, HCB and PCBs or to compare them to national permissible exposure levels that may have been established.

52. Dietary intake studies allow the assessment of the magnitude of exposure to contaminants in the diet and potential health risks to consumers. Dietary intake data collected so far are limited in scope. There is a need to collect such data from additional countries, and especially from developing countries, to obtain a better global coverage of exposure levels. WHO, through the Joint UNEP/FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring Programme would be prepared to increase the present data base by collecting information on dietary intake studies from Codex Contact Points. Such information would be collected through the mechanism currently used by the JFCMP; the data would be computer processed, summarized, evaluated and presented to the CCPR.

53. Pesticides and other contaminants to be included in dietary intake studies are selected through the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) of JFCMP. The next session of TAC, which consists of directors of Collaborating Centres, is to be held in September 1985. The Chairmen of both CCPR and CCFA are now regularly invited to attend the meetings.

54. Pesticides of particular interest to the CCPR could be submitted to the TAC for inclusion in the Programme's monitoring activities.

55. In reply to several questions from delegates on certain data in the review, the representative of WHO indicated that the data received were evaluated by the Technical Advisory Committee, which could also suggest improvements in various aspects of the programme, including the reporting and summarizing of data. The data however were presented in the form in which they had been submitted by the collaborating centres. The activities of the Swedish National Food Administration in providing quality assurance programmes were gratefully acknowledged.

56. It was pointed out that a relationship existed between the various activities in the field of estimating consumer exposure to pesticide residues: the monitoring by individual countries, the data assembled by JFCMP, the paper prepared by the ad hoc Working Group on Regulatory Principles and the related discussion at the JMPR. It was agreed that information on consumer safety aspects in the intake of pesticide residues was of primary concern to Codex. The guidelines for the Study of Dietary Intakes of Chemical Contaminants (see ALINORM 85/24 paras 38-45) formed an important contribution in this field.

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

57. The delegation of Sweden pointed to a recent publication on Levels of OC-pesticides, PCBs and certain other Organohalogen Compounds in Fishery Products in Sweden, 1976-1982 (Var Föda Volume 36, Supplement 1, 1984), available at the National Food Administration, Uppsala, Sweden.

58. The delegation of Australia reported that dietary intake studies had been undertaken in Australia since 1969. The results of the "Market Basket (Noxious Substances) Survey of Foods, 1983" were made available to the Committee as Room Document 10. The study revealed that the intakes of organochlorine and organophosphorus pesticides, nitrates, nitrites and certain heavy metals were well below the ADIs established by WHO.

The delegation of New Zealand submitted a summary of data derived from a 1982 diet survey in its country.

The delegation of the United Kingdom presented a paper on a reorganization of Total Diet Studies in its country.

The delegation of The Netherlands announced that both a market basket and a duplicate diet study, repeating studies carried out some years ago, had been initiated recently. Results were expected in 1986. Intake studies in that country had revealed an average PCB intake of 0.2 µg/kg b.w./day, which was much higher than the amounts reported to JFCMP by some other countries.

The delegation of Canada informed the Committee that although dietary intake studies had been discontinued for several years, new studies on dietary intakes of pesticide residues and other substances would be started during 1985.

The delegation of Cuba said that the preliminary results of a total diet study on various organochlorine pesticides had indicated that intakes were below the respective ADIs.

The delegation of the United States of America had completed its Total Diet Studies for 1982-1984 and results would be published in the JAOAC.

CONSIDERATION OF MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS

59. The Committee had before it the following documents:

- CX/PR 85/2 and CL 1984/35-PR containing MRLs and proposed amendments to Codex MRLs at Steps 3, 5 and 6;
- CX/PR 85/5 containing government comments on the above;
- CAC/PR 2-1985 (second preliminary issue) containing Part 2 of the Guide to Codex recommendations concerning pesticide residues in which part maximum limits for pesticide residues are listed.
- CAC/Vol. XIII - Ed. 1, Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticides Residues.

60. It was agreed to consider the MRL proposals (including proposed amendments) contained in the 1983 and 1984 JMPR Report at the 1986 Session, since the evaluations were not available.

61. In the interest of economy the following paragraphs refer only to those MRLs and ERLs on which there was detailed discussion, where delegates expressed reservations, or where relevant information had to be recorded. The Steps in the Codex Procedure to which the Committee advanced or returned individual MRLs or ERLs or at which limits were held are indicated under each pesticide.

Where the Committee decided to recommend to the Commission that Steps 6 and 7 be omitted, this decision is given under the appropriate pesticide as "at Step 5 (omission of Steps 6 and 7)" or "at Step 5 (omission of Step 6)" where the ADI is temporary. Where the Committee had already carried out Steps 6 and 7 before the MRL had been considered by the Commission at Step 5, the decision of the Committee is recorded as "at Step 5 or 8". In these cases the Commission is being requested to accept that there is no further need, in the opinion of the Committee, to carry out Steps 6 and 7.

62. The Committee noted that, in due course, the Secretariat would issue a revised Part 2 of the Guide (CAC/PR 2-1985) and such other documents as will be necessary for the consideration of maximum residue limits by the Commission or by Governments.

BROMOPHOS (004)

Apples

63. Since no comments were made in support of the proposal by the 1982 JMPR to increase the Codex MRL from 2 mg/kg to 5 mg/kg, the Committee decided not to proceed with the amendment of the Codex MRL.

Carrots

64. The delegations of Finland, France and Italy could not accept the proposed MRL of 2 mg/kg since 1 mg/kg was considered more in line with GAP. The delegation of The Netherlands stated that residues between 1 and 2 mg/kg could be expected in carrot crops grown late in the season. It was decided not to amend the proposal.

Kale

65. The delegation of The Netherlands reserved its position on the proposed MRL of 0.5 mg/kg since this MRL could be expected to be exceeded in crops grown late in the season. The Committee agreed to request governments to send data to the JMPR.

Pea straw

66. It was noted that the change from "pea fodder" to "pea straw" did not affect the nature of the commodity covered by the MRL. The Committee accepted this change.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5 : kale, pea straw

At Step 5 or 8: carrots

CARBARYL (008)

67. The proposed changes of the Codex MRLs from "bananas (in the pulp)" to "bananas" and "poultry (in the edible portion)" to "poultry meat" were considered non-substantial and were adopted by the Committee.

CARBOPHENOTHION (011)

68. The change in the residue definition proposed by the 1983 JMPR was considered non-substantial and accepted by the Committee.

CHLORDANE (012)

69. The delegation of France stated that for fruit and vegetables a limit of 0.01 mg/kg was sufficient. It was noted that the 1984 JMPR had lowered all ERLs for fruits and cereals to 0.02 mg/kg and that this might present an analytical problem.

It was decided to propose for fruit, vegetables and cereals ERLs of 0.02 mg/kg. Governments were requested to comment on the proposed ERLs and to mention possible analytical problems.

It was also agreed that the Codex MRLs for beans, citrus fruit, cottonseed oil (edible), egg plants, peas, peppers, pimentoes, pome fruit, soyabean oil (edible), stone fruit and tomatoes should be changed to ERLs at the same level. This change was considered to be non-substantial.

Status of MRLs
At Step 6: all proposed ERLs

CHLORPYRIFOS (017)
Dried vine fruits

70. It was noted that according to the new classification "dried vine fruits" would be changed to "currants and raisins" (in French "raisins secs"). The proposal would be considered by the Committee at its next Session.

ENDOSULFAN (032)

71. It was noted that endosulfan will be considered by the 1985 JMPR.

ETHION (034)

72. The Committee accepted the non-substantial change in the residue definition proposed by the 1983 JMPR.

FENCHLORPHOS (036)

73. The change in the definition for the residue proposed by the 1983 JMPR was considered non-substantial and accepted by the Committee. The delegation of Canada was of the opinion that the expression "fat soluble residue" should only refer to the products of animal origin. It was noted that it had been decided at an earlier Session to use the expression "fat-soluble pesticide" to indicate that the item "milk products" should be deleted. The limit for milk products has to be calculated from that for milk for these compounds. The Secretariat was requested to recommend, at the next Session, a clearer means of indicating those pesticides for which it is necessary to calculate MRLs for milk products from the MRL for milk.

FENITROTHION (037)

74. The Committee accepted the non-substantial change in the residue definition proposed by the 1983 JMPR.

FENSULFOTHION (038)

75. The change in the residue definition proposed by the 1982 CCPR was considered to be non-substantial and accepted by the Committee.

FENTIN (040)

76. A proposal to delete the word "hydroxide" from the residue definition was referred to the newly established ad hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis for consideration.

INORGANIC BROMIDE (047)

77. The delegation of the United States noted that the definition of the residue was inconsistent with footnote 82. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany stated that for analytical reasons it is not possible to distinguish between different sources of bromide. The Committee decided to delete footnote 82.

Cabbage

78. Since it was not clear to the Committee what kind of cabbage was meant, the Committee decided to postpone a decision until the next Session.

Lettuce

79. Some delegations commented that the proposed MRL of 100 mg/kg was too high, while others were of the opinion that GAP data justified an MRL of 100 mg/kg or more.

Status of MRLs

At Step 6: cabbage, lettuce.

LINDANE (048)

80. In reply to a question from the Chairman several delegations reported that lindane was not used on stored grain in their countries. The delegation of Italy reported that lindane was still being used on stored grain, on a limited scale. The delegation of the United States indicated that lindane was used on certain cereals in some unusual pest control situations. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany reported the use of lindane in empty premises.

MALATHION (049)

81. The change in residue definition proposed by the 1984 JMPR was considered to be non-substantial and accepted by the Committee.

METHIDATHION (051)

Mandarins

82. The Committee was informed that a typing error had been made. The proposed MRL was at Step 8.

PARAQUAT (057)

Soya beans

83. The proposal was made by the JMPR 1981 to raise the MRL from 0.1 to 0.2 mg/kg. The delegation of The Netherlands was of the opinion that the MRL should not exceed 0.1 mg/kg. The delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that a proposal was pending to raise their national MRL from 0.05 to 0.2 mg/kg. The Committee decided to leave the proposed MRL at Step 6 until the United States has made a decision.

PARATHION (058), PARATHION-METHYL (059) AND PYRETHRINS (063)

84. The changes in the residue definitions proposed by the 1984 JMPR (and for Pyrethrins by the 1982 CCPR) were considered to be non-substantial and accepted by the Committee.

CYHEXATIN (067)

85. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany drew attention to the MRLs of azocyclotin which also should be considered in relation with the MRLs for this compound. It was noted however that the compound will be on the agenda of the 1985 JMPR. The revised residue definition proposed by the 1982 JMPR was referred to the ad hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis. In the light of their agreement, the Committee agreed to propose the change as a non-substantial amendment to the Commission. The new definition reads: "Sum of cyhexatin and dicyclohexyltin oxide, expressed as cyhexatin".

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: kiwi fruit

At Step 6: beans, peaches

CARBENDAZIM (072)

86. The Committee noted that the Guideline Levels for this compound had been converted to MRLs as the 1983 JMPR had established an ADI for carbendazim. It was decided to give Governments an opportunity to comment and to return the proposals to Step 3.

DEMETON-S-METHYL (073)

87. Attention was drawn to the fact that the ADI had been withdrawn by the 1982 JMPR. The 1984 JMPR Report summarized the

information that was required. As there are already some CXLs for this compound (not mentioned in CAC/PR 2-1985) and in the light of the report of the representative of GIFAP that information would soon be made available for consideration by the JMPR, the Committee decided not to convert the MRLs into Guideline Levels. Proposals were kept at Steps 3 and 7.

88. The Committee accepted the non-substantial change in the residue definition proposed by the 1982 CCPR.

PROPOXUR (075)

89. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Committee that new toxicological data pointing to possible carcinogenic effects would soon become available. It was suggested that the Ad Hoc Working Group on Priorities put the compound on the priority list. The JMPR was requested to evaluate the toxicological data at the earliest opportunity.

90. The Committee accepted the non-substantial change in the residue definition proposed by the 1983 JMPR.

VAMIDOTHION (078)

91. As the compound is on the agenda of the 1985 JMPR, discussion on the MRLs was postponed.

CHINOMETHIONAT (80)

92. The Committee noted that the 1984 JMPR had withdrawn the ADI for the compound. It was proposed by the delegation of The Netherlands to change the MRLs into Guideline Levels and to give governments an opportunity to comment on the figures in the light of the new toxicological situation and the potential for change in GAP. The representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that in 1981, 14 reports had been submitted to WHO but there had been no discussion in the JMPR. The Committee decided to leave the proposals at Step 7 and requested WHO and the manufacturer to clarify the matter.

CHLOROTHALONIL (081)

93. The Committee noted that the 1983 JMPR had proposed to change the residue definition. The delegation of Canada was of the opinion that toxicologically significant metabolites should be included in the residue definition. Although the delegation of the United States of America supported the Canadian position in general, it reserved its position. The delegation of the United Kingdom drew attention to para 2.3 of the 1983 JMPR Report where the philosophy of the JMPR with regard to the inclusion of metabolites in residue definitions is explained.

The composition and the total level of the residue of toxicological significance have to be determined by metabolic studies and supervised residue trials and are necessary in establishing the acceptability of the proposed use of the pesticide. However, for the control of good agricultural practice the simple residue definition will suffice and will greatly facilitate analysis. The Committee decided to accept the proposed change of the residue definition.

94. The proposed change from "beans, Lima" to "beans, Lima (without pod)" was considered non-substantial and accepted.

DICHLORFLUANID (082)

Cereal grains

95. At the last session the proposal was referred back to the JMPR, but was not discussed by the 1984 Joint Meeting. As there were

no objections to this group tolerance replacing individual MRLs for barley oats, rye and wheat, the Committee decided to advance the proposed figure to the next Step of the procedure and suggested omission of Steps 6 and 7.

FENAMIPHOS (085) The proposed change in the residue definition was considered non-substantial and accepted.

PIRIMIPHOS-METHYL (086)
97. The Committee accepted the non-substantial change in the residue definition proposed by the 1983 JMPR.

sec-BUTYLAMINE (089)
98. The TADI of this pesticide was withdrawn by the 1984 JMPR; toxicological data are not expected to be completed. It was agreed to postpone a decision on whether to delete all MRLs or to convert them to GLs until the next Session. As there are several CXLs it was decided to draw the attention of Governments and the Commission to the withdrawal of the TADI.

DEMETON (092)
99. The Committee agreed that the change in the residue definition was non-substantial and accepted it.

100. It was noted that the 1982 JMPR had withdrawn the ADI because demeton was no longer used in agriculture. The representative of GIFAP stated that apparently there was still some use in the United States of America and in Canada. The Committee agreed that since the ADI had been withdrawn and according to the representative of GIFAP no new data could be expected for this compound, which was more than 30 year old, it was appropriate also to withdraw the Codex MRLs. The Codex Alimentarius Commission would be requested to do so. It was agreed to publish GLs for demeton in part 3 of the Guide.

ACEPHATE (095)
101. The temporary ADI was lowered to 0.0005 mg/kg body weight by the 1984 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: tree tomato (tamarillo)
At Step 7: all other proposals (TADI)

DIALIFOS (098)
102. The Committee re-examined the decision of its last Session to propose to the Commission that all MRLs be deleted. It was agreed to maintain this decision and to publish all deleted MRLs as GLs in part 3 of the Guide.

METHAMIDOPHOS (100)
103. Since the pesticide had a temporary ADI, the Committee did not advance the MRLs of all those commodities which were at Step 7 beyond that Step.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: tree tomato (tamarillo)
At Step 7: alfalfa, broccoli, cauliflower, citrus fruit, cucumbers, eggplants, lettuce, soya beans, sugar beets and sugar beet leaves (TADI)

PIRIMICARB (101)

104. The delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that its government was withdrawing the MRLs for commodities treated by this pesticide because of a request from the registrant in 1980. The action was for commercial reasons and not due to any adverse toxicological findings on the pesticide.

Oranges

105. The delegation of Spain informed the Committee that it would make data available on residues in tangerines, oranges and lemons treated with pirimicarb for consideration by the 1985 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7: oranges.

MALEIC HYDRAZIDE (102)

106. The Committee noted that the 1984 JMPR changed the residue definition to read "Sum of free and conjugated maleic hydrazide expressed as maleic hydrazide". The change in the definition was considered non-substantial.

107. The delegation of The Netherlands brought to the attention of the Committee that the 1984 JMPR had also changed the definition of the ADI for the pesticide, which was only valid for the Na and K salts and for material containing not more than 1 mg hydrazine/kg. Though specific studies on kidney function were requested by the 1980 JMPR, no results of such studies had been available to the 1984 JMPR, which considered only certain teratology studies. The observer from GIFAP informed the Committee that the results of kidney function studies with the potassium salt of maleic hydrazide were completed and would be made available to the JMPR.

108. Noting that the 1984 JMPR converted the temporary ADI for the pesticide to a full ADI, the Committee advanced the MRLs for onions and potatoes from Step 7 to Step 8.

109. The delegation of France expressed a reservation against advancing the MRL of potatoes, since potatoes were consumed in considerable amounts in that country and the pesticide, being a systemic compound, penetrates into the product and is persistent. The delegation of Italy reserved its position because it had not yet had an opportunity to evaluate all data.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: onions, potatoes

PHOSMET (103)

110. The Committee expressed the opinion that since the pesticide had been reviewed by the 1984 JMPR, it wished to study the evaluations before considering the MRLs for the different commodities.

111. The Committee noted that the delegation of the United States of America had provided data from supervised trials on alfalfa to the 1984 JMPR for consideration. The residue levels were higher than the proposed MRL. The Committee discussed the identity of "forage crops (dry) (except alfalfa)" and was informed by the delegation of the

United Kingdom that the information was available in the 1976 JMPR evaluations. The delegation of the United States of America agreed to attempt to make GAP information on forage crops other than alfalfa available to the JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: alfalfa (dry)

At Step 6: apples, apricots, grapes, nectarines, peaches and pears

At Step 7: forage crops (dry, except alfalfa)

DITHIOCARBAMATES (105)

112. The Committee recalled the decision it had taken at its last Session, when it agreed not to take any action on the MRLs for this group of pesticides pending review by the 1984 JMPR. This however did not take place, although France had made data on lettuce available to the JMPR. The Committee learned that the pesticide would now be reviewed by the 1985 JMPR.

