

INTRODUCTION

1. The 50th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) was held in Haikou, China, from 9 to 14 April 2018 at the kind invitation of the Government of the People's Republic of China. Professor Xiongwu QIAO, Director of the Shanxi Academy of Agricultural Science chaired the Session, assisted by Dr Guibiao YE, Director of CCPR Secretariat, Institute for Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs the People's Republic of China. Representatives from ** Member countries, ** Member organization, ** international organizations attended the Session. The list of participants is attached as Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION¹

2. Mr Aiguo MA, General Agronomist of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China, opened the Session, congratulated CCPR on its achievements over the past 50 years; underscored the importance of setting robust and practical standards in order to global harmonisation; and expressed the Chinese Government commitment to continue supporting Codex activities. Ms Caixiang FU, Vice Governor of Hainan Province, addressed the Committee and extended their warmest welcome to all participants.
3. Mr Guilherme Costa, Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Mr. Zhongjun ZHANG, Deputy Representative of Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Representation in China, also addressed the Committee. Mr Tom Heilandt, Secretary of the Codex Alimentarius Commission addressed the meeting through a pre-recorded video message.

Division of Competence²

4. The Committee noted the division of competence between the European Union and its Member States, according to paragraph 5, Rule II of the Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)³

5. The Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the Session with the following additions under agenda item 11, Other business:
 - (i) Biopesticides (Chile);
 - (ii) Participation of JMPR in an international joint review of a new compound (Canada);
 - (iii) Uniform risk management approach to address the issue of endocrine disrupting chemicals in food (India); and
 - (iv) Revision of the Guidelines on the use of mass spectrometry for the identification, confirmation and quantitative determination of residues (CXG 56-2005); and
 - (v) Information by Japan on new MRLs for Fosetyl-AI
6. The Committee agreed to establish in-session working groups (WGs) on the following topics, open to all members and observers and working in English only:
7. Classification of Foods and Feeds – To consider key issues related to the revision of the Classification (CXM 4-1989) and examples of representatives commodities (CXG 84-2012) (Agenda Item 07) (chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by The Netherlands);
8. IESTI equations – To consider key points raised in the discussion paper on the review of the IESTI equations (Agenda Item 08) (chaired by The Netherlands and co-chaired by Australia and Uganda).

APPOINTMENT OF RAPORTEURS (Agenda Item 2)

9. The Committee appointed Mr David LUNN (New Zealand) and Mr Kevin BODNARUK (Australia) to act as rapporteurs.

MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda Item 03)⁴

10. The Committee noted some matters were for information only, and that matters for action would be considered under relevant Agenda Items.

¹ CRD34 (Remarks delivered at the opening ceremony)

² CRD1

³ CX/PR 18/50/01

⁴ CX/PR 18/50/02; CRD03 (Chile); CRD04 (EU, Kenya); CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD20 (Paraguay); CRD21 (Mali); CRD26 (Senegal); CRD28 (Nicaragua); CRD29 (Nigeria)

Closer collaboration between CCPR and CCRVDF

11. Delegations supported the need to evolve innovative ways for better collaboration between JMPR/JECFA (see Agenda Item 04a) and CCPR/CCRVDF, for optimal evaluation of dual use compounds, and proposed that these could include: improved collaboration between JMPR/JECFA e.g. harmonized MRLs, residue definitions, etc.; regular communication between delegations to CCPR and CCRVDF as well as within Codex Secretariat itself; improved synchronization of work between the CCPR and CCRVDF WG on Priorities. The Committee agreed to further consider this matter under Agenda Item 09 (paragraph **).

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda Item 4a)⁵

12. The Committee noted matters of interest arising from FAO and WHO relevant to the work of CCPR as follows:
- Improvement of chronic dietary exposure assessment
 - Acute probabilistic dietary exposure assessment for pesticides
 - Global food consumption databases and ongoing activities to support countries to generate and to use data for risk analysis purposes
13. The Representative of WHO provided relevant information to CCPR on the FAO/WHO scientific advice in particular i) the establishment of a joint JECFA and JMPR Expert working group on assessment of chronic dietary exposure for pesticides and veterinary drugs; ii) the alignment of methodologies to assess compounds used both as pesticides and veterinary drugs; iii) the progress on the performance of a probabilistic assessment based on the acute exposure for 47 pesticides having an acute reference dose; iv) ongoing efforts to support countries to generate and to use data for risk analysis purposes
14. The Representative of FAO reported on the outcome of the FAO survey on the use of antibiotics in crops conducted after CCPR49. Overall the survey indicated that antibiotics, antimicrobials that specifically inhibit or kill bacteria, are approved for use to treat plant diseases in at least 20 countries. The regulations and oversight of antibiotic use are strong and residues present on foods of plant origin are minimal. In contrast, the amounts and types of antimicrobials used, the crops treated and the potential for AMR are unknown. In order to develop science-based recommendations to mitigate the negative public health impacts of AMR, the use of antimicrobials in plant production resulting in occupational exposure, food, and environmental contamination need to be assessed. FAO will continue to work on this area together with WHO and OIE.
15. The Committee noted that the work priorities of FAO and WHO related to the work of CCPR should include: the impact of the use of antimicrobial compounds in plant protection (food and feed); close cooperation between scientific bodies (in particular JMPR and JECFA); and capacity building to enhance participation of Codex members in the work of JMPR and CCPR.