113. The delegation of The Netherlands brought to the attention of the Committee the non-existence of more specific residue definitions and the problems of residue analysis when mixed groups of pesticides were involved. As an example of the latter problem, the effect of the use of thiram on the estimation of residues of ethylenebisdithiocarbamates was cited. The Secretariat agreed to seek the views of member countries on the subject by a circular letter. It was also agreed to ask the 1985 JMPR to consider the problem.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: celeriac roots (see "Guide" footnote 308)

At Step 7: apples, bananas (whole), bananas (pulp), beans (in pod), carrots, celery, cherries, cucumbers, currants (black and red), endive, grapes, lettuce, melons, peaches, pears, plums, potatoes, strawberries, tomatoes and wheat.

ETHIOFENCARB (107)

114. The Committee noted the changed residue definition proposed by the 1982 CCPR: "sum of ethiofencarb, its sulphoxide and sulphone, expressed as ethiofencarb". The change in the definition was considered non-substantial.

115. The Committee noted that the revised MRL for Beans (with pod) was proposed by the 1983 JMPR and postponed consideration.

Status of MRLs

At Step 6: beans (with pod).

PHORATE (112)

116. The delegation of The Netherlands informed the Committee that the problem with the pesticide was its low TADI (0.0002 mg/kg body weight). For this reason they could not accept MRLs for food above 0.05 mg/kg and for animal feedstuffs above 0.1 mg/kg. To substantiate its statement the delegation informed the Committee that, with a pre-harvest interval of 45-60 days, GAP would result in a residue of not more than 0.05 mg/kg in beans. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany held the same view.

117. The delegation of Italy informed the Committee that national tolerances for beans and other vegetables were as low as 0.02 mg/kg. In view of the low TADI for the pesticide it felt that the MRLs should not exceed 0.05 mg/kg.

118. For toxicological reasons, the delegation of Spain expressed a reservation against all MRLs except those for potatoes and sugar beets. The delegation of Austria was of the view that MRLs for the pesticide should be as low as possible and informed the Committee that the national tolerance for various commodities was 0.01 mg/kg. The delegation of the United States of America however supported an MRL of 0.1 mg/kg for beans.

119. The delegation of India informed the Committee that the MRLs for carrots and lettuce were so high that daily intakes of these vegetables alone could result in exceeding the ADI. It agreed to provide residue data based on supervised trials on sugar cane to the JMPR for its consideration of an MRL for this crop.

120. The Committee noted that the ADI for phorate would be considered by the 1985 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: hops (dried)

At Step 5: all other proposals

ALDICARB (117)

121. It was noted that several CXLs had been omitted from the Guide. The Secretariat was requested to clarify the matter.

Citrus fruit

122. The delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that the registrant had already submitted additional data for review by the 1985 JMPR.

Maize, Maize fodder, Maize forage

123. The delegations of France and The Netherlands could not accept an MRL of 20 mg/kg for maize forage, because it was considered inconsistent with an MRL of 2 mg/kg for maize fodder. The JMPR was requested to review the proposals in this light.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: maize, maize fodder, maize forage

At Step 7: citrus fruit

CYPERMETHRIN (118)

Barley, Carcase meat, Meat by-products

124. The delegation of Australia informed the Committee that data on residues of the compound in meat exist, and that negotiations were proceeding for their submission to the JMPR as soon as possible.

Beans (with pod)

125. The change in the commodity definition proposed by the 1984 JMPR was considered to be non-substantial and accepted by the Committee.

Beans (without pod)

126. The change in the commodity definition proposed by the 1984 JMPR was considered to be non-substantial and accepted by the Committee.

Grapes

127. It was noted that by a decision of the 1984 JMPR grapes were now covered by the group "small fruit and berries".

Legume oilseeds

128. It was noted that if the proposed MRL for legume oilseeds was accepted, there would be no MRL for soybeans since soybeans were not classified as legume oilseeds. It was therefore decided to propose separate MRLs for peanuts and soybeans at a level of 0.05* mg/kg. This should be brought to the attention of the JMPR.

Lettuce

129. The delegation of The Netherlands was of the opinion that on the basis of the available data an MRL of 1 mg/kg would be sufficient. It was decided to return the proposed MRL to Step 6.

Oilseeds

130. The delegation of The Netherlands noted that in the new proposed classification oilseeds would also include peanuts. It was decided to refer this definition problem to the JMPR for clarification.

Peaches

131. Some delegations were in favour of an MRL of 1 mg/kg. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany supported the MRL of 2 mg/kg, based on GAP data. It was decided to return the proposed MRL to Step 6 so that it could be considered together with that for nectarines at the next session.

Wheat

132. The delegation of Australia informed the Committee that they would supply data.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3 : tea
At Step 5 : barley, meat by-products, nectarines, oilseeds, poultry meat, spinach
At Step 5 or 8: carcass meat, eggs
At Step 6 : lettuce, peaches, small fruits and berries
At Step 7 : wheat
At Step 8 : peanuts, pome fruit, soybeans

PERMETHRIN (120)

Citrus fruit

133. The delegation of Spain supported an MRL of 2 mg/kg. Data would be submitted on supervised trials to be considered by the 1986 JMPR. The MRL was advanced to Step 8.

Legume oilseeds

134. The Committee noted that the 1984 JMPR had lowered the MRL for soybeans from 0.1 to 0.05* mg/kg and decided to substitute "peanuts" for "legume oilseeds".

Lettuce

135. The delegations of France and the Federal Republic of Germany stated that they could not accept an MRL of 10 mg/kg. They supported the 1 mg/kg suggestion in the written comment of Hungary. The delegation of the United States of America was of the opinion that 20 mg/kg was required for GAP. It was decided to return the proposed MRL to Step 6 to allow countries time for reconsideration and comment.

Milk

136. It was noted that the 1985 JMPR will consider permethrin in milk, as requested by the 16th Session of the CCPR (para 180).

Onions (spring)

137. The delegation of The Netherlands regretted that they could not submit data from supervised trials, as promised at the 16th Session of the CCPR. Data will be submitted as soon as available.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: peanuts, pistachio nuts, sorghum fodder
(on a dry weight basis)

At Step 5: milk, pig meat by-products, sheep meat
by-products, wheat bran, wheat flour (white),
wheat flour (wholemeal)

At Step 5 or 8: almonds, cattle meat by-products, poultry meat

At Step 6: beans (with pod), celery, lettuce, soybeans,
spinach, tomatoes

At Step 7: onions (spring)

At Step 8: citrus fruit

AMITRAZ (122)

138. The delegation of The Netherlands stated that it would reconsider its reservations in the light of the new ADI set by the 1984 JMPR. The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany, France and Sweden supported this view. The proposals on which no reservations had been expressed did not require reconsideration. The Committee agreed to an editorial correction in the residue description in the Guide.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: carcass meat of sheep, cherries, olive oil, oranges,
peaches and pome fruit

At Step 6: cattle meat by-products, cottonseed, cottonseed oil,
cucumbers, pig meat by-products and sheep meat
by-products

At Step 8: carcass meat of cattle, carcass meat of pigs, milk

ETRIMFOS (123)

139. The delegation of Czechoslovakia said that the inclusion of metabolites and degradation products in the definition of the residue caused problems. It was indicated that the JMPR had come to the conclusion that all three compounds mentioned were of interest. The matter was drawn to the attention of the newly established ad hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis.

140. The 1982 JMPR evaluation of this compound, which had erroneously been omitted from that year's publication, would appear in the 1984 JMPR evaluations. Discussion of the proposals emerging from the 1982 JMPR was postponed until these evaluations are available.

Barley; Maize; Wheat; Wheat bran (unprocessed); Wheat flour (white);
Wheat flour (wholemeal)

141. The delegation of The Netherlands opposed the MRLs for these commodities as it had been shown that a level of 10 mg/kg in cereals (the proposed MRL) resulted in residues of 5 mg/kg in wholemeal bread, which was not acceptable in view of the toxicity of the compound and the intake of wholemeal cereal products in its country. Similar views were expressed by the delegations of Finland and Sweden.

142. The delegation of Australia said that trials with the compound used as a grain protectant had just started in its country and would be completed in about 18 months, after which results would be submitted to the JMPR. It was agreed that it was important to identify in the Guide those MRLs which resulted from post-harvest uses as this would facilitate understanding of the GAP involved.

143. It was agreed that the word "unprocessed" should be deleted after wheat bran, as it was understood that without such indication the proposal automatically related to unprocessed wheat bran. The same correction might be needed for a number of other compounds.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5 : barley, maize, wheat, wheat bran, wheat flour (white), wheat flour (wholemeal)
At Step 5 or 8: rapeseed, rapeseed oil (refined)

OXAMYL (126)

144. The delegations of the Federal Republic of Germany and France reserved their positions because certain toxicological information was not available to them.

145. The delegation of Canada was of the opinion that the plant metabolite referred to as DMCF, which according to the 1980 evaluations was frequently found, should be included in the description of the residue.

146. The delegation of the United States of America said that data on GAP had been supplied to the JMPR for apples, celery, citrus, melons, peppers, summer squash, tomatoes and watermelons. The data would be considered by the 1985 JMPR.

147. The MRLs for cottonseed, peanuts, peanut fodder and pineapples were temporary owing to the lack of certain residue data. All Governments were invited to supply such data wherever available.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: coffee beans, onions, sugarcane.
At Step 5: apples, bananas, beans (kidney), beans kidney (dry), beans Lima, celery, citrus fruit, cottonseed, cucumber, maize, melons, peanuts, peanut fodder, peppers, pineapples, soybeans (dry), summer squash, sweet potatoes, tomatoes, watermelons.
At Step 6: beets, carrots, potatoes, sugar beets

AZOCYCLOTIN (129)

148. Status of MRLs

At Step 3: beans.
At Step 5: apples, eggplants, grapes, strawberries

ISOPHENPHOS (131)

149. It was noted that the delegation of the United States of America had advised the Committee that national tolerances for the pesticide included two cholinesterase-inhibiting metabolites: des-N-isopropyl-isophenphos (DNI) and its oxygen analogue (DNIOA). The JMPR had concluded that DNI was below the limit of determination in all samples and that DNIOA formed a substantial proportion of the residue only when the total residue was low. The Committee agreed to retain the residue description "sum of isophenphos and its oxygen analogue". The delegation of the United States of America could not accept the current Codex definition.

Citrus fruit

150. The delegations of France, The Netherlands and Switzerland reserved their positions until further information on the residue in different varieties of citrus fruit and on the distribution of residues in the peel and pulp was available (see ALINORM 85/24A, paras 214-215).
The Committee noted that such data would be supplied to the JMPR in 1986.

Maize fodder, Sweet corn fodder

151. A decision was postponed pending reconsideration of the present MRLs by the JMPR (see also ALINORM 85/24A para 216).

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: citrus fruit, maize fodder, pears, sweet corn fodder.

At Step 5 (omission of Step 6): bananas

At Step 7: animal fat, brassica leafy vegetables, carcase meat, celeriac, celery, maize, meat by-products, milk, poultry by-products, poultry meat, rapeseed, swedes (rutabaga), sweet corn, turnips (TADI).

METHIOCARB (132)

152. It was noted that the commodities listed as being at Step 4 should properly be at Step 3 since the MRLs were temporary pending the evaluation of further information on GAP in the use of methiocarb. An ADI of 0.001 mg/kg body weight had been proposed by the 1983 JMPR. No basic objections were raised to the temporary MRLs.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: all proposals

TRIADIMEFON (133)

153. The delegation of the United States of America recommended that the JMPR be requested to re-examine the residue definition for the following reasons:

1. There were indications that there were residues on some plants for which there were no metabolic studies.
2. Conjugated residues were not determined, although methods were now available which would determine free and conjugated residues in plants and animals.
3. The most recent feeding trials data examined by the JMPR (1983) were based on these more recent methods.

It was agreed to bring these observations to the attention of the JMPR and, pending further consideration of the residue definition, to maintain the temporary MRLs.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: all proposals

DELTAMETHRIN (135)

154. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany pointed out that not all toxicological problems had yet been solved and thought that further evaluation of the residue definition and examination of the therapeutic mechanism were required.

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

155. The delegation of The Netherlands reiterated its reservation on the proposed figures and supported the recommendations of the 1981 evaluations (page 140) that more information was required on the levels and fate of the products under various storage conditions and on the effects of processing and cooking all cereal grains. Pending such information it also wished wheat flour (wholemeal) to be held at Step 5. The MRL for wheat flour (white) was corrected from 2 to 0.5 mg/kg in CAC/PR 2-1985.

The delegation of France thought that more information was required on stored wheat in relation to GAP.

The delegation of the United Kingdom agreed with those from The Netherlands and France and stated that it could not agree with the recommendations of the JMPR. It reserved its position with regard to the MRLs for the wheat commodities.

Coffee beans

156. The delegation of The Netherlands enquired whether the proposed MRL of 2 mg/kg was related to treatment by spraying or by dusting. In its opinion the figure was applicable only to dusting. It was agreed to refer the question to the JMPR.

Hops (dry)

157. The delegation of The Netherlands pointed out that the fate of the residue during brewing had not been reported. It was agreed to refer this matter to the JMPR to consider information from the manufacturer or other sources.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: brassica leafy vegetables

At Step 5: cereal grains, coffee beans, fruiting vegetables - edible peel, hops (dry), leafy vegetables, wheat bran, wheat flour (white), wheat flour (wholemeal)

At Step 5 or 8: artichokes, assorted fruits-edible peel, bananas, bulb vegetables, cereal straw, clementines, cocoa beans, grapes, kiwi fruit, legume animal feeds (on dry weight basis), legume oilseeds, legume vegetables, melons, mushrooms, oilseeds, oranges, pineapples, pome fruit, root and tuber vegetables, stone fruit, strawberries, tea.

BENDIOCARB (137)

Rice (dehusked)

158. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany reiterated its opinion that residue data on polished rice were needed before establishing an MRL.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: rice (de-husked)

At Step 5 or 8: all other proposals

METALAXYL (138)

159. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany had information available on experimental findings which led to the conclusion that further toxicological investigations, including the question of possible carcinogenic properties, would be necessary before an increase in or extension of the proposals could be considered.

160. The delegation of Canada expressed reservations against all the proposed MRLs because of the residue definition and analytical problems, and thought that all MRLs should be reconsidered by the JMPR. The delegation of the United States of America agreed with this point of view. It agreed to undertake to supply information on GAP to the JMPR. The Committee agreed to await a re-evaluation.

Avocados

161. It was noted that the limit of determination (0.1 mg/kg) was higher than that specified for other commodities (0.05 mg/kg). It was decided to refer the matter to the JMPR for clarification.

Grapes

162. The MRL of 5 mg/kg was thought to be too high. Available data indicated that 2 mg/kg was more acceptable. The delegation of Italy said that it could not accept an MRL of more than 1 mg/kg for grapes and for all other fruits and vegetables.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: all proposals

CONSIDERATION OF GUIDELINE LEVELS

163. The Committee had before it document CAC/PR 3-1985 containing Guideline Levels estimated by the JMPR. It proceeded to discuss the Guideline Levels in order to ascertain current interest in the compounds, existing uses, the toxicological status of the pesticides and the likelihood of required toxicological data being made available to the JMPR.

CARBON DISULPHIDE (009), CARBON TETRACHLORIDE (010), 1,2-DIBROMOETHANE (023), 1,2-DICHLOROETHANE (024), METHYL BROMIDE (052)

164. The Committee noted that it had requested the JMPR to reconsider the Guideline Levels for some of these fumigants with a view to the possible establishment of MRLs on the basis that no residues would remain in the food as consumed (see paras 236-247, ALIORM 85/24A). The opinion was expressed that, as regards the figures themselves, the JMPR was not likely to be able to come to a different conclusion in the absence of further data. The representative of the EEC drew attention to the EEC Scientific Committee's recent conclusions concerning fumigants which it might be useful for the JMPR to consider. The delegation of the United Kingdom questioned whether the high figure of 10 mg/kg for methyl bromide in nuts at the point of entry to a country was consistent, in view of normal airing periods, with the desired limit of 0.01* mg/kg for nuts at the point of retail sale or when offered for consumption.

HEXACHLOROBENZENE (044)

165. The representative of the AOAC informed the Committee about a symposium to be held in Lyon on hexachlorobenzene.

AZINPHOS-ETHYL (068)

166. The representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that toxicological data required by the JMPR would not be available since interest in the compound was diminishing.

CAMPHECHLOR (071)

167. The Committee noted that camphechlor was a suspected carcinogen and agreed that the Guideline Levels estimated by the JMPR should not be included in the Codex Guide. The Secretariat was of the opinion that the JMPR should be requested to consider on a case by case basis whether Guideline Levels should be estimated on the basis of existing toxicological information. In the opinion of the Secretariat FAO and WHO should not publish Guideline Levels in the reports of the JMPR for compounds where the CCPR deemed it inappropriate to do so.

DINOCAP (087)

168. The representative of GIFAP indicated that toxicological data might be made available to the JMPR in 1986 depending on the conclusions of government re-evaluations currently in progress. The Committee noted that dinocap was on the agenda of the 1985 JMPR.

BIORESMETHRIN (093)

169. The Committee discussed whether the Guideline Levels should be deleted, noting that the long-term studies required by the JMPR were unlikely to become available. The delegation of Australia informed the Committee that this pesticide was used as a grain protectant and that negotiations were under way with the manufacturer in order to generate the toxicity data required. The Committee agreed not to delete the Guideline Levels at present.

METHOMYL (094)

170. The representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that toxicological data were offered to WHO for evaluation by the 1985 JMPR but because of the present workload could not be accepted before 1986. It was also noted that the ad hoc Working Group on Priorities had recommended the re-evaluation of this pesticide at the earliest opportunity. It was agreed to await the evaluations of the JMPR.

DAMINOZIDE (104)

171. The representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that toxicological information would be available for the 1988 JMPR. The Committee decided not to consider this pesticide further at this time.

ETHEPHON (106)

172. The representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that it was hoped to provide information on this compound as soon as possible.

ETHYLENETHIOUREA (ETU) (108)

173. The Chairman expressed the opinion that the JMPR should be requested to consider the question of the possible establishment of MRLs for ETU on the basis of the ADI established for ethylenebis-dithiocarbamates (para 261-263 ALINORM 85/24A). The representative of WHO stated that the WHO Expert Group could not deal with the matter in 1985. It was explained that the questions referred to the JMPR were normally placed before its next meeting and that the problem only represented an interpretation of an existing evaluation by the JMPR. It was also noted that the FAO Panel of Experts would consider the Guideline Levels in 1985.

AMINOCARB (134)

174. Noting that this pesticide no longer had any uses in connection with the production of food, the Committee agreed that the Guideline Levels should be deleted.

PROCYMIDONE (136)

175. The Committee was informed by the representative of GIFAP that toxicological studies were under way but that it was not yet known when they would be available. It was decided not to take any action at this time.

BUTOCARBOXIM (139)

176. It was agreed to consider the Guideline Levels at the next Session in the light of the 1983 Evaluations.

NITROFEN (140)

177. The Committee was informed that the United States of America was considering revoking the tolerances and that the use of nitrofen was decreasing. It was agreed to consider the Guideline Levels in the light of the 1983 evaluations and to request by circular letter more information on GAP for the compound.

ETHOPROPHOS (149), PROPYLENETHIOUREA (PTU) (150)

178. It was agreed to consider these at a future Session in the light of the 1984 Evaluations.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON DEVELOPMENT OF RESIDUES DATA AND SAMPLING

179. The Committee considered the report of the above ad hoc Working Group (see Appendix III to this report) which was introduced by Mr. J.A.R. Bates (United Kingdom), Chairman of the Working Group.

Guidelines on Residues Studies on Products of Animal Origin

180. The Committee made minor changes to the draft Guidelines and agreed that they should be distributed by the Secretariat to Governments and international organizations for comment. Mr. Bates, Chairman of the Working Group, was requested to arrange for the comments to be considered and incorporated into the final version, which should be published following its consideration by the JMPR. Mr. Bates invited interested parties to comment on the draft Guidelines as soon as possible, and well before the next meeting of the JMPR in September 1985.

181. The Committee noted that the Guidelines would be published either in the Codex Guide or in another publication series. The representative of GIFAP indicated that the Guidelines could also be published by that organization. This offer was accepted.

Guidelines on Sampling of Agricultural Commodities in Residues Trials

182. The Committee noted that revised Guidelines would be prepared on the basis of comments for consideration by the Working Group at the next Session.

Guidelines on Sampling Meat for Residue Analysis

183. The Committee agreed that the Guidelines to be prepared by the United States of America should be circulated by the Chairman of the Group for comments and that the revised Guidelines should be considered by the next Session of the Working Group.

184. The opinion was expressed that the basis for accepting consignments of meat products in relation to Codex MRLs should be carefully considered and that the sampling plans should take into account various meat products, such as those described in the revised Codex classification being developed. The Working Group had concluded that the recommendations for carcass meat should be based on the principle that, unlike most sampling of crop commodities, primary samples of meat should be analysed individually and that the MRL should be applied to the concentration in the primary sample. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany wanted the Report of the Working Group to reflect its concern that the analysis of a primary sample of carcass meat may not lead to a representative figure on the pesticide content of the whole lot.

Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feedstuffs

185. The Committee briefly discussed the Codex classification (CAC/PR 4-1984) prepared by the FAO consultant Mr. A.F.H. Besemer (The Netherlands) and noted that the classification still required further refinement.

186. It was pointed out that the classification included aspects which needed consideration by Governments. For example, the rearrangement of food groups should be carefully reviewed since it may have an effect on existing Codex group MRLs. As groups of foods and feedstuffs were established on the basis of pesticide residue potential, such questions as the possibility of extrapolation of residue data from certain indicator foods would have to be considered.

187. The Secretariat noted that funds and expertise were available during 1985 for the computerization of Codex MRLs and the notifications of acceptances received. There was an urgent need to proceed with this work which also involved the revised classification. The delegation of Australia pointed out that the best way to test the food and feed classification was to try it out in practice. The Committee noted that the purpose of the Codex

classification was to define the exact meaning of Codex MRLs by defining food and feed commodities, and by indicating the commodities included in MRLs for groups of commodities. The classification would also bring consistency into commodity descriptions in English, French and Spanish.

188. The Committee agreed that comments should be requested on the classification (CAC/PR4-1984) and that the Secretariat should arrange for the finalization of the classification, involving the JMPR where required. It also agreed that the implications of the Codex classification for the work of the CCPR should be examined at the next Session. The Committee noted that it would be possible to use the present classification in the development of the computerization of Codex MRLs and Government acceptances while the new Codex classification was being finalized.

Appointment of an ad hoc Working Group on Development of Pesticides Data and Sampling

189. The Committee thanked the Working Group and its Chairman for their contribution to this Session. A new ad hoc Working Group was appointed under the Chairmanship of Mr. J.A.R. Bates (United Kingdom) with the same membership as the outgoing group.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS

190. The Committee considered the report of the ad hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis (see Appendix II to this report). It was introduced by the Chairman of the Working Group, Mr. P.A. Greve (The Netherlands).

Recommendations for "Simplified" methods

191. Considering the urgent need expressed for "simplified" methods by the Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries, and taking into consideration the replies received to the questionnaire sent out by the Chairman of the Working Group, the Working Group had made a selection of "Simplified" methods for the analysis of pesticides. The following criteria were chosen for classifying a method as a "simplified" method:
i) the use of thin-layer chromatography, spectrophotometry, or basic GLC or HPLC for the determinative step; ii) the use of small volumes of solvents; iii) elementary clean-up; iv) absence of need for expensive or rare reagents; v) a procedure robust enough to withstand less than ideal laboratory conditions.

192. The Committee noted that simplified methods could not be regarded as substitutes for more precise methods nor could they be regarded as "simple" in the sense of requiring less skill. It expressed the opinion however that these simplified methods could prove useful where sophisticated equipment was not available. The Working Group was requested to encourage the development of simple methods based on TLC, which could be used for screening purposes and which would give fairly accurate and comparable results. The Committee noted that references* to the simplified methods were marked with [S] and expressed the view that it would have been more useful had such marking also been included in the List of Methods of Analysis*.

193. The representative of IUPAC informed the Committee that the Pesticide Commission of his organization was continuing its efforts to develop simplified methods for the estimation of pesticides.

* List of Methods of Analysis and References will be published elsewhere.

ANALYSIS OF PCBs

194. The Committee noted that international harmonization of acceptable levels of PCBs in food could only be achieved if methods are available that can provide reliable and comparable data. The results from the different methods used cannot directly be compared. The choice of the method however was related to the available data base and the way limits were developed and expressed. Although it appeared essential that especially for the determination of PCB levels in food methods of analysis and quantification capable of obtaining comparable results should be used, it was not yet possible to reach agreement on a single method which could be recommended.

195. The Committee noted that at the OECD seminar on PCBs (The Hague, 1983) it had been concluded that capillary GLC, determining individual PCB isomers and congeners, was the method of choice. It was recognized however that this method was rather sophisticated for a number of laboratories. It was expected that more analysts would become familiar with it in future. For PCBs there was not a simple, reliable method giving comparable results. Less complex methods are sometimes used for enforcement purposes but even then rigorous calibration is required.

196. The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany was of the opinion that it might be possible to compare results obtained by different methods if these methods had been suitably calibrated and it expressed the view that the Working Group should study such a possibility.

197. The Committee agreed that it would be useful if the Working Group on Methods of Analysis would further cooperate with the Working Group on Contaminants in this area and possibly hold a combined meeting at the next Session.

Recommendations for methods of analysis

198. The Chairman of the Working Group commented that updating the recommended methods of analysis, ensuring that they were consistent both with the definition of the residue and with current analytical practice, was an ongoing task of the group.

199. The Committee noted that there was a change in layout: the pesticides were arranged according to Codex numbers, a system followed in the Guide. For many new pesticides published methods of determination were not available.

Statements made by CCMAS

a. Obligatory or Advisory Nature of Codex Methods of Analysis

200. The Committee noted that most of the methods recommended by the Working Group were of Codex Type III ("alternative approved methods") and IV ("tentative methods"). It was of the view that for PCB determinations where dispute situations may arise, Type I methods ("defining methods") might be needed.

b. Limit of determination:

201. The Committee noted that the Working Group had endorsed the preference of CCMAS for the concept of "limit of determination" rather than "limit of detection."

202. The representative of AOAC informed the Committee that MRLs at or about the limit of determination recommended by the JMPR and adopted by the CCPR were only indicative of the level and could vary.

Appointment of an ad hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis

203. The Committee thanked the members and the Chairman of the Working Group for the work done prior to and during the Session. It was decided to set up a new ad hoc Working Group under the Chairmanship of Mr. P.A. Greve (Netherlands) with the same membership as before.

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

204. The Chairman of the above ad hoc Working Group (WG 3) was Mr. V. Tolosa (Argentina) and the Rapporteur Mr. Fathy Macklad (Egypt). In introducing the report of the Working Group (see Appendix IV) Mr. Tolosa regretted that comparatively few developing countries were present at this Session of the Committee and consequently at the meeting of the Working Group.

Reports of the Vice-Chairman on Regional Activities in the Field of Pesticide Residues

205. The reports of the three regions, which had been given for Africa by Mr. M. Fathy (in the absence of the Vice-Chairman Mrs. S.M. Dogheim); for Asia by the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Deema and for Latin America and the Caribbean by the Vice-Chairman, were summarized by Mr. Tolosa.

Second Questionnaire of WG 3 (CL 1984/34-PR)

206. The Working Group had noted that as reported in WG 3/PR 85/2, 22 countries had replied to the questionnaire on manpower development and national facilities for pesticide residue control. In addition four other countries gave further details from the floor. The Working Group had also noted that although the Questionnaire had been given wide distribution by the Secretariat it had not been received by all delegations. It was agreed to issue a third questionnaire suitably modified to take account of omissions and amendments. GIFAP offered to continue to coordinate the replies.

International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides

207. The Working Group was informed that a draft of the above Code was before the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) for consideration. At a later stage Mr. B.B. Watts (New Zealand) reported that the Code had been endorsed by COAG and would be referred to the FAO Council and Conference later in the year.

Progress Report on Action Taken on the Recommendations of the Working Group

208. The Working Group had reviewed the above document, CX/PR 85/8, and had attached to its report (Appendix IV Annex I) a revised version of the recommendations. This included an amendment to recommendation 4 which reflected more accurately the role of IPCS as being interested in safety aspects rather than in the agricultural use of pesticides.

With regard to recommendation 9 the Working Group had noted that the matter of simple methods for pesticide analysis that could be used without sophisticated equipment had been referred to the Working Group on Methods of Analysis (see also Appendix II).

The Working Group had made other minor changes to the recommendations.

209. In conclusion Mr. Tolosa informed the Committee that the following participants had been nominated as regional Vice-Chairmen for Pesticide Residue Matters:

Africa: Mr. Fathy Macklad (Egypt)

Asia: Mr. Sakdi Prayoon Deema (Thailand)

Latin America and the Caribbean: Mr. Victoriano Tolosa (Argentina)

210. In the discussion that followed, the delegation of Spain, referring to the under-representation of developing countries at the 4th Session of the Working Group, emphasized the importance of improving communications with countries of the regions with regard to documentation and information on Codex work. The delegation also pointed out that the individual country responses to the second questionnaire would have been more informative if they had included the names and addresses and laboratory services or organizations of those who had replied on behalf of their Governments. The Secretariat agreed to supplement the document with the necessary information. After further discussion it was agreed that the Secretariat and GIFAP would collaborate in the drafting of the questionnaire which would contain, among other items, a column for "other remarks" and enquiries which would evaluate the results of previous programmes on pesticide residue analysis.

211. The regional Vice-Chairman for Asia gave further information on the course in pesticide residue analysis in Bangkok. The course was aimed at establishing a regional network on pesticide residue analysis. It had been organized in close collaboration with FAO, the regional Working Group and with the excellent cooperation of GIFAP. The Committee endorsed the Resolution developed by the First Session of the Group of Developing Countries in Asia Concerning Residue Problems (CX/PR 85/9, Appendix II) and noted that the Resolution would be presented to the Commission. The regional Vice-Chairman for Latin America and the Caribbean pointed out that paragraph 7 of the report did not accurately reflect the report he had made and it was agreed that the Secretariat should bring the paragraph into line with his written text.

212. The delegation of India referred to the recommendations in Annex I of the Working Group report. In view of the statements made during the Working Group discussions, the delegation was of the opinion that the recommendations could be further strengthened by including resolutions concerning the lack of financial resources, materials and equipment. The delegation of Cameroon agreed with this point of view and emphasized that developing countries, because of financial constraints were not able to participate fully in Codex Sessions and as a consequence did not appreciate the importance of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. In many countries there were inadequate national structures to inform interested authorities of the work of Codex technical and commodity committees. In addition there was a lack of technical personnel and regulatory structures to control pesticide residues and environmental contaminants. This was also an obstacle to effective participation in Codex technical and commodity committees. The delegation of Australia pointed out that many delegations had to travel long distances to attend Committee Sessions and suggested that it would be advantageous to hold Working Group discussions later in the Session to allow maximum participation.

213. The Committee considered supplementary resolutions proposed by the delegation of India and the Chairman of the Working Group and after some discussion agreed to add the following text to the recommendations:

"Urges

International Organizations such as FAO, WHO and others to provide funds to increase participation of representatives of Developing Countries at all Codex Sessions, thereby making the contribution of these countries to the work of the Commission in general, and the work of the CCPR in particular, more effective.

4. Last sentence

Evaluation facilities should also be identified and developed for establishing health-related studies with international or bilateral financial assistance to countries of the regions.

3. New addition

This assistance should include the provision of funds to be allocated for the purchase and installation of advanced analytical equipment and for training analysts in the use of such equipment; for the training of maintenance personnel, the establishment of central and satellite laboratories in the various regions, and the purchase of reagents and reference standards for pesticides and their metabolites."

214. The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Working Group as amended. It appreciated the work done by the members and the Chairman during the year and decided to set up a new ad hoc Working Group under the Chairmanship of Mr. Victoriano Tolosa (Argentina) who also represented the Latin American and Caribbean Region. Mr. Sakdi Prayoon Deema (Thailand) and Mr. Fathy Macklad (Egypt) were appointed Regional Chairmen for the regions of Asia and Africa respectively.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON REGULATORY PRINCIPLES

215. The Committee considered the Report of the ad hoc Working Group on Regulatory Principles (see Appendix V to this Report), which was introduced by the Chairman of the Group, Mr. J. Wessel (United States of America), and documents CX/PR 85/10 and ALINORM 85/24A-Add.2

Recommended National Regulatory Practices

216. At the 16th Session, the Committee decided to adopt the draft document entitled "Recommended National Regulatory Practices to Facilitate Acceptance and Use of Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues in Foods" (ALINORM 85/24A-Add. 2) and to ask Governments for comments on the use of the document and on the effect of its use on national regulatory practices. Because the document had been issued only recently, comments had not yet been received. It was decided by the Committee again to request countries to comment on the use of the document for discussion by the Working Group and the Committee at the next session of the CCPR. The comments should be submitted to the Chairman of the Working Group not later than February 1, 1986.

Draft Resolution on National Regulatory Practices (CX/PR 85/10)

217. It was noted that a minor change had been made in the proposed draft. Page 4, line 3 should read: Pointing out that the recommendations cover the major aspects of the ...

218. The delegation of the United States of America stated that it fully endorsed the resolution and that, although they could not endorse all proposals, the proposed resolution could support harmonization.

The Committee decided to adopt the resolution. It will be submitted to the Codex Alimentarius Commission for endorsement and distribution to Governments.

Replies to the Questionnaire on National Pesticide Regulatory Systems

219. The Committee was informed that since last year only one country had submitted a response to the questionnaire (Room document 12).

The Working Group was of the opinion that further action on the questionnaire on National Pesticide Regulatory Systems was no longer necessary and proposed to the Committee that it should develop a new questionnaire to be issued in 1988, to obtain specific information from countries regarding the effect of their use of the document on recommended national regulatory practices. The Committee agreed to this.

Acceptability of Codex MRLs in the Light of Possible Dietary Exposure
220.

The Working Group considered the second draft of a discussion paper on Codex Limits for Pesticide Residues in Food and Consumer Safety. It was concluded that additional work was needed. It was agreed that members of the Working Group would submit additional comments to the Chairman within three months for preparation of a third draft. The Committee noted that the subject would be discussed by the 1985 JMPR taking the discussion paper into account. After comments by the JMPR, the document will be submitted to the Working Group for consideration at the next Session of the CCPR. The delegation of Australia doubted whether the approach as expressed in the paper would be the most appropriate, considering the confusion already existing on ADI, TADI, EDI etc., and considering the need and wishes of developing countries on facilities for trials, market basket studies, etc. They were concerned that it could cause polarization between developed and developing countries. They would send to the Chairman of the Working Group their comments and, if possible, suggestions for a less complex approach.

Appointment of an ad hoc Working Group on Regulatory Principles

221. The Committee thanked the members and the Chairman of the Working Group for their work. It was decided to set up a new ad hoc Working Group under the Chairmanship of Mr. J. Wessel (United States of America) with the same membership as before.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITIES

222. The Committee considered the Report of the ad hoc Working Group on Priorities (see Appendix VI to this Report), which was introduced by Mr. B.B. Watts (New Zealand), Chairman of the Working Group. He stressed the importance of criteria for establishing priorities as mentioned in para 2 of the Working Group Report. He also drew attention to the possibility of using food/pesticide combinations for establishing an order of priority for each year as outlined in para 9 of the Report.

223. The five compounds from List I of last year's Working Group Report are on the agenda of the 1985 JMPR: dimethipin, flucythrinate, clofentezine, thiodicarb and pyrazofos. In reply to a question of the delegation of The Netherlands it was explained that even though butocarboxim was not considered by the 1984 JMPR it did not need to be added to this priority list as the compound had already been before the JMPR.

224. Vinclozolin and glyphosate were high on the list of priorities for the 1986 JMPR as the manufacturers had indicated that data would be available for these compounds. They had been removed from the list in 1984. Fluvalinate appeared to meet the criteria and data were available, although it may not cause problems in trade. Information on this is required.