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (Agenda Item 4b)⁶

16. The Committee noted information provided by IAEA and OECD on their activities relevant to the work of CCPR.

REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATION BY THE 2017 JMPR (Agenda Item 5a)⁷

17. The Committee noted the information provided by the JMPR Secretariat on the following matters:
- Special studies on microbiological effects of pesticide residues in foods
 - Use of historical control data
 - Further consideration of the process for establishing group MRLs: Update on the use of the revised commodity classification for vegetables
 - Field use pattern anticipated residue comparison model
 - Update of the IESTI model used for the calculation of dietary intake: New large portion data
18. The Committee further noted comments of delegations in regard to the following matters:

⁵ CX/PR 18/50/03; CRD05 (EU, Kenya), CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD21 (Mali), CRD26 (Senegal)

⁶ CX/PR 18/50/04; CRD05 (Kenya), CRD14 (AU), CRD17 (Ghana), CRD21 (Mali), CRD26 (Senegal), CRD32 (Australia and the United States)

⁷ Section 2 of the 2017 JMPR Report; CRD06 (China, EU, Kenya); CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana), CRD21 (Mali)

Special studies on microbiological effects of pesticide residues in foods

19. Delegations welcomed the initiative of JMPR to carry out when appropriate assessments of the adverse chronic and acute effects of pesticide residues on the microorganisms in the human gastrointestinal tract in line with those routinely done by JECFA for veterinary drug residues.

Establishment group MRLs with the revised Classification of Food and Feed (CXM 4-1989)

20. In relation to the establishment of group MRLs using the revised Classification (in particular the revised Type02), delegations expressed concerns on the JMPR exclusion of certain crops (in particular minor crops) from their recommended group MRLs. It was recalled that one of the key points for the revision of the Classification was the establishment of group MRLs that cover minor crops which otherwise would be difficult to establish.
21. The JMPR Secretariat had identified several cases where there was insufficient information to support a conclusion that a group MRL would be sufficient to accommodate potential residues in all commodities in the group. Where the morphology and crop production practices suggested that potential residues could be significantly different from those in the representative commodity, JMPR agreed that the best science-based decision was to make the recommendations for a subgroup rather than for a group as this would be more scientifically sound. JMPR welcomed additional information comparing residues in the various commodities of the crop grouping including guidance from CCPR on the acceptable variation of residues between members of a group or sub-group.
22. The JMPR Secretariat agreed that JMPR would revisit those recommendations in 2018 to exclude Marthynia, Roselle and okra from the MRL recommendations for the subgroup of peppers (126 oxamyl, 193 Fenproximate 233 Spinetoram, 243 Fluopyram) based on the information to be submitted by EU and Canada.

Field use pattern anticipated residue comparison model/tool

23. Delegations noted that this tool would allow JMPR to make use of data from trials not reflecting the cGAP. The tool was a pragmatic approach to decide if the results of supervised trials with several parameters not matching cGAP could be used to recommend MRLs.
24. Delegations supported this approach in general. However, the Committee considered that there was a need to validate the tool to ensure that the residue data sets were suitable for estimating MRLs. The tool should thus be tested for different pesticide / commodity combinations comparing the outcome of assessments based on trials that match the GAP with the outcome of assessments based on residue trials that deviate in different parameters from the GAP to gain experience in the application of the tool and to increase confidence amongst users.

Update of the IESTI model used for the calculation of dietary intake: New large portion data

25. Delegations noted the following: it would be useful to explore mechanisms to support developing countries to generate / provide large portion data in order to make the risk assessment more accurate and the MRLs more globally accepted; the database should be updated regularly and should take into consideration the outcome of the international workshop on the IESTI equations in relation to consumption data to be expressed as a function of actual body weights; a new revision of the European model for pesticide risk assessment had been published and contained updated EU consumption data that could be taken into account for the IESTI model used by JMPR.