225. The delegation of the United States of America doubted whether thiofanox would meet the criterion of being of concern for commodities in international trade. It invited other Governments to consider this compound in 1986 when new nominations are being considered. There was no indication of the availability of data or justification for priority for dalapon and BPMC, for which national MRLs are established in several countries.

226. The Committee noted that methomyl would be re-evaluated in 1986 because complete toxicological, metabolic and residue studies would be available. New toxicological data on ethoprofos had already been submitted.

227. In reply to a request from the representative of WHO for the opportunity to review the Working Group's circular letters in draft form, the chairman of the Working Group offered to consult at the draft stage with both FAO and WHO.

228. The Committee thanked the Chairman and members of the ad hoc Working Group. It was decided to set up a new ad hoc Working Group under the Chairmanship of Mr. B.B. Watts (New Zealand) with the same membership. The Committee was informed that Ms. J. Taylor (Canada), who had replaced Ms. Stalker (Canada), would continue to provide Secretariat assistance.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON CONTAMINANTS

229. The Committee considered the Report of the ad hoc Working Group on Contaminants (see Appendix VII to this Report). The Report was introduced by Mr. K. Voldum-Clausen (Denmark), Chairman of the Working Group.

230. The Working Group had met for the first time since it had been established at the XVth Session of the Committee in 1984. Its terms of reference were given in the Report of that Session (see ALINORM 85/24A, para 317).

Need for Codex limits for PCBs

231. The need for Codex to develop limits for contaminants such as PCBs, for which there was no good agricultural or other practice, had been extensively discussed. Although no barriers to trade were known to occur at present, it was anticipated that because a number of countries had established legal limits or were in the process of doing so, and because these limits varied widely, such barriers were likely to develop in the future.

Methodology

232. The Working Group had not been able to devote sufficient time to a full discussion on harmonization of methods for obtaining reliable and comparable data on PCBs in different food commodities. This needed to be further considered at the next Session, partly in collaboration with the Working Group on Methods of Analysis (see paras 194-197). Such a discussion and the assessment of data to be supplied would however be easier in a group which was much smaller than that at the present Session. Delegations were recommended to reduce the number of participants to possibly one per delegation for this discussion.

Resolution

233. It was generally understood that setting limits for contaminants in foodstuffs was not a primary means of control of contamination. The control of environmental exposure however required measures to be taken by other bodies. This was reflected in the Resolution on PCBs which is appended to the Report of the Working Group, which was unanimously adopted by the Committee and would be submitted to the Commission to be endorsed. It was emphasized that every possible measure was needed to prevent the further spread of environmental contamination with PCBs.

Questionnaire

234. In order to provide a better background for the work of the Group a questionnaire on several aspects related to PCBs (methods of analysis and quantification, monitoring, barriers to trade etc.) had been developed. Some amendments were made to this questionnaire in order to obtain more information on possible barriers to trade. It is appended as Annex II to the Report of the Working Group.

Appointment of a new ad hoc Working Group on Contaminants

235. The Committee thanked the members and especially the Chairman of the Working Group for their work during the Session. A new ad hoc Working Group was established, with the same membership as the previous group. As Mr. Voldum-Clausen was unable to continue its chairmanship, the Committee unanimously agreed to the nomination of Mr. W. Cochrane (Canada) as Chairman of the ad hoc Working Group.

OTHER BUSINESS

236. The Committee expressed its thanks to Mr. I.A. Alkema of the Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs of The Netherlands for his valuable contribution to the work of the Committee from its first Session, especially by ensuring the efficient functioning of the technical secretariat and in introducing computerization into the preparation of documents needed by the Committee, and into the listing of Codex MRLs. The Committee wished Mr. Alkema a long and happy retirement.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION

237. The Chairman of the Committee indicated that the next (eighteenth) Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and its Working Groups would be held in The Hague from 18 to 28 April 1986. The tentative schedule for the start of the plenary session of the Committee and the meetings of the Working Groups is as follows:

Plenary Session of the CCPR

Monday, 21 April 1986, 9.30 hours

Working Group on Regulatory Principles

Friday 18 April 1986, 9.30 hours

Working Group on Development of Residues Data and Sampling

Saturday, 19 April 1986, 9.00 hours

Working Group on methods of Analysis

Saturday, 19 April 1986, 14.00 hours (combined session with W.G. on Contaminants 14.00 - 15.30 hours)

Working Group on Contaminants

Saturday 19 April 1986, 9.00 hours (combined session with W.G. on Methods of Analysis 14.00 - 15.30 hours)

Working Group on Priorities

Monday, 21 April 1986, 12.30 - 14.00 hours.

Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries

Tuesday, 22 April 1986, 14.30 - 18.00 hours.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

238. In his closing remarks the Chairman of the Committee mentioned that fewer countries had taken part this year. Eight of those present at the last Session were absent, but four which were not here in 1984 had participated. Seven of those absent were developing countries, and in this connection the Chairman reminded delegations that continuity was essential for profitable participation in the work of the CCPR.

The Chairman referred to the growing interest shown by international organisations. Four new ones were represented this year, although two participants in the sixteenth Session were absent. The Chairman reminded delegates that the relatively light work-load at this Session would be balanced by an unusually heavy one in 1986. For this reason it was important that plenty of time in addition to that needed for the Plenary Session should be allowed for the activities of the Working Groups.

The new Classification system developed by Mr. Besemer could be expected to make for more specific and consistent proposals, and hence in the future to facilitate the acceptance of Codex MRLs.

The Chairman mentioned particularly the Resolution on National Regulatory Practices and looked forward to its adoption by the Commission. He saw this as a valuable means of removing obstacles to acceptances.

Finally the Chairman thanked the participants and all who had contributed so effectively to the work of the CCPR, and looked forward to another successful Session in 1986.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

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

Ir. A.J. Pieters
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam
Netherlands

ALGERIA
L'ALGERIE
ARGELIA

ANMOUR AMAR
Ingénieur
Laboratoire d'Analyse des
Résidus de Pesticides
ALGER EL-HARRACH

MOULOUD HAOUAR
Ingénieur Responsable du
Laboratoire d'Analyses de
Résidus de Pesticides
ALGER EL-HARRACH

ARGENTINA
ARGENTINE
ARGENTINA

VICTORIANO TOLOSA
Director General of the
National Laboratories Service
for Cattle Products
Secretaria Agricultura
y Gawaderia
Paseo Colon 922-1305
Buenos Aires

LEONILDA B. DIAZ HOLTON
Commercial Secretary
Argentina Embassy
Catsheuvel 85
2517 KA The Hague
The Netherlands

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE
AUSTRALIA

G.N. HOOPER
Principal Chemist
Agricultural and
Veterinary Chemicals
Section
Department of Primary
Industry
Canberra, A.C.T. 2600

A.L. BLACK
Medical Services Adviser (Toxicology)
Department of Health
P.O. Box 100
Woden A.C.T.

R.S. BELCHER
Chief Chemist
Victorian Dept. of
Agriculture
5 MacArthur St.,
Melbourne 3002, VIC.

A.W. MORLEY
Agricultural and Veterinary
Chemicals Association of
Australia
P.O. Box 3968
Sydney 2001

AUSTRIA
AUTRICHE
AUSTRIA

EDMUND PLATTNER
Federal Ministry of Health
and Environmental Protection
Stubenring 1
A-1010 Vienna

ROBERT WOMASTEK
Federal Institute for
Plant Protection
Trunnerstrasse 5
A-1020 Vienna

BELGIUM
BELGIQUE
BELGICA

W. DEJONCKHEERE
Lab. voor Fytofarmacie
Fac. van de Landbouw-
wetenschappen
Rijksuniversiteit Gent
Coupure 653
B 9000 Gent

J. AERTS
Instituut voor Hygiëne en
Epidemiologie
J. Wijtsmanstraat 14
B 1050 Brussel

M. GALOUX
Station de Phytopharmacie
Rue du Bordia 11
B-5800 Gembloux

L. SMEETS
Ministerie van Landbouw
Manhattan Center, 14e
Bolwerklaan 21
1000 Brussel

BRAZIL
BRESIL
BRASIL

JOSE VICENTE DA SILVA LESSA
Second Secretary Embassy of
Brazil
Mauritskade 19
2514 HD The Hague

CAMEROON
CAMEROUN
CAMERUN

PIERRE NGANKO
Embassy of Cameroon
Amaliastraat 14
The Hague
The Netherlands

ENIL J.B. TUTUWAN
Comité National Permanent
de l'Homme et la Biosphere (MAB/MESRES)
B.P. 4742
Yaoundé

JEAN DJAMBONG
Direction de l'Agriculture-Service
de la Législation Phytosanitaire
B.P. 624
Yaoundé

CATHERINE TSIMI
Ministère de la Santé
Yaoundé

CANADA
CANADA
CANADA

J.K. TAYLOR
Assoc Director
Pesticides Division
Plant Health and Plant
Production Directorate
Food Production and
Inspection Branch
Agriculture Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0C6

W. COCHRANE
Laboratory Services
Division
Food Production and
Inspection Branch
Agriculture Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0C6

CANADA (cont'd)

P. BENNETT
Head, Agricultural
Chemical Section
Chemical Evaluation
Division
Bureau of Chemical Safety
Food Directorate, Health
Protection Branch
Health and Welfare Canada
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0L2

CHILE
CHILI
CHILE

CESAR ALBERTO RUIZ ASMUSSEN
First Secretary
Embassy of Chile in
The Netherlands
Mauritskade 51
2514 HG The Hague

CHINA, PEOPLE'S REP.OF
CHINE, REP.POPULAIRE DE
CHINA, REP.POPULAR DE

ZHEN ZIHOU
Senior Engineer
State Administration for
Inspection of Import and
Export Commodities of the
People's Republic of China
12, Jianguomenwai Street
Beijing (Peking)

TIAN QIJING
Engineer
Scientific Research
Institute of Food and
Fermentation Industry
Ministry of Light Industry
San Li Tun Beijing (Peking)

HOU YUKAI
Engineer
Shengyang Research Institute
of Chemical Industry
Tie XT district Shenyang City

CHINA, PEOPLE'S REP.OF (cont'd)

CHEN YUYING
Engineer
Shanghai Administration for
Inspection of Import and
Export Commodities of China
13, Zhongshan Road (E.1.)
Shanghai

YAO SHUTIAN
Interpreter
State Administration for
Inspection of Import and
Export Commodities of the
People's Republic of China
12, Jianguomenwai Street
Beijing (Peking)

CUBA
CUBA
CUBA

MANUEL GRILLO RODRIGUEZ
Ministerio de Salud Publica
La Havana

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TCHECOSLOVAQUIE
CZECHOSLOVAQUIA

L. ROSIVAL
Director, Centre of Hygiene
of the Research
Institute for Preventive
Medicine
Limbová Ul. L4
Bratislava

VACLAV BENES
Institute of Hygiene and
Epidemiology
Srobarova 48
10042 Prague 10

DEM.PEOPLE'S REP.OF KOREA
REP.POP.DEM. DE COREE
REP.POP.DEM. DE COREA

AN GI HO
Foodstuff Institute
P.O. Box 901
Pyanyang

CHOI IL ROK
Foodstuff Institute
P.O. Box 901
Pyanyang

DENMARK
DANEMARK
DINAMARCA

K. VOLDUM-CLAUSEN
Head of Division of Pesticides
and Contaminants
National Food Institute
Mørkhøj Bygade 19
2860 Søborg

M. GREEN LAURIDSEN
Scientific Officer
Pesticide Laboratory
National Food Institute
Mørkhøj Bygade 19
2860 Søborg

EGYPT
EGYPTE
EGIPTO

FATHY MACKLAD
Agricultural Research Centre
Central Agricultural Pesticides
Laboratory
Etay El-Baroud

FINLAND
FINLANDE
FINLANDIA

VESA TUOMAALA
Chief Inspector of
Food Division
National Board of Trade and
Consumer Interests
Box 9
00531 Helsinki 53

JUHANI PAAKKANEN
Chief Inspector
Ministry of Trade and Industry
Aleksanterinkatu 10
00170 Helsinki

HANS BLOMQUIST
Head of Division
Pesticide Regulation
Unit Agricultural Research
Centre
Box 18
01301 Vantaa 30

ARTO KIVIRANTA
Head of Pesticide
Section Customs Laboratory
Tekniikantie 13
02150 Espoo 15

FINLAND (cont'd)

HEIKKI PYYSSALO
Head of Analytical Department
Technical Research Centre
of Finland
Biologinkuja 1
02150 Espoo

FRANCE
FRANCE
FRANCIA

M.B. DECLERCQ
Chef de Travaux
Laboratoire Central de Recherches
et d'Analyses
25 Avenue de la Republique
91305 Massy

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

M. DE CACQUERAY
Union des Industries de la
Protection des Plantes
2, Rue Denfert-Rochereau
92100 Boulogne-Billancourt

M. L'HOTELLIER
Union des Industries de la
Protection des Plantes
2, Rue Denfert-Rochereau
92100 Boulogne-Billancourt

M. TOURNAYRE
Union des Industries de la
Protection des Plantes
2, Rue Denfert-Rochereau
92100 Boulogne-Billancourt

GABON
GABON
GABON

M.B.A. ASSOUMOU LEON
Chef de Service de la Protection
des Végétaux
B.P. 1633 Libreville

GERMANY, FED.REP. OF
ALLEMAGNE, REP.FED.D'
ALEMANIA, REP.FED. DE

WALTER TÖPNER
Oberregierungsrat
Bundesministerium für Jugend,
Familie und Gesundheit
Deutschherrenstrasse 87
D-5300 Bonn 2

R. PETZOLD
Regierungsdirektor
Bundesministerium für
Ernährung, Landwirtschaft
und Forsten,
Rochusstrasse 1
D-5300 Bonn 1

W. LINGK
Direktor und Professor
Bundesgesundheitsamt
Postfach 330013
D-1000 Berlin 33

HANS BECK
Wissenschaftlicher
Direktor
Bundesgesundheitsamt
Postfach 330013
D-1000 Berlin 33

A. RÖPSCH
Wissenschaftlicher
Direktor
Biologische Bundesanstalt für
Land- und Forstwirtschaft
Messeweg 11/12
D-3300 Braunschweig

HANS GERD NOLTING
Wissenschaftlicher Rat
Biologische Bundesanstalt
für Land- und Forstwirtschaft
Messeweg 11/12
D-300 Braunschweig

GABRIELE TIMME
Bayer AG
PF-A/CE-RA
Pflanzenschutzzentrum Monheim
D-5090 Leverkusen-Bayerwerk

GEORG LEBER
Industrieverband
Pflanzenschutz e.V.
Karlstrasse 21
D-6000 Frankfurt (M)

GERMANY, FED.REP. OF (cont'd)

SIGBERT GORBACH
Hoechst AG
Analytisches Labor
Postfach 80 03 20
D-6230 Frankfurt am Main

KLAUS OTTO GUENTHER
Landesuntersuchungsinstitut
für Lebensmittel, Arzneimittel und
Tierseuchen
Invalidenstrasse 60
D-1000 Berlin 21

W. BOSSE
GTZ-Pesticide-Residue Project
Rheinstrasse 91
D-6100 Darmstadt

GREECE
GRECE
GRECIA

P. PATSAKOS
Chief of the Department for
Pesticide Control
Benaki Plant Pathology Institute
Kiphissia, Athens

CH. LENTZA-RIZOS
Pesticide Residue Laboratory
Benaki Plant Pathology Institute
Kiphissia, Athens

HUNGARY
HONGRIE
HUNGRIA

LASZLO GYÖRFI
Head of Department on
Pesticide Residues
Plant Protection and
Agrochemistry Centre
Budapest P.O. Box 127
Budapest
1502 Hungary

INDIA
INDIE
INDIA

R.L. RAJAK
Plant Protection Adviser to Government
of India
Ministry of Agriculture
New Delhi

IRAN
IRAN
IRAN

EGHBAL TAHERI
Ministry of Health
Toxicology Department
Food & Drug Control Lab.
Emam Khomeini Avenue
Teheran

ZAHRA FETIDAH
Ministry of Health
Toxicology Department
Food & Drug Control Lab.
Emam Khomeini Avenue
Teheran

IRELAND
IRLANDE
IRLANDA

JAMES QUIGLEY
Senior Chemist
State Laboratory
Abbotstown
Castleknock
CO Dublin

J.F. EADES
Head of Pesticide Residues
and Analytical Services
The Agricultural Institute
(An Foras Taluntais)
Oak Park
Carlow

M.B. DOLAN
Assistant Agricultural
Inspector Departement of
Agriculture
Dublin 2

ISRAEL
ISRAEL
ISRAEL

PAUL M. VERMES
Head of Pesticide Division
Department of Plant Protection
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 78
Bet Dagan 50250

ZEEV GOLLOP
Consultant Agricultural
Chemicals, Bromine Compounds
Limited
P.O.B. 180
Beer Sheva

ISRAEL (cont'd)

M. HOFFMAN
Department of Plant Protection
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 78
Bet Dagan 50250

ITALY
ITALIE
ITALIA

M.S. BELLISAI
Ministero della Sanità
D.G.I.A.N.
Piazza Marconi 25
Rome

RICCARD FABBRINI
Farmoplant
Via Bonfadini 148
20138 Milan

ENRICA QUATTRUCCI
Istituto Nazionale
della Nutrizione
Via Ardeatine 546
00179 Rome

JAPAN
JAPON
JAPON

SABURO TAKEI
Japan Society of Agricultural
Chemical Industry
Nihon-Bashi Club. 6F
1-8-25 Nihon-Bashi Muromachi
Chuoku Tokyo

TOSHIO SHIMOMURA
Japan Society of Agricultural
Chemical Industry
Nihon-Bashi Club. 6F
1-8-25 Nihon-Bashi Muromachi
Chuoku Tokyo

AKIRA OKUMURA
Japan Society of Agricultural
Chemical Industry
Nihon-Bashi Club. 6F
1-8-25 Nihon-Bashi Muromachi
Chuoku Tokyo

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAISES BAJOS

H.M. NOLLEN
Ministry of Agriculture and
Fisheries/Plant Protection
Service
P.O. Box 9102
6700 HC Wageningen

A.F.H. BESEMER
Hartenseweg 30
6705 BJ Wageningen

P.A. GREVE
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
National Institute of Public
Health and Environmental
Hygiene
P.O. Box 1
3720 BA Bilthoven

D.G. KLOET
Ministry of Agriculture and
Fisheries
Nutrition and Quality Affairs
Service
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague

J. VAN DER KOLK
Ministry of Welfare, Health and
Cultural Affairs
Foodstuffs Division
P.O. Box 439
2260 AK Leidschendam

E.M. DEN TONKELAAR
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
National Institute of
Public Health and Environmental
Hygiene
P.O. Box 1
3720 BA Bilthoven

L.G.M.Th. TUINSTRA
Ministry of Agriculture and
Fisheries
State Institute for Quality
Control of Agricultural
Products
P.O. Box 230
6700 AE Wageningen

NETHERLANDS (cont'd)

B. WIJERS
General Commodity Board for
Arable Products
P.O. Box 29739
2502 LS The Hague

C.M. KEET
Netherlands Association of
Pesticide Manufacturers c/o
Duphar B.V.
P.O. Box 2
1380 AA Weesp

F.G. DE BOER
Netherlands Association of
Pesticide Manufacturers c/o
Duphar B.V.
P.O. Box 54
1243 ZG 's-Graveland

NEW ZEALAND
NOUVELLE-ZELANDE
NUEVA ZELANDIA

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

NORWAY
NORVEGE
NORUEGA

TORE H. SMITH
National Institute of Public
Health
Geitmyrsvn. 75
0462 Oslo 4

HÅKON FRIESTAD
Head of Section
Chemical Analysis Laboratory
1432 Ås-NLH

NORWAY (cont'd)

JORALF PAULSEN
Ministry of Agriculture
Pesticides Board
P.O. Box 59
1432 Ås-NLH Norway

OMAN, SULTANATE OF
L'OMAN, SULTANAT D'
OMAN, SULTANIA DE

ABDUL MUNIM M. MJENI
Ministry of Agriculture and
Fisheries
P.O. Box 467
Muscat

PHILIPPINES
PHILIPPINES
FILIPINAS

CECILIA P. GASTON
Deputy Administrator for
Pesticides
Fertilizer and Pesticide
Authority
Raha Sulayman Bldg (4th Floor)
Benavidez St., Legazpi Village
Makati, Metro Manila

POLAND
POLOGNE
POLONIA

JAN LUDWICKI
Chief of Section
National Institute of Hygiene
24 Chocimska Str.
Warsaw

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPAÑA

E. CELMA
Ministerio de Agricultura
Juan Bravo 3-B
Madrid-28006

ADRES LORENTE
Office Commercial
Avenue des Arts 21
1040 Bruxelles
Belgium

SWEDEN
SUEDE
SUECIA

ARNE ANDERSSON
Senior Chemist
The National Food Administration
Box 622
S-751 26 UPPSALA

ARNE STRÖM
Toxicologist
The National Food Administration
Box 622
S-751 26 UPPSALA

BO WAHLSTRÖM
Senior Technical Officer
Products Control Board
Box 1302
S-171 25 SOLNA

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

CL. WÜTHRICH
Food Control Division
Federal Office of Public Health
Haslerstrasse 16
CH-3008 Berne

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

TH. KAPPELER
Nestec
Case Postale 88
CH-1814 La-Tour-de-Peilz

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

J.P. SEILER
Swiss Federal Research
Station
CH-8820 Waedenswil

T. STIJVE
Nestec
Case Postale 88
CH-1814 La Tour-de-Peilz

THAILAND
THAÏLANDE
TAILANDIA

SAKDIPRAYOON DEEMA
Inspector General
Ministry of Agriculture and
Co-Operatives
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200

PAKDEE POTHISIRI
Director of Food Control Division
Food and Drug Administration
Ministry of Public Health,
Devaves Palace
Bangkok 10200

AMARA VONGBUDDHAPITAK
Chief, Pesticide Residues
Analysis
Division of Food Analysis
Department of Medical Sciences
Ministry of Public Health,
Yodse
Bangkok 10100

TAWATCHAI HONGTRAKUL
Research Scientist, Agricultural
Toxic Substances Division
Department of Agriculture
Bangkhen, Bangkok 10900

TUNISIA
TUNISIE
TUNEZ

HASSAN KAMOON
Directeur Général Technique
à la Société Tunisienne
d'engrais chimiques (STEC)
Usine El Afrane Djebel Djelloud
Tunis

FREDJ LANDOULSI
Ingénieur au Ministère de
l'Economie Nationale
La Kasbah
Tunis

UNITED KINGDOM
ROYAUME-UNI
REINO UNIDO

J.S. BYNG
Senior Executive Officer
Pesticides and Infestation
Control Division, Branch A
Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1P 2AE

J.A.R. BATES
Head of Pesticide
Registration Dept
Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Food
Harpenden Laboratory
Hatching Green
Harpenden
Hertfordshire AL5 2BD

D.F. LEE
Principal Scientific Officer
Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Food
Pest Control Chemistry
Department
Harpenden Laboratory
Hatching Green
Harpenden
Hertfordshire AL5 2BD

H.M. GOALEN
Regional Veterinary Officer
Ministry of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Food
Tolworth Tower
Surbiton
Surrey KT6 7DY

D.G. LINDSAY
Principal Scientific
Officer, Food Science Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
and Food
Great Westminster House
Horseferry Road
London SW1P 2AE

R.A. HOODLESS
Principal Science Officer
Laboratory of the Government
Chemist
Cornwall House
Stamford Street
London SE1 9NQ

UNITED KINGDOM (cont'd)

F.A. CHANDRA
Senior Medical Officer
Department of Health and Social
Security
Hannibal House
Elephant and Castle
London SE1 6TE

D. HALLIDAY
Head, Chemical Control and
Pesticide Analysis Section
Tropical Development and
Research Institute
Storage Department
London Road
Slough
Berkshire SL3 7HL

G.A. WILLIS
British Agrochemicals
Association c/o
Imperial Chemical Industries PLC
Plant Protection Division
Fernhurst
Haslemere
Surrey GU27 3JE

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

STANFORD N. FERTIG
Chief, Pesticide Impact
Assessment Staff
Agricultural Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Building 1070, BARC-East
Beltsville, Maryland 20705

ELIZABETH CAMPBELL
Division of Regulatory
Guidance (HFF-312)
Food and Drug Administration
200 C Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20204

FRANK CORDLE
Chief, Epidemiology and Clinical
Toxicology
Food and Drug Administration
200 C Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20204

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (cont'd)

MARYLN CORDLE
Deputy Director
Residue Evaluation and Planning
Division
Science Program, FSIS
Room 602, Annex Building
300 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20250

N. FRED IVES
Chemist, Office of Pesticide
Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency TS-769 C
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

EDWIN L. JOHNSON
Director
Office of Water
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

RICHARD M. PARRY, Jr.
Assistant to the Administrator
USDA/ARS
Building 005
Room 114
Beltsville, Maryland 20705

JOHN R. WESSEL
Director, Contaminants Policy Staff
Office of Regulatory Affairs
Food and Drug Administration
Rockville, Maryland 20857

BRUCE JAEGER
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency
Toxicology Branch
Crystal Mall 2
Crystal City, Virginia 22202

LINDA WOOD
Executive Officer for Codex
USDA/FSIS
Room 4435, South Building
14th & Independence Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20250

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA(cont'd)

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

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

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

JOHN P. FRAWLEY
General Manager
Health, Environment and Safety
Hercules Incorporated
Hercules Plaza
Wilmington, Delaware 19899

OBSERVER COUNTRIES
PAYS OBSERVATEURS
PAISES OBSERVADORES

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC
REPUBLIQUE DEMOCRATIQUE ALLEMANDE
REPUBLICA DEMOCRATICA ALEMANA

WERNER RAFFKE
Ministry of Public Health
Rathausstrasse 3
DDR 1020 Berlin

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

MARIA OCHOA
Administrative Officer
Council of Europe
67006 Strasbourg
France

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

MICHAEL WALSH
Commission of the European
Communities
Legislation on Crop Products
and Animal Nutrition
200 Rue de la Loi
1049 Brussel
Belgium

ECONOMIC BENELUX UNION

H. ROOVERS
Economic Benelux Unie
General Secretariat
Regentschapsstraat 39
Brussel
Belgium

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF PURE
AND APPLIED CHEMISTRY (IUPAC)

H. FREHSE
Bayer AG, PF-A/CE-RA
Pflanzenschutzzentrum Monheim
D-5090 Leverkusen-Bayerwerk
Federal Republic of Germany

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF
NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF
PESTICIDE MANUFACTURERS (GIFAP)

W. BONTHRONE
Shell International Chemical Co.,
Shell Centre
London SE1 7PG
Great Britain

H.R. BYRNE
Chevron Chemical Co.,
940 Hensley Street
Richmond, CA 94804
USA

W. DAHNEN
Merck, Sharp & Dohme Agvet
P.O. Box 2000
Rahway, New Jersey
07065-0912 - USA

GIFAP (cont'd)

R.C. DIRKS
Monsanto Company
800 North Lindbergh Blvd.,
St. Louis, Mo 63167
USA

G.B. FULLER
Monsanto Company
800 N. Lindbergh Boulevard
St. Louis
Missouri 63141
USA

G.R. GARDINER
Technical Director
GIFAP
Avenue Hamoir 12
1180 Bruxelles
Belgium

S. GORBACH
Hoechst A.G.
Postfach 800320
6230 Frankfurt/Main 80
Fed. Rep. of Germany

W. GRAHAM
Uniroyal Limited
Brooklands Farm
Cheltenham Road
Evesham
Worcestershire WR11 6LW
Great Britain

M. HATTORI
Nippon Soda Co. Ltd.,
2-1, 2-chome, Ohtemachi
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100
Japan

RICHARD J. HEMINGWAY
ICI Plant Protection Div.
Jealotts Hill
Bracknell Berks
England

LARRY R. HODGES
Union Carbide Agricultural
Products Company, Inc.
P.O. Box 12014
Research Triangle Park,
North Carolina 27709
USA

GIFAP (cont'd)

H. HOSODA
Nihon Nohyaku Co. Ltd.,
Eitaro Building No. 2-5
1-chome Nihonbashi
Chuo-ku, Tokyo 103
Japan

B.G. JULIN
Manager, Regulatory Affairs
E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co
Agricultural Chemicals Dept.
Barley Mill Plaza
Walkers Mill 4102
Wilmington, Delaware 19898
USA

R.J. LACOSTE
(GIFAP Official Observer)
Foreign Regulatory Affairs,
Rohm and Haas Co
Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19105
USA

D.S. LAHODA
Product Registration Dept.
May & Baker
Ongar Research Station
Fyfield Road, Ongar,
Essex CM 5 OHW,
Great Britain

MARC LAURENT
Rhone Poulenc
Centre de Recherches
13 Quai Jules Guesde
94400 Vitry sur Seine
France

K. LEEMANS
Monsanto Europe
Tervurenlaan 270
1150 Bruxelles
Belgium

MARGUERITE L. LENG
Dow Chemical Company
International Regulatory Affairs
1803 Building Midland,
Michigan 48640 USA

GIFAP (cont'd)

M.N. LOUIS
Pennwalt Holland BV
P.O. Box 7120
3000 HC Rotterdam
The Netherlands

R. MARLOW
Shell International Chemical Co.
Shell Centre
London SE1 7PG
Great Britain

R.J. NIELSSON
American Cyanamid Company
P.O. Box 400
Princeton
New Jersey 08540
USA

FRANCES M. RAMER
Velsicol Chemical Corporation
341 East Ohio Street
Chicago, Ill 60611
USA

F.I. RAVENEY
Union Carbide Europe S.A.
15 Ch. Louis Dunant
Geneve - Switzerland

HENNING REGENSTEIN
BASF Aktiengesellschaft
Landw. Versuchsstation
6703 Limburgerhof
Germany, Fed.Rep. of

SAMUEL F. RICKARD
SDS Biotech Corporation
Agricultural Chemicals Business
7528 Auburn Road
P.O. Box 348
Painesville, OH 44077
USA

R. RIMPAU
Hoechst A.G., K.607
P.O. Box 800320
6230 Frankfurt/Main
Fed.Rep. of Germany

R.R. ROWE
European Registration Manager
Dow Chemical Co. Ltd.
King's Lynn, Norfolk
Great Britain

GIFAP (cont'd)

G.M. STONE
Uniroyal Inc.
74 Amity Rd
Bethany CT - USA

Y. TAKIMOTO
Sumitomo Chemical Co. Ltd.,
Pesticides Division
5, 5-chome, Kitahama
Higashi-ku, Osaka
Japan

B. THOMAS
FBC Ltd.
Chesterford Park Research Station
Saffron Walden
Essex CB10 1XL
Great Britain

R.C. TINCKNELL
11, Walkwood End
Beaconsfield
Bucks HP9 1PR

H.C.C. WAGNER
Merck Sharp & Dohme Agvet Division
P.O. Box 581
2003 PC Haarlem
The Netherlands

JACK J. WISE
Stauffer Chemical
Washington, D.C.
USA

ALFRED P. WUNDERLI
Chevron Chemical Company
940 Hensley Street Richmond,
California 94804
USA

ASSOCIATION OF OFFICIAL ANALYTICAL
CHEMISTS (AOAC)

M. TUINSTRA-LAUWAARS
European Representative of
Association of Official
Analytical Chemists
Langhoven 12
6721 SR Bennekom
The Netherlands

ASSOCIATION OF OFFICIAL
ANALYTICAL CHEMISTS (AOAC)
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF
LEGAL METROLOGY (OIML)

D.C. ABBOTT
Green Gables
Green Lane, Ashtead
Surrey
United Kingdom

EUROPEAN FOOD LAW ASSOCIATION
(EFLA)
INTERNATIONAL LIFE SCIENCES
INSTITUTE (ILSI)

J. BYRNE
European Food Law Association
28 Avenue Bois de Collines
Bruxelles - Belgium

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF
GROCERY MANUFACTURERS
ASSOCIATIONS (IFGMA)

SHERWIN GARDNER
Vice President
Science and Technology
Grocery Manufacturers of
America, Inc.
1010 Wisconsin Avenue
N.W. Washington, DC 20007

FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT
SECRETARIAT FAO/OMS
SECRETARIA FAO/OMS

H. GALAL GORCHEV
Scientist
Environmental Hazards & Food
Protection
World Health Organization
CH-1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland

J. HUTCHINSON
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards
Programme
FAO, 00100 Rome
Italy

F.-W. KOPISCH-OBUCH
Pesticide Residue Specialist
Plant Protection Service
FAO, 00100 Rome
Italy

FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT (cont'd)

L.G. LADOMERY (Secretary)
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards
Programme
FAO, 00100 Rome
Italy

A.F. MACHIN
Consultant
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards
Programme
Boundary Corner
2 Ullathorne Road
London, SW16 1SN
United Kingdom

M. MERCIER
Manager IPCS/WHO
World Health Organization
CH-1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland

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

G. VETTORAZZI
Senior Toxicologist
International Programme on
Chemical Safety (IPCS)
World Health Organization
CH-1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland

NETHERLANDS SECRETARIAT
SECRETARIAT PAYS-BAS
SECRETARIA PAISES-BAJOS

I.A. ALKEMA
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam
The Netherlands

H.J.A. BLAAUWGEERS
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam
The Netherlands

NETHERLANDS SECRETARIAT (cont'd)

P. HAKKENBRAK
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam
The Netherlands

L.J. SCHUDEBOOM
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam
The Netherlands

M. VAN DIEPEN
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
Foodstuffs Division
Dokter Reijersstraat 10
Leidschendam
The Netherlands

REPORT OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Members of the Group under Chairmanship of Mr. P.A. Greve.

Abbott, D.C.	AOAC
Andersson, A.	Sweden
Beck, H.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Belcher, R.S.	Australia
Boer, F.G. de	Netherlands
Campbell, E.	United States of America
Chen Ya-Ling	China
Cochrane, W.P.	Canada
Cordle, M.	United States of America
Declercq, B.	France
Dejonckheere, W.	Belgium
Eades, J.F.	Ireland
Frehse, H.	IUPAC
Friestad, H.O.	Norway
Galoux, M.	Belgium
Goalen, H.M.	United Kingdom
Gorbach, S.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Green Lauridsen, M.	Denmark
Greve, P.A.	Netherlands
Guenther, K.O.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Hascoët, M.	France
Hou Yu-kai	China
Hoodless, R.A.	United Kingdom
Ives, F.	United States of America
Kiviranta, A.	Finland
Laurent, M.	France
Lee, D.F.	United Kingdom
Marlow, E.	GIFAP
Morley, A.	Australia
Nolting, H.-G.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Ochoa, M.	Council of Europe
Plattner, E.	Austria
Pyysalo, H.	Finland
Quigley, J.	Ireland
Regenstein, H.	GIFAP
Stijve, T.	Switzerland
Takei, S.	Japan
Takimoto, Y.	Japan
Tian Qi-jing	China
Timme, G.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Tournayre, M.	France
Tuinstra, L.G.M.Th.	Netherlands
Tutuwan, E.J.B.	Cameroon
Vongbuddhapitak, A.	Thailand
Wessel, J.R.	United States of America
Womastek, R.	Austria
Yao Shu-tian	China

1. Agenda

The Working Group discussed the following points:
- recommendations for "simplified" methods;

- analysis of PCBs;
- recommendations for methods of analysis:
- statements made by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS);
- statements made on behalf of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC) and the International Organisation of Legal Metrology (OIML).

2. Recommendations for "simplified" methods

Further to the discussions held last year (cf ALINORM 85/24A, pages 42 and 68-69) and taking into account the answers given in the questionnaire sent out by the Chairman on this subject, the Working Group discussed the possibilities of recommending "simplified" methods. The need for such methods had in the meantime been stressed also by the Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries (cf Document CX/PR 85/8, par. 9). General requirements for methods to be classified as "simplified" were agreed upon by the Group (see par. 1.6 of Annex I to this Appendix) and a selection of "simplified" methods from the references given in par. 3 of the same Annex was made. It was suggested that GIFAP could be of help by encouraging the supply of information on "simplified" methods of analysis.

3. Analysis of PCBs

Further to the discussions held last year (cf ALINORM 85/24A, pages 48 and 68) and taking into account the answers given in the questionnaire sent out by the Chairman on this subject, the Working Group discussed the problems connected with the analysis of PCBs in food. Basically, three ways of measuring the residue are currently in use:

- from the GLC pattern (usually derived from a packed column) an estimate is made of the total PCB content;
- selected individual PCB congeners are determined by capillary GLC and their concentrations are added;
- selected individual PCB congeners are determined by capillary GLC and their concentrations are reported as such.

The first method (the "pattern" method) has the advantage of being relatively simple as regards instrumentation; however, it has to be standardised carefully and the assessment of the measurements also needs careful treatment. The second and third methods ("individual component" methods) have the advantage that well-defined compounds are determined. In all methods there is an element of arbitrariness in the choice of peaks on which quantitation of the PCB content is based. It was also noted that the results from the different methods cannot be directly compared.

Choice between the methods available is dictated mainly by the way national limits are developed and expressed. If the deliberations in the Working Group on Contaminants or in Plenary make it desirable, further discussions would take place at a future meeting of CCPR.

4. Recommendations for methods of analysis

The Working Group undertook the up-dating and reviewing of the recommendations for methods of analysis given at the previous Session (Ref. CAC/PR 8-1984). The new list, which supercedes the lists given previously, will be published under ref. CAC/PR 8-1985.

In order to harmonize the lay-out of the list with the other parts of the Guide (CAC/PR 2/1984), the pesticides have been rearranged according to their Codex number rather than alphabetically as previously. References to "simplified" methods (cf par. 2) have been marked with an "[S]".

5. Statements made by the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling CCMAS

At the request of the Chairman of the CCPR, the Group discussed a statement made by CCMAS on "Obligatory or Advisory Nature of Codex Methods of Analysis" and on "Definition of Limit of Determination" (Document CX/PR 85/3, par. 1-6).

The Group restated its opinion (cf ALINORM 85/24, page 60) that "reference methods", defined as "Type II" by CCMAS, do not serve the purpose of CCPR. The recommendations given by the Group so far can be regarded as "alternative approved methods" (Type III) or "tentative methods" (Type IV), whereas "defining methods" (Type I) have not yet been given by the Group. It might be envisaged, however, that such methods will have to be chosen in the case of PCBs and other complex mixtures (cf par. 3).

The preference stated by CCMAS for the concept of "limit of determination" rather than "limit of detection" is fully endorsed by the Group. It was brought to the attention of the Group that AOAC recently adopted a similar standpoint on this subject.

In the same context it was mentioned that some MRLs are set below a practical limit of determination. This poses difficulties for laboratories which want to check samples routinely for compliance with those low MRLs, especially when using multi-residue methods of analysis.

6. Statements made on behalf of AOAC and OIML

On behalf of AOAC, Dr. Abbott stated that AOAC is continuously interested in data on collaborative tests and will, whenever possible, promote their publication in the Journal of the AOAC. The conclusions of the meeting on this subject held in Washington last year under the auspices of AOAC and IUPAC will be published in the Journal of the AOAC.

On behalf of OIML, Dr. Abbott announced the preparation of a publication on performance specifications for, among others, gas chromatographs and GC/MS systems. In the near future, a similar document on HPLC and AAS will be prepared.

- - - - -

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON DEVELOPMENT OF RESIDUES DATA AND SAMPLING

1. Members of the Group met under the Chairmanship of Mr. J.A.R. Bates.

An Gi Ho	Korea, Dem.People's Rep.of
Andersson, A.	Sweden
Bates, J.A.R.	United Kingdom
Beck, H.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Belcher, R.S.	Australia
Bellisai, H.S.	Italy
Bennet, P.R.	Canada
Besemer, A.F.H.	The Netherlands
Boer, F.G. de	The Netherlands
Campbell, E.	United States of America
Ćelma, E.	Spain
Chen, Yu-Ying	China
Choi Il Rok	Korea, Dem.People's Rep.of
Cochrane, W.P.	Canada
Cordle, M.	United States of America
Dejonckheere, W.	Belgium
Dolan, M.B.	Ireland
Eades, J.F.	Ireland
Fabbrini, R.	Italy
Frehse, H.	IUPAC
Friestad, H.O.	Norway
Goalen, H.M.	United Kingdom
Gorbach, S.G.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Green Lauridsen, M.	Denmark
Greve, P.A.	The Netherlands
Günther, K.O.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Györfi, László	Hungary
Harcoet, M.	France
Hemingway, R.J.	GIFAP
Hongtrakul, T.	Thailand
Hoodless, R.A.	United Kingdom
Ives, F.	United States of America
Kiviranta, A.	Finland
Lee, D.F.	United Kingdom
Morley, A.	Australia
Nolting, H.G.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Ochoa, M.	Council of Europe
Plattner, E.	Austria
Pyysalo, H.	Finland
Quattrocci, E.	Italy
Rajak, R.L.	India
Regenstein, H.	GIFAP
Röpsch, A.	Germany, Fed.Rep.of
Stijve, T.	Switzerland
Takei, S.	Japan
Timme, G.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Tournayre, M.	France
Tuinstra, L.G.M.Th.	The Netherlands
Tutuwan, E.J.B.	Cameroon
Walsh, M.	EEC
Wessel, J.R.	United States of America
Womastek, R.	Austria
Yao, Shu Tian	China

Guidelines on studies to provide data on the nature and amount of pesticide residues in products of animal origin

2. The Group considered a further draft of these Guidelines together with several written comments from members. Some modifications were made after discussion of proposed amendments and it was agreed to submit a final version to the plenary meeting (Room Document nr. 11)

Guidelines on sample sizes of agricultural commodities in Pesticide Residues Trials

3. The FAO Guidelines on Pesticide Residue Trials include proposals for the size of samples that should be taken from trials plots. The practical experience with these proposals led the GIFAP Residue Committee to prepare a working paper for the Group to consider possible improvements in the proposals for sample sizes. The Group, after a preliminary examination of the working paper requested the Chairman to collect written comments from members and prepare a new draft for further discussion.

Guidelines on sampling food for the determination of pesticide residues for regulatory purposes (sampling of meat)

4. Information from some member countries was discussed by the Group and it was agreed that it was now possible to draft some recommendations for sampling meat and meat products. These would be circulated to members for comment and a further draft would be reviewed at the 18th CCPR in 1986. It was concluded that the recommendations for carcass meat should be based on the principle that, unlike most sampling of crop commodities, primary samples of meat should be analysed individually and that the MRL should be applied to the concentration in the primary sample.

Codex classification of Foods and Animal Feedstuffs.

5. At the request of the plenary meeting the Group made a preliminary examination of the revised Classification (Ref. CAC/PR 4-1984), in particular the descriptions of the part of the commodities to which MRLs apply and which should be analysed. The Group identified some omissions and suggested some amendments to the consultant preparing the document. It recommended that member countries should be invited to examine the document in detail before the next session.

- - - - -

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

1. The above Working Group held its session under the Chairmanship of Mr. Victoriano Tolosa (Argentina).

The following participated in the deliberations.

Ammour, A.	Algeria
Assoumou, L.	Gabon
Black, A.	Australia
Bosse, W.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Byng, J.S.	United Kingdom
Byrne, A.D.	GIFAP
Cacqueray, M.	France
Celma, E.	Spain
Chandra, F.A.	United Kingdom
Declercq, M.B.	France
Deema, S.	Thailand
Diaz Holton, B.	Argentina
Dirks, R.C.	GIFAP
Djambong, J.	Cameroon
Fathy Macklad	Egypt (Rapporteur)
Fertig, S.N.	United States of America
Fuller, G.B.	GIFAP
Gardiner, G.R.	GIFAP
Gorchev, H. Galal	WHO
Grillo, M.	Cuba
Halliday, D.	United Kingdom
Haouar, M.	Algeria
Hooper, G.N.	Australia
Hotellier, M. l'	France
Hutchinson, J.	FAO
Julin, B.G.	GIFAP
Kopisch-Obuch, F.-W.	FAO
Lacoste, R.J.	GIFAP
Ladomery, L.G.	FAO
Lahoda, D.S.	GIFAP
Laurent, M.	GIFAP
Leng, M.L.	GIFAP
McCollister, D.D.	United States of America
Mercier, M.	WHO
Mjeni, A.M.	Sultanate of Oman
Okumura, A.	Japan
Parry, R.M.	United States of America
Pothisiri, P.	Thailand
Rajak, R.L.	India
Rao-Maturu, N.	FAO
Rickard, S.F.	GIFAP
Schuddeboom, L.J.	The Netherlands
Smeets, L.	Belgium
Ström, A.	Sweden
Taylor, J.K.	Canada
Tincknell, R.C.	GIFAP

Tolosa, V.	Argentina
Tsimi, C.	Cameroon
Tutuwan, E.	Cameroon
Vettorazzi, G.	WHO
Wahlström, B.	Sweden
Willis, G.A.	United Kingdom
Zheng Zihou	China

Appointment of rapporteurs

2. Mr. Macklad Fathy (Egypt) was appointed to act as rapporteur of the session of the Working Group.

Adoption of the Provisional Agenda

3. The Working Group adopted the provisional agenda (WG3/PR83/1) without change.

Matters of interest to the Working Group

4. The Working Group had before it documents WG3/PR 85/2, WG3/PR 85/3 and Cx/PR 85/8.

Reports of the Vice-Chairmen on Regional Activities in the field of pesticide residues

Africa:

5. In the absence of Mrs. S.M. Dogheim (Egypt), Vice-Chairman for the region of Africa, Mr. M. Fathy (Egypt) gave a report on regional activities in Egypt in the field of pesticide residues. The Committee noted that the region of Africa had not been as active as would be desirable in the field of pesticide residue work. It was noted, however, that Egypt was in agreement to hold a regional seminar on pesticides and their residues in that country but that further details still needed to be worked out.

The delegation of France expressed the opinion that the Region of Africa should receive the greatest attention from FAO and other international organizations as regards the control of pesticides and their residues.

Asia:

6. Mr. Deema, Vice Chairman for the Region of Asia, informed the Working Group that, following the recommendations of the meeting in Phetchburi held in Feb. 1984, FAO Technical staff had visited Thailand with a view to setting up a Regional Pesticide Training Center in Chang-Mai. A course in pesticide residue analysis in which 8 countries in the region of Asia had participated had been held in Bangkok, Thailand. The valuable assistance of GIFAP in this connection was very much appreciated.

It was envisaged that a regional meeting on pesticide residue problems would be held in Thailand, just prior to the fifth session of the Codex Coordinating Committee for Asia in Jakarta (Indonesia) during early 1986. The meeting envisaged would be of a seminar type at which invited speakers, experts in the field of pesticides would also participate.

Latin America

7. Mr. Tolosa, Vice-Chairman of the Region of Latin America and the Caribbean informed the Working Group that letters were sent to the

following countries: Peru, Mexico, Jamaica, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Cuba, Costa Rica, Columbia, Venezuela, Panama, Paraguay, Uruguay, Guatemala, El Salvador, Chili, Trinidad and Tobago. With the aim of establishing communications in region.

The Letters emphasized the importance of free exchange of views between countries and with this in mind the following points were made:

- (a) The need to reply to the questionnaire CL 1984/34-PR which when analysed could lead to decision on reciprocal technical aid and/or aid from international organizations;
- (b) The need to establish "simple" analytical methodology. For this countries would need to formulate their priorities for transmission to the Working Group on Analytical Methods of the CCPR;
- (c) The importance to countries of the region of the Draft International Code of Practice on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, a document prepared by FAO. This Draft Code deals with many problems encountered by Developing Countries with regard to pesticides, such as registration, impossibility of countries of the region to finance testing for evaluation of the toxicological aspects, installation of facilities for the certification of the active principle, national systems of inspection and extension. These and other problems are common to the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean in the matters under our consideration.

8. The replies show the following common points:

- a) Encourage better communication among countries of the region
- b) The need of funds for laboratory maintenance for pesticide residue control
- c) Financial constraints in acquiring equipment and accessories in foreign currency.
- d) Need for monitoring programmes for pesticide residues for food in the so-called "food basket".

9. Taking these into account a list of some priorities for the region can be compiled.

- a) To identify the existing laboratory or laboratories in countries which supply formulation and residue analysis services in the region. The financial and technical assistance must be relied on through coordination activities of FAO of WHO.
- b) The Codex Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean should serve as the forum for discussions and proposals of countries of the region on pesticide matters.
- c) To repeat the statement of Mr. R. Mendez, Vice-Chairman of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, made at the 31st Session of the Executive Committee of the Commission when he underlined the need of obtaining funds to assist in increasing participation for developing countries at Codex meetings. He also pointed out that working through correspondence was not sufficient to enable the Coordinators to carry out their functions efficiently in their regions and suggested that funds should be found to finance these activities.

- d) Encourage the financial assistance provided by PAHO to Latin America and Caribbean countries for participation in the workshops/seminars held prior to the Sessions of the Coordinating Committee for the region. Extension of funding to allow participation of pesticide specialists of the region at the Committee's Session should be requested.

The Group noted that, in order to make the Regions conscious of pesticide residue problems, all Codex regional Coordinating Committees had as a standing item on their agenda pesticide related problems in the Region, for discussion. The Committee learnt in addition that PAHO was organizing a two day seminar on "Health and Food Control" in association with the 5th Session of the Codex Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean which would also discuss pesticide problems in general.

Second Questionnaire of WG3 (CL 1984/34-PR)

10. The Working Group noted that, in response to a circular letter containing a questionnaire on manpower development and providing facilities for pesticide residue control in developing countries replies were received from 22 countries as contained in WG3/PR 85/2.

Delegations from 4 other countries also provided replies to the questionnaire from the floor.

The delegation of India informed the Committee that the present questionnaire should be modified to include needs for strengthening the existing facilities. Also since some text was missing in the second questionnaire and, as pointed out by the delegation of Australia, some governments had not received the questionnaire, the Secretariat was asked to distribute a third questionnaire suitably modified. GIFAP agreed to continue its function to coordinate the replies.

The delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Working Group about the existence of an organization, the German Agency for Technical Cooperation, in its country which provided assistance to developing countries in the field of pesticide analysis and pesticide formulation.

International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides

11. The Working Group was informed that a revised draft of the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides had been prepared on the basis of comments received from 80 countries and international organizations and that the revised version of the Code was before the FAO Committee on Agriculture for adoption.* Many developing countries appeared to be in favour of the latest version of the Code.

Some members of the Group were of the view that the Code would be most effective as a voluntary Code for the control of agricultural chemicals.

* Mr. B. Watts (New Zealand) informed the Committee that the Code has been endorsed by the FAO Committee on Agriculture and will be referred to the FAO Council and FAO Conference, meeting later this year.

Simplified Approach to the Control of Pesticides

12. The Group noted that the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Specifications, Registration Requirements and Application Standards had drawn up recommendations to the developing countries for measures to be taken for the immediate control of pesticides even before establishing an effective pesticide registration scheme (see WG3:PR 85/3).

Recommendations of the Working Group

13. The Group had before it document CX/PR 85/8 which contained a progress report on action taken on the recommendations of WG3. The document contained the recommendations and notes by the Secretariat on the action taken.

Recommendation 1b:

14. The Group noted that it would be difficult for international organizations to evaluate conditions in a given country unless requested to do so by Governments which should identify their own priorities. The Group also noted that certain developing countries were carrying out their own safety evaluations and in order to assist them, IPCS should provide the JMPR evaluations and other relevant information at an early date. It was also pointed out that in addition to toxicological evaluation of pesticides, information should also be made available on the toxicity of intermediate chemicals in pesticide manufacture.

Recommendation 4

15. Since IPCS is interested in safety aspects rather than agricultural use of pesticides, the view was expressed that the recommendation should be reworded. Dr. Mercier, manager of IPCS, informed the Group that certain pesticides banned for use in many developed countries, would find continued use for some more time to come and that this would necessitate certain safety surveillance programmes and emergency care in cases of intoxication due to pesticides. In the list of priority chemical substances which are the subject of Environmental Health Criteria Documents, pesticides play an important place and about 30 pesticides have been actually considered. These documents will be accompanied by supplements which will provide administration practical information and useful advice. Medical brochures containing information concerning diagnostic means and treatment of acute intoxications, will be published. Particular attention is paid to the training of required personnel. Various means of strengthening and supporting the activities of JMPR are being examined together with some member states. The Group asked the Secretariat to redraft recommendation 4 in consultation with Dr. Mercier.

Recommendations 5 and 6

16. The Group noted that the above are ongoing activities and should be retained.

Recommendation 9

17. In view of the urgent need for simple methods for pesticide analysis that could be used without sophisticated equipment, the Group agreed to refer this matter to the Working Group on Methods of Analysis, noting that the Working Group had already initiated action.

Recommendation 10

18. The Group agreed with the view that a reference should be made to the FAO model pesticide registration scheme.

Recommendation 11 and 12

19. The Group felt that the above recommendations were not followed by governments, resulting in difficulty in communication. The Secretariat was requested to send a circular letter to governments requesting information on persons/offices responsible on pesticide residue matters, as contained in the recommendation.

Recommendation 13

20. The Secretariat was requested by the Group to issue a third questionnaire (see para 8)

Recommendation 14

21. The Group agreed that the Vice-Chairmen for the Regions on pesticide residue matters would be responsible for organizing the meetings referred to in the recommendation.
Reference to time frame was deleted from the recommendation.

Recommendation 15

22. The Group was of the view that this was a significant recommendation that should be stressed.

Recommendation 16

23. The Group expressed the view that assistance should be provided to strengthen the existing laboratories in addition to develop new ones.
The recommendations of the Group as revised are given in Annex 1.

Nomination of Regional Chairmen for Pesticide Residue Matters

24.	For Africa	Mr. Macklad Fathy	(Egypt)
	Asia	Mr. Sakdi Prayoon Deema	(Thailand)
	Latin America and the Caribbean	Mr. Victoriano Tolosa	(Argentina)

It was agreed that the Chairman for the Working Group 3 should, henceforth, be chosen from the above three regional chairmen or from among the delegates on an ad hoc-basis.

The Working Group expressed its thanks to Mr. A.F. Rahde former Chairman of the Working Group and Mrs. S. Dogheim (former Vice-Chairman for Africa) for their work.

Other Business

25. The delegation of Cuba expressed the view that it would be essential for Mr. V. Tolosa (coordinator for pesticide residue matters in the Region of Latin America and the Caribbean) to participate in the seminar "Health and food control" which will be held in association with the 4th Session of the Regional Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean. This would facilitate discussion on "Pesticide Residue problems in the region of Latin America" during the seminar.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Noting that most of the countries, in spite of having food laws and regulations for the prevention of food adulteration, do not have adequate laws or regulations for the registration of pesticides:
 - Noting that facilities for pre-registration trials on pesticides and their formulations, for toxicity tests, determination of residues on crops, stored food commodities, animal foods, processed foods, etc., for generation of appropriate data on intake and on the impact of pesticides on the environment are inadequate or even non-existent in many countries;
 - Noting that, where laboratory facilities exist, the available equipment and funds, including foreign exchange, for the continued operation of the laboratories are insufficient, and that the number of laboratories is inadequate;
 - Agreeing that the training of appropriate personnel in the above fields deserves immediate attention;
1. Requests that, in order to overcome the above drawbacks, FAO and WHO should:
 - (a) prepare and supply to developing countries, at the earliest opportunity, guidelines for the gradual introduction of a basic registration scheme for pesticides with an ultimate aim of preparing model pesticides laws or regulations for appropriate action by the governments of developing countries;
 - (b) evaluate conditions in individual countries and prepare a proposal for the essential components of a pesticide laboratory which would fit the needs of those countries. This proposal should take into account pesticide formulation control as well as the pesticide residue analysis of relevant food commodities.
 2. Recommends that FAO/WHO and other International Bodies should be prepared to supply, on request, information on toxicological data (including toxic hazards and precautions to be taken) and efficacy of pesticides and formulations to developing countries.
 3. Urges that FAO and International Organizations such as UNDP, UNEP, IAEA, IUPAC and GIFAP as well as governments and bilateral agencies should, in the light of countries' priorities intensify their assistance to developing countries in establishing, as early as possible, suitable laboratory facilities for pesticide analysis and training. This assistance should include the provision of funds to be allocated for the purchase and installation of advanced analytical equipment; the training of analysts in the use of such equipment and the training of maintenance personnel; the establishment of central and satellite laboratories in the various regions; purchase of reagents and reference standards of pesticides and metabolites.
 4. Requests
The International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS), established by UNEP, ILO and WHO, to intensify its actions in order to supply to Member States relevant information on health and environmental risks caused by exposure to pesticides. Furthermore, to make special efforts to train personnel in developing countries, needed for the implementation of the recommendations of the IPCS with a view to establishing appropriate legislation. Evaluation facilities should also be identified and developed for establishing health related studies with international or bilateral financial assistance to countries of the regions.

5. Recommends that, in order to accelerate the development of pesticide control, consultations among developing countries be arranged in the various Regions in order to study the needs and means so that action programmes on pesticide residues could be drawn up on the basis of priorities decided in these consultations, through approach involving "Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC)".
6. Recommends that, as a collaborative effort among countries, Regional Committees on Pesticides should be established to discuss problems related to pesticides in the Region and that seminars and conferences for exchange of technical information and experiences gained in this field be held frequently.
7. Requests FAO/WHO to consider the preparation of a manual to advise on the availability of information on pesticides, the work and recommendations of international bodies and sources of technical assistance, etc.
8. Requests that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and Codex Regional Coordinating Committees should include on their agenda subjects of interest to developing countries in the field of pesticides including those proposed by the Working Group.
9. Urges the Ad Hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues to encourage the development of simplified methods of analysis for the determination of pesticides that could be used without sophisticated equipment, and to draw particular attention to simplified methods.
10. Recommends that developing countries should:
 - (a) establish national inter-departmental committees to deal with matters related to pesticide residues and to act as a National Codex Committee and as the Codex Contact Point in this field;
 - (b) identify the responsible person in the interdepartmental Committee who would be responsible for all Codex matters related to pesticides;
 - (c) ensure control of import, sale and use of pesticides and their residues in food;
 - (d) take steps to ensure that pesticides are registered on the basis of:
 - (i) appropriate data such as those recommended by FAO/WHO (Ref. FAO Guidelines for the Registration and Control of Pesticides (including model scheme for the establishment of national Organizations));
 - (ii) local agricultural information; and taking into account, where appropriate
 - (iii) the Evaluations and Reports of the Joint FAO/WHO Meetings on Pesticide Residues to supplement toxicological and residue data which should be required to be submitted by each company applying for national registration.
 - (e) Prepare a document indicating the presently available facilities and expertise in developing countries for pre-registration trials, toxicological evaluation, residue analysis, generation of appropriate data on intake of pesticide residues, and impact in the environment. Such a document should be a collaborative effort of regional Committees.
 - (f) To carry out regular monitoring where facilities exist or are developed subsequently and, pending the availability of such facilities, to cooperate/collaborate in residue analysis of food items of national/international importance.

11. Agrees that there is increasing need for governments to identify clearly the department(s) in charge of national programmes of pesticide residues, to whom policy matters and documents should be referred.
12. Recommends that all governments should prepare or update without delay the mailing list of personnel connected with pesticide residues for ensuring timely supply of FAO/WHO documents on the subject.
13. Agrees that there is a need for periodic updating of questionnaires to be sent to all governments to elicit information on:
 - (a) available technical facilities;
 - (b) infrastructures;
 - (c) instrumental analysis, control and toxicological aspects of pesticides; and
 - (d) availability of expert manpower in the area.
14. Observes that there is an increasing interest and need felt to promote regional meetings on pesticide residues, aiming at technical cooperation and the evaluation of common problems in the area related to:
 - (i) registration
 - (ii) analytical methods
 - (iii) good agricultural practice; and
 - (iv) acceptances of Codex maximum residue limits; andagrees that assistance from FAO and WHO in such meetings would be most welcome.
15. Urges governments to undertake collaborative studies aimed at generating residue data for such commodities which move in international trade and which are of economic significance to the developing countries, from supervised field trials conducted according to Good Agricultural Practice using pesticides of common interest in the Region. Such an exercise enables the active participation of the developing countries in the Region in the process of establishing Codex MRLs and ERLs in order to ensure that Codex limits are appropriate to the situations prevailing in those countries.
16. Recommends that developing countries take steps to ensure the continued availability of funds and foreign exchange so that laboratories including those established under UN technical assistance arrangements remain fully operational.
17. Urges International Organizations such as FAO, WHO and others to provide funds to increase participation of representatives of Developing Countries at all Codex Sessions and thereby making the contribution of these countries to the work of the Commission in general and of the CCPR in particular more effective.
18. Recommends that the governments, UN Bodies and International Organizations to whom the above recommendations are directed take follow-up action as early as possible and that appropriate funds be earmarked so that the recommendations be given effect.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON REGULATORY PRINCIPLES

1. The Group met under the Chairmanship of Mr. J. Wessel.

Abbott, D.C.	AOAC
Bates, J.A.R.	United Kingdom
Bennett, P.R.	Canada
Besemer, A.F.H.	The Netherlands
Black, A.L.	Australia
Blomqvist, H.	Finland
Bonthrone, W.	GIFAP
Bosse, W.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Byng, J.S.	United Kingdom
Byrne, H.D.	GIFAP
Cacqueray, M. de	France
Celma, E.	Spain
Chandra, F.	United Kingdom
Cordle, F.	United States of America
Declercq, M.B.	France
Deema, S.	Thailand
Dirks, R.C.	GIFAP
Dolan, M.B.	Ireland
Dupuis, G.	Switzerland
Fertig, S.	United States of America
Frawley, J.P.	United States of America
Fuller, G.B.	GIFAP
Gardiner, G.R.	GIFAP
Gardner, S.	IFGMA
Gollop, E.	Israel
Gorbach, S.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Gorchev, H. Galal	WHO
Graham, W.	GIFAP
Guenther, K.O.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Györfi, L.	Hungary
Halliday, D.	United Kingdom
Hodges, L.R.	GIFAP
Hooper, G.N.	Australia
Hotellier, M. l'	France
Hutchinson, J.	FAO
Ives, F.	United States of America
Jaeger, R.B.	United States of America
Julin, B.G.	GIFAP
Keet, C.	The Netherlands
Kolk, J. van der	The Netherlands
Kopisch-Obuch, F.-W.	FAO
Lacoste, R.J.	GIFAP
Ladomery, L.G.	FAO
Lahoda, D.S.	GIFAP
Laurent, M.	GIFAP
Leber, G.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Leemans, K.	GIFAP
Leng, M.L.	GIFAP
Lindsay, D.G.	United Kingdom
McCollister, D.D.	United States of America
Mercier, M.	IPCS/WHO
Nollen, H.M.	The Netherlands
Ochoa, M.	Council of Europe
Okumura, A.	Japan

Paakkanen, J.	Finland
Parry, R.	United States of America
Paulsen, J.	Norway
Petzold, R.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Plattner, E.	Austria
Pothisiri, P.	Thailand
Raffke, W.	German Dem. Rep.
Ramer, F.M.	GIFAP
Rao Maturu, N.	FAO
Regenstein, H.	GIFAP
Rickard, S.	GIFAP
Rimpau, R.H.	GIFAP
Roovers, H.	Benelux
Röpsch, A.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Salter, L.	Canada
Seiler, J.P.	Switzerland
Smeets, L.	Belgium
Smith, T.H.	Norway
Strom, A.	Sweden
Timme, G.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Tincknell, R.C.	GIFAP
Töpner, W.	Germany, Fed. Rep. of
Tuomaala, V.	Finland
Vermes, P.	Israel
Vettorazzi, G.	WHO
Wahlström, B.	Sweden
Walsh, M.	EEC
Wessel, J.	United States of America
Willis, G.A.	United Kingdom
Wunderli, A.P.	GIFAP

2. Agenda:

The following topics were discussed:

- a. Recommended National Regulatory Practices to Facilitate Acceptance and Use of Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues in Foods (ALINORM 85/24A-Add. 2).
- b. Draft Resolution on National Regulatory Practices (CX/PR 85/10).
- c. Replies to the Questionnaire on National Pesticide Regulatory Systems.
- d. Acceptability of Codex MRLs in Light of Possible Dietary Exposure.

Recommended National Regulatory Practices

3. At the 16th Session of the CCPR, the Committee adopted the Working Group's draft document entitled "Recommended National Regulatory Practices to Facilitate Acceptance and Use of Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues in Foods." Following the session, the document underwent editing and a summary of the recommendations contained in the document was added. As requested by the Committee, the final version (ref. ALINORM 85/24A-Add. 2) was distributed to Codex Contact Points and participants at the 16th Session of the CCPR.

4. At that Session the Working Group also suggested that governments submit comments for discussion at the 17th Session of the CCPR on their experiences in the use of the document and the effect the recommendations had had or might have on their national regulatory practices. No comments were received because the document was issued only recently, which did not give governments adequate opportunity to

consider the recommendations and their application, as appropriate, at the national level. Accordingly the Working Group recommended that the Committee again request countries to comment on their use of the document, for discussion by the Working Group and the Committee at the next Session of the CCPR. The comments should be submitted to the Chairman of the Working Group no later than February 1, 1986.

Draft Resolution on National Regulatory Practices

5. The Working Group also considered a draft resolution (CX/PR 85/10), the purpose of which was that the Codex Alimentarius Commission, at its next Session, should endorse and to call to the attention of countries the document on recommended national regulatory practices. The Working Group suggested several minor changes in the draft resolution and recommended that the Committee consider and adopt the draft for forwarding to the Commission. (see Annex I to this Appendix).

Replies to the Questionnaire on National Pesticide Regulatory Systems

6. The United Kingdom delegation informed the Working Group that since last year only one country (Thailand) had submitted updated information for the questionnaire (will be included in a document to be prepared by the Secretariat).

7. The Working Group agreed that further action on the original questionnaire was no longer necessary. Instead, the Group concluded that a new questionnaire should be developed to obtain specific information from countries regarding their use of the document on recommended national regulatory practices. If the Committee agrees, the new questionnaire will be issued in 1988.

Acceptability of Codex MRLs in the Light of Possible Dietary Exposure

8. At the 16th Session of the CCPR, the Working Group discussed the problem of countries not being able to accept Codex MRLs from a consumer safety point of view. As a result, it was agreed that guidelines should be developed to assist countries in making realistic predictions of dietary exposures relative to ADIs when Codex MRLs for the pesticide are accepted (paras 297-300 and para 9, Appendix V, ALINORM 85/24 A). It was further agreed that a discussion paper on this topic should be prepared by the Working Group which would examine the various issues involved in considering the relationship of Codex MRLs to consumer safety and other relevant issues concerning the development and use of the proposed guidelines.

9. Following the 16th Session, an informal meeting was held by WHO in Geneva to outline the scope and content of the discussion paper. Among other things, the meeting suggested that in addition to the need for countries to estimate dietary exposures to pesticide residues at the national level, such estimates would also be needed by the JMPR and CCPR at the international level. This concept was included in a draft discussion paper which was circulated to members of the Working Group in October 1984 for review. On the basis of the comments received, a second draft of the discussion paper was prepared for discussion at the Working Group meeting.

10. The discussion covered a number of major points in the draft, including the meaning of ADIs and the relationships between GAP, MRLs and ADIs, the possible role of the JMPR in estimating dietary exposures to pesticide residues, the types of information needed for making such estimates, the simultaneous occurrence of several residues and other related issues.

It was agreed that members of the Working Group should submit to the Chairman within three months additional comments on these and other aspects in the discussion paper for preparation of a third draft. It was also agreed that the third draft should be presented first to the 1985 JMPR for review and comment. It was felt that the views of the JMPR concerning the various issues involved in estimating dietary exposures to pesticide residues in relation to ADIs would be important and useful information for the Committee when considering the discussion paper. Therefore, the Working Group's presentation of a revised discussion paper to the Committee would take place at the next Session.

- - - - -

APPENDIX V(contd.)
ANNEX I

Draft Codex Resolution on National Regulatory Practices for Pesticide Residues in Food

Having examined the attached document entitled "Recommended National Regulatory Practices to Facilitate Acceptance and Use of Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues in Food" (ALINORM 85/24 A-Add.2);

Recognizing that since its first session in 1966, the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues has made considerable progress in the development of recommended international maximum limits for pesticide residues in food that have been adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and in the development of related procedures bearing on the meaning and use of such limits;

Recognizing that the acceptance and use of Codex recommended maximum residue limits for food on an international scale are an important contribution to ensuring the safety of the consumer, the maintenance of adequate pest control measures according to Good Agricultural Practice, and the facilitation of international trade;

Pointing out that a number of the Member Countries have accepted the recommended limits in a form that will facilitate international trade, but that many Member Countries have not notified the Codex Alimentarius Commission of their position on any of the recommended maximum residue limits;

Being aware of the fact that a few countries have laws that prohibit them from recognizing the good agricultural practices of other countries in the use of pesticides, and that most other countries which do not have this legal impediment, are confronted with other obstacles of a policy or procedural nature that can impede or prevent them from accepting or uniformly applying Codex maximum residue limits to food in international trade;

Draws attention to the fact that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues has prepared the attached document which provides detailed information on (1) the principles and procedures followed by the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues and by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues in the elaboration of recommended international maximum limits for pesticide residues in food; (2) the importance of reaching international agreement on such limits; (3) the issues that can serve as obstacles to governments accepting Codex limits; and (4) the regulatory practices recommended for Member Countries to follow in order to overcome these obstacles and to achieve the benefits to health and trade of having international agreement on maximum limits for pesticide residues in food;

APPENDIX V (contd.)

ANNEX I (contd.)

Urges that each Member Country, as a matter of national policy, make the commitment to strive to accept Codex recommended pesticide limits in a form that facilitates international trade in its country's commodities and in those of other countries;

Recommends that, as part of this commitment, national authorities should undertake appropriate action of legislative, legal, or administrative nature that will enable their government to meet the objectives of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues and the Codex Alimentarius Commission;

Draws attention to the recommended national regulatory practice summarized in pages i-iv of the document and presented in detail in Part II of the document;

Pointing out that the recommendations cover most aspect of the regulation of pesticide residues in food including: (1) good agricultural practices in the use of pesticides as reflected by Codex, (2) consumer safety (e.g., the relationship of intake of pesticide residues to acceptable daily intakes, Codex limits for pesticides not registered in a country, and the availability of proprietary toxicological data); (3) the portions of commodities to which Codex limits apply; (4) Codex limits in terms of residue definition; (5) sampling and analytical procedures for purposes of MRL enforcement; (6) the regulation of pesticide residues in processed food; and (7) other issues such as Codex limits that are higher than national limits or the lack of national limits;

Recognizing that for some Member Countries, many of the recommended regulatory practices already exist, whereas the national regulatory practices of other Member Countries are either not consistent with or contrary to those recommended;

Recommends that each Member Country consider the document in its entirety and then begin a national programme for harmonizing, as appropriate, its national pesticide regulatory practices with those set forth by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues in its document.

- - - - -

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITIES

The Group met under the Chairmanship of Mr. B.B. Watts.

Anderson, A.	Sweden
Bates, J.A.R.	United Kingdom
Belcher, R.	Australia
Bellisai, M.G.	Italy
Besemer, A.F.H.	The Netherlands
Black, A.L.	Australia
Blomquist, H.	Finland
Bon throne, W.	GIFAP
Byng, J.S.	United Kingdom
Dirks, R.	GIFAP
Dupuis, G.	Switzerland
Fabbrini, R.	Italy
Fuller, G.	GIFAP
Graham, W.	GIFAP
Hoffman-Hadar, M.	Israel
Hooper, G.N.	Australia
Hotellier, M. l'	France
Julin, B.	GIFAP
Kolk, J. van der	The Netherlands
Kopisch-Obuch, F.-W.	FAO
Ladomery, L.G.	FAO
Laurent, M.	GIFAP
Leemans, K.	GIFAP
Marlow, R.	GIFAP
Morley, A.	Australia
Parry, R.M.	United States of America
Regenstein, H.	GIFAP
Rimpau, R.	GIFAP
Salter, L.	Canada
Seiler, J.P.	Switzerland
Ström, A.	Sweden
Taylor, J.	Canada
Tincknell, R.C.	GIFAP
Tonkelaar, E.M. den	The Netherlands
Vermes, P.	Israel
Vettorazzi, G.	WHO
Wahlström, B.	Sweden
Walsh, M.	EEC
Watts, B.B.	New Zealand
Willis, G.A.	United Kingdom

1. The Working Group agreed on two proposals:
 - (i) to simplify procedures by establishing one list of pesticides in order of priority instead of using multiple lists in different categories,
 - (ii) to maintain on the list of priorities pesticides which continue to meet the criteria even when it appears that data will not be available.

2. The importance of the following criteria for establishing priorities was reemphasized:
The use of the pesticide must:
give rise to residues in or on a food or feed commodity moving in international trade,
the presence of which are or may be a matter of public health concern and thus create or have the potential to create significant problems in international trade.

3. The Working Group noted that the compounds dimethipin, flucythrinate, chlofentezine, thiodicarb and pyrazofos were on the agenda for the 1985 JMPR:

4. The remaining compounds have been listed in the table below in order of priority. The first 6, vinclozolin to benalaxyl, are proposed for the 1986 JMPR agenda.

<u>Number</u>	<u>ISO Common Name</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Data Available</u>	<u>JMPR Agenda</u>	<u>Manufacturer</u>
77-	vinclozolin ^a	FRG	1986	1986	BASF
81-11	glyphosate ^a	USA	1986	1986	Monsanto
83-03	fluvalinate ^b	USA	1986	1986	Zoecon
84-04	propiconazole	Australia	1986	1986	Ciba Geigy
84-05	cyfluthrin	Australia	1986	1986	Bayer AG
85-01	benalaxyl	Italy	1985	1986	Farmoplant
85-02	tolyfluanid ^c	NL			Bayer
85-03	dalapon ^c	Thailand			Dow
85-04	BPMC ^c	Thailand			Kumiai
77-	thiofanox ^d	USA			Rhone Poulenc

- a. Removed from lists in 1984 as it appeared that data would not be available. Reinstated with high priority in 1985 as the company has indicated that data will be available for the 1986 JMPR.
- b. There were questions regarding the market size of fluvalinate and the nature of the problems it is causing in trade.
- c. More information regarding the nature of the problem in trade will be supplied by the sponsoring countries.
- d. Thiofanox was removed from the group of pesticides to be reviewed in 1986 because of unavailability of data.

5. The Working Group recommended to the JMPR to reevaluate methomyl at the earliest opportunity. New data will be made available by the manufacturers which may make it possible to change Guideline Levels into (T)MRLs.

6. The Working Group was also informed that new data are available on ethoprophos, which have been submitted to the JMPR.

7. The delegation of The Netherlands informed the Working Group that the toxicological data on inorganic bromide, which were to have been available in 1985, will now be available in 1986. The Working Group recommended that the review of these data be given priority for evaluation at the 1986 JMPR.

8. The next Circular Letter regarding priorities will request countries to identify compounds both for evaluation and reevaluation. If they are for reevaluation the reason for the reevaluation should be provided e.g. guideline levels, an ADI established several years ago and new data now available, etc.

9. The delegation of the United States of America noted that the 16th Session of the CCPR (Alinorm 85/24A para 8c) had expressed the need for a mechanism to identify food/pesticide combinations which should be considered by Codex as a matter of priority for evaluation by the JMPR and CCPR. Current procedures identify pesticides only. Food/pesticide combinations could be used to establish priority for compounds when there are too many on the list for JMPR to review in one year. Also identification of major food/pesticide combinations

moving in international trade could focus the efforts of JMPR and CCPR when GAP data are available on many commodities. The delegation of the USA will prepare a document providing more detail to be distributed to Priority Working Group members before the next Session.

10. The Working Group was informed that the JMPR does not necessarily extrapolate from one crop to another in the same commodity group when proposing MRLs. It was suggested that countries which have a commodity important in trade but no residue data, should ask JMPR to consider whether available data could be extrapolated and an MRL established for that commodity.

- - - -

ALINORM 85/24B
APPENDIX VII

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON CONTAMINANTS

1. The Group met under the Chairmanship of Mr. K. Voldum-Clausen.

Abbott, D.C.	AOAC
Anderson, A.	Sweden
Beck, H.	Fed. Rep. Germany
Belcher, R.S.	Australia
Bennett, P.R.	Canada
Campbell, E.	United States of America
Chandra, F.A.	United Kingdom
Chen, Ya-Ying	China
Cordle, F.	United States of America
Cordle, M.	United States of America
Dahmen, W.J.	GIFAP
Declercq, M.B.	France
Deema, S.	Thailand
Eades, S.F.	Ireland
Fertig, S.N.	United States of America
Gorchev, H. Galal	WHO
Halliday, D.	United Kingdom
Hoffman-Hadar, M.	Israel
Hooper, G.N.	Australia
Hou, Yu-Kai	China
Hutchinson, J.M.	FAO
Kiviranta, A.	Finland
Kolk, J. van der	The Netherlands (rapporteur)
Kopisch-Obuch, F.W.	FAO
Ladomery, L.G.	FAO
Lahoda, D.G.	GIFAP
Laurent, M.	GIFAP
Leng, M.L.	GIFAP
Lindsay, D.G.	United Kingdom
Mercier, M.	WHO
Paakkanen, J.	Finland
Parry, R.M.	United States of America
Plattner, E.	Austria
Pyysalo, H.	Finland
Quattrucci, E.	Italy
Rao Maturu, N.	FAO
Rickard, S.F.	GIFAP
Salter, L.	Canada
Schuddeboom, L.J.	The Netherlands
Stijve, T.	Switzerland

Ström, A.	Sweden
Taylor, J.	Canada
Tuinstra, L.G.M.Th.	The Netherlands
Tuomaala, V.	Finland
Venetië, R. van	The Netherlands
Vettorazzi, G.	WHO
Voldum-Clausen, K.	Denmark
Walsh, M.	EEC
Wessel, J.R.	United States of America
Womastek, R.	Austria
Wuthrich, C.	Switzerland

Terms of reference of the Working Group

2. The terms of reference of this new Ad Hoc Working Group, established at the 16th Session of the Committee in 1984 are given in the Report of that Session (see ALINORM 85/24A, para 317):

(a) To develop in collaboration with the Joint FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring Programme (JFCMP) the methodology for monitoring, including protocols for sampling, with the aim of obtaining internationally comparable data on the levels occurring in foodstuffs in trade.

(b) To consider the need and recommend, if possible, levels of PCBs which for the time being might be considered acceptable for the international trade of foodstuffs. These should reflect the levels of contamination which need not be exceeded, if proper measures are taken in the production of foodstuffs.

3. The Working Group had before it the paper, prepared for the 16th Session of the Committee by J. van der Kolk as an FAO consultant (CX/PR 84/10). In addition the Chairman had circulated a proposal for a questionnaire to the members of the Working Group.

Methodology for monitoring

4. The representative of WHO outlined the present scope and purpose of the JFCMP. This Programme was built on the existing monitoring activities of 22 collaborating centres in different countries. These centres were invited to submit the data they considered to be representative for their country. They themselves decided on methodology, sampling plans, method of analysis etc. A Quality Assurance Control Programme, conducted by the National Food Administration, Uppsala, Sweden, had shown that the data were of rather good quality.

It was recognized that, although the programme might be adequate for the purposes of JFCMP, it was not suitable in its present form to meet the needs of the CCPR with respect to assessing levels of PCBs in food.

For the purpose of the CCPR it would be necessary to introduce more standardized methodology, including sampling plans, definition of portions of commodities to be analysed, methods of analysis and especially the quantitation procedure. The discussion in the Ad Hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis (see Appendix II, Para 3) had stressed, amongst other things, the need to report quite clearly not only the method of analysis but also the quantitation procedures involved. This information should be recorded in the JFCMP document.

Need for Codex recommendations on limits for PCBs

5. It was emphasized that the situation with regard to environmental contaminants could not easily be compared with that for pesticides, as there was no good agricultural or other practice which could serve as a basis for making recommendations. Moreover, in the case of PCBs, the control of exposure involved many aspects, such as control of manufacture, use and disposal. Setting limits for foods would not be the primary means of control.

The control of environmental exposure however was beyond the scope of Codex activities and required measures to be taken by other bodies. This was reflected in the text of a draft resolution, which is appended to this Report and which is offered to the Committee for adoption.

6. It was noted that a number of countries had considered it necessary for public health reasons to establish limits for PCBs for a number of relevant food commodities. These limits, however, varied considerably between countries and had a serious potential for creating barriers to trade. For these reasons it was agreed that there was a need to harmonize the limits already in existence and those currently being developed and it was considered that this was a task for Codex. As this was the first time that the Committee had dealt with environmental contaminants from non-agricultural sources, it was not yet clear what the nature of such limits would be. There were some resemblances to some older pesticides, whose uses had been discontinued and for which ERLs or sometimes GLs had been proposed.

7. No information had been put forward, however, to indicate that barriers to trade already exist in practice. It was considered useful that such information any should be made available to the Working Group. National limits had sometimes been established because of severe local or regional contamination. The importance of the foodstuffs involved might therefore be rather limited in international trade. As in several countries limits had only been introduced recently or were still in the process of being introduced, it was anticipated that trade problems might develop in the future.

Toxicology

8. The manager of IPCS, M. Mercier, informed the Group of the action which had been taken to up-date the toxicological evaluation of PCBs. A small group of experts which had been active in the toxicological evaluation of PCBs would soon meet in order to start the work. Using the normal IPCS procedures it was expected that the document would be in its final stage by the next Session of the Committee.

The re-evaluation involved many difficult aspects, given the very complex nature of the matter. IARC would be closely associated with the work.

Questionnaire

9. The Group agreed that it was a prerequisite for the development of limits that a much better data base be developed on levels occurring in foodstuffs than that available at present should be developed. This would be a major function of the revised questionnaire, which would be circulated to Governments. On the basis of the replies to this questionnaire, further action would have to be taken at the next Session. The text of the questionnaire is given in Annex II to this Report.

- - - - -

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PCBs
BY THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues,

Noting the serious health concern of many Governments with regard to contamination of foods by PCBs and the action of several Governments relating to the introduction of maximum limits for PCBs in food;

Considering the special concern expressed with regard to the levels of PCBs in human milk and their possible consequences for the health of breast-fed infants;

Having regard to the widespread occurrence of PCBs in the environment and their presence in many foods, especially those of animal origin and particularly fish;

Considering that in many instances food is the major source of exposure of humans to contaminants and that authorities responsible for controlling environmental contamination, both at a national and an international level, should give high priority to contaminants of concern;

Noting that, notwithstanding action already taken by national and international authorities, levels of contamination of foods, of human fat and of human milk by PCBs in general do not show a downward trend; and

Considering that the best way of dealing with contaminants such as PCBs is to control or eliminate the sources of contamination;

Recommends to Governments that action be taken to:

- avoid direct contamination of foodstuffs and feedstuffs by PCB-containing equipment;
- phase out all uses of PCBs as soon as possible, considering that for virtually all uses suitable alternatives are available;
- control existing PCB-containing equipment with regard to leakage;
- ensure that in the disposal of PCBs and PCB containing equipments methods which avoid further environmental contamination are used; and
- discourage PCB containing equipment from being exported, especially to developing countries;

Recommends further that:

- WHO and UNEP be requested to assist in outlining appropriate measures to control or eliminate sources of contamination by PCBs, e.g. measures based on OECD work in this field (especially that relating to equipment containing PCBs and the disposal of old equipment and of PCB-containing waste).

The Working Group recommends that the Codex Alimentarius Commission be requested to endorse these recommendations.

Questionnaire on matters related to the contamination of foodstuffs with PCBs

Prepared by the CCPR ad hoc Working Group on Contaminants (see paras 317-322 of the Report of the Sixteenth Session of the CCPR, ALINORM 85/24A and paras 229-235 of the Report of the Seventeenth Session, ALINORM 85/24B).

1. Are foods regularly analysed for residues of PCBs in your country?
If so:
 - (a) Which food groups are analysed (meat, animal fat, fish, dairy products etc.)?
 - (b) How many samples are analysed yearly from each food group?
 - (c) Which analytical procedure(s) is/are used? (Principle only)
 - i. procedures for extraction and clean-up
 - ii. method of analysis (packed column "pattern method" or capillary gas chromatography "individual component method")
 - iii. quantitation procedure applied
 - (d) To which PCB standard material does the method refer?
 - (e) Has the method been collaboratively tested and have the laboratories where the data have been produced participated in such testing?

2. Are national residue limits established in your country? If so:
 - (a) What limits have been established?
 - (b) Are the limits mandatory or only guidelines?
 - (c) Do the limits relate to specific analytical methods and/or quantitation procedures?
 - (d) Do the limits relate to specific PCB standard material?
 - (e) Are the limits intended to control contamination in a specific area in your country? If so, are foodstuffs produced in this area to be exported?
 - (f) Are the limits intended to control a general problem of contamination in your country?

3. If residue limits are not established is it planned to establish limits within the next two years? If so:
 - (a) What limits are to be established?
 - (b) Will the limits be mandatory or only guidelines?
 - (c) Will the limits relate to specific analytical methods and/or quantitation procedures?
 - (d) Will the limits relate to specific PCB standards?

4. If monitoring data from 1983 and/or 1984 are available, information on levels in different food groups (median and range) would be appreciated. If analytical methods used are different from the methods mentioned in 1(c), please indicate the method(s), including quantitation procedure(s).

5. Have limits for PCBs established in your country given rise to any barrier to the import of foodstuffs into your country? Have you encountered any problem in exporting foodstuffs from your country because of limits for PCBs established in other countries?

Information should be sent to the Chairman of the ad hoc Working Group, Mr. W. Cochrane, Food Production and Inspection Branch, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, with a copy to the Codex Secretariat, FAO, 00100 Rome, Italy, before November 1, 1985.

OPENING SPEECH BY MR. W. LEMSTRA, SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE MINISTRY OF WELFARE, HEALTH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure to welcome you in The Hague on behalf of both the Minister and the Secretary of State for Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs.

I am glad that we in The Netherlands have got the opportunity to really do something about pesticides by hosting your Committee. The fruitful combination of activities of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues and the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues has resulted in tangible results. This cooperation should be continued. This year's meeting of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues means the end of its teenager stage. In 1966 the first meeting of your Committee took place. In seventeen meetings during a period of twenty years the CCPR has grown up and developed into the institution it is today. It is clear to others who take the trouble to get acquainted with your activities that the CCPR has played and continues to play an important role in the control of pesticide residues in food. CCPR has looked at its task broad-mindedly. Without leaving its terms of reference it has covered a wide area of subjects, where harmonization is a stipulation to reach an agreement on acceptable maximum residue limits. This stage in the development of your Committee is marked by a set of documents containing the results of 20 years of international discussions. Just before your 1984 meeting volume number thirteen of the Codex Alimentarius had appeared, containing among other things all Codex limits for pesticides. Shortly before this year's meeting several parts of your "Guide" were published.

I think that the whole complex of publications will facilitate your Committee in reaching an agreement and in addition will allow and facilitate governments to adjust their legislation to international standards. It is this last aspect to which your Committee in its 20th year of existence is directing its attention. Last year your Committee accepted recommendations for national legislation, describing the different situations that can exist for countries when considering acceptance of the Codex maximum residue limits. In addition to these Recommendations, which will be widely distributed, it was decided that a document would be prepared that could guide governments in deciding whether proposed Codex limits would be acceptable from a consumer safety point of view under their specific national circumstances. I think that the "Recommendations" together with this last document, for which a draft is already available, marks the stage in which your Committee directs itself to the outside world. In other words: you try to sell your product in the conviction that it is worth to be bought. I think that this fits very well in the activities of the Codex Secretariat, that likewise does its utmost to arrive at "acceptances" in the many fields covered by the Codex Alimentarius.

I like to add that we in The Netherlands feel rather uneasy about this last aspect of the procedure. It happens too often that governments, in setting limits for pesticide residues deviate from recommended Codex figures. Although it is the sovereign right of governments to develop their own legislation, it is regrettable that even governments, actively participating in this Committee, in this respect behave as if nothing has happened in The Hague. Taking into account that many developing countries, although sometimes not even represented in CCPR, often use the Codex limits as their legal limits, it must make a poor impression that countries which have contributed to create these Codex limits, deviate from them in their own legislation. This detracts from the trust given to Codex standards and damages the prestige of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in general

ALINORM 85/24B
APPENDIX VIII(contd.)

and the CCPR in particular. I think that participants to the CCPR are in the best position to serve as ambassadors for Codex work at home. I hope that the Recommendations, together with the document on the safety evaluation of Codex limits, will be a helpful tool in convincing your people to take the necessary steps in order to adjust national legislation to Codex recommendations.

Pesticides form a sensitive subject and continue to stay in the vivid interest of people. Everywhere in the world governments have to look for a well considered balance between the interests of agriculture and of health. Participation in Codex asks for a wider view than just national agricultural interests.

It asks for acceptance of agricultural necessity in other parts of the world. It sometimes asks governments to be prepared to set higher residue limits than is necessary for their national needs. But they can only be expected to do that when they have sufficient data at their disposal to justify their decisions.

Certainly in the pesticide field, governments have to lean heavily on industry for the supply of these data. Of course it is in the industry's own interest to make all relevant data available to national governments in order to obtain the registration they need as a condition for sales. We should not forget also that industry itself may create barriers for trade if they do not take the necessary measures concerning the maximum residue limits in the countries to which their agricultural product will be exported. Industry and trade have also to take into account differences in the level of resulting residues in different countries and also differences in crops on which their pesticide will be used. Where industry and trade do not succeed in obtaining an international uniform residue picture, it is the Codex where we have to try subsequently to reharmonize the situation.

Nevertheless we have to be grateful that many pesticide manufacturers accept their responsibility and cooperate with FAO and WHO and supply the data necessary for the evaluation of the toxicity and the residues. Very critical we have to be in regard to those manufacturers who refuse this cooperation. In doing so they make it more difficult for governments to obtain the information necessary for adjustment of legislation to international needs.

It is also very important that organizations like WHO and FAO which are also responsible for a smooth function of the CCPR, take their jobs seriously.

The Government of The Netherlands, in receiving you here from all over the world, also feels a responsibility to create optimal conditions in order to get good results.

I do hope that your Conference and your Committee meetings will be very successful and will be fruitful, in spite of the fact that not all essential documents were available in time.

I wish you a good time in The Netherlands.