REPORT ON THE JMPR RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC CONCERNS RAISED BY CCPR (Agenda Item 5b)⁸

26. The Committee noted that specific concerns on compounds raised by CCPR would be addressed when discussing the relevant compounds under Agenda Item 06.
27. In addition, the Committee noted information provided by the JMPR Secretariat on the following matters:
- Update from JECFA
 - Harmonization of the dietary exposure methodologies for compounds used both as pesticides and veterinary drugs – Harmonizing/combining exposure from veterinary drug and pesticide use
 - Pesticides for vector control – New pesticide active ingredients developed initially for vector control: Use of JMPR WHO Core Assessment Group for Pesticides (new pesticide active ingredients developed initially for vector control may be included in future JMPR meetings)
 - Update from the IPCS
 - Harmonization of the residue definition – determining the level of interest in a pilot project to achieve more harmonized residue definitions

⁸ Section 3 of the 2017 JMPR Report; CRD06 (China, EU, Kenya); CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD21 (Mali)

DRAFT AND PROPOSED DRAFT MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED AT STEPS 7 AND 4 (Agenda Item 6)⁹**General Remarks**

28. The EU advised the Committee that they would be introducing reservations for a number of proposed draft and draft MRLs during the discussions on the individual compounds and that the reasons for these reservation were outlined in CRD06.
29. The EU explained to the Committee that it was current EU policy to align EU MRLs with Codex MRLs (CXLs) if three conditions were fulfilled: (i) that the EU sets MRLs for the commodity under consideration; (ii) that the current EU MRL is lower than the CXL; and (iii) that the CXL is acceptable to the EU with respect to aspects such as consumer protection, supporting data, and extrapolations.
30. In the interest of transparency the Delegation advised the Committee that they would be making reservations during the discussions on the individual compounds where they considered the third criterion had not been met (CRD06).
31. Norway and Switzerland advised the Committee that they supported all EU reservations as their residue risk assessment approach was the same as that of the EU.
32. The Committee agreed that these reservations, where relevant, would be noted in the report.
33. The EU also explained that the MRLs and the currently taken positions for propiconazole, tebuconazole, difenoconazole and prothioconazole might be revised in future, pending an evaluation of triazole derivative metabolites in the EU.

CAPTAN (7)

34. The Committee noted that the JMPR was unable to make a maximum residue level recommendation due to issues with analysis.

CHLOMEQUAT (15)

35. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 and the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs. The Committee also agreed to revoke the CXLs for Maize fodder (dry), Rape seed, Rape seed oil, Crude, Rye flour and Wheat wholemeal as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

2,4-D (20)

36. In response to the concern form from USA relating to the 2017 JMPR decision not to recommend a maximum residue level for cotton seed, the JMPR Secretariat explained that there were questions about the storage stability of 2,4-D and 2,4-DCP residue in cotton seed and that the results of the storage stability studies for soya bean were not able to be extrapolated to cotton seed.

DIQUAT (31)

37. The Committee noted that diquat was scheduled for evaluation by JMPR in 2018.

CARBENDAZIM (72)+THIOPHANATE-METHYL (77)

38. The Committee was advised that the 2017 JMPR was not able to recommend MRLs for thiophanate-methyl and carbendazim because of insufficient toxicological data for carbendazin (arising from the use of thiophanate-methyl). The Committee agreed to maintain all CXLs awaiting the outcome of the 2022 JMPR re-evaluation based on toxicological data to be submitted for carbendazim.

OXAMYL (126)

39. The Committee noted the reservations of EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for cucumber and summer squash due to acute health risks for a group of EU consumers.
40. Canada, Germany, Uganda and Kenya suggested the Committee and JMPR to keep marthynia, okra and roselle in the subgroup of pepper and wait for more minor crops data to do scientific evaluation in future.

⁹ CX/PR 18/50/05; CX/PR 18/50/05-Add.1 (Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile and Egypt); CRD07(Kenya, EU, USA); CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD19 (Indonesia); CRD20 (Paraguay); CRD25 (Morocco); CRD29 (Nigeria); CRD31(EI Salvador)

41. In light of the discussions on crop group extrapolation (Agenda Item 5a, para. ...), the Committee decided to keep the proposed draft MRLs for pepper chili (dried) and for the subgroup of peppers (includes all commodities in this subgroup, except marthynia, okra and roselle) to Step 4, and to advance all the remaining proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.
42. The Committee also agreed to revoke the CXLs for Citrus fruit; Cotton seed; Eggs; Peanut; Peanut fodder; Poultry meat; Poultry edible offal; Spices, Fruits and Berries; Spices and Roots and Rhizomes and also to withdraw the draft MRLs for Citrus fruit (at 3 mg/kg); Cucumber (at 1 mg/kg); Melons, except Watermelon (at 1 mg/kg) and Peppers subgroup (at 5 mg/kg) as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

PROPICONAZOLE (160)

43. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for all commodities because they cannot finalize their consumer risk assessment because of toxicological concerns with several triazole metabolites.
44. The Committee also noted the proposal from EU, Norway and Switzerland that more refined MRL recommendations are possible for post-harvest treatment (using the mean residue+4SD) and agreed to keep all the proposed draft MRLs to Step 4 awaiting JMPR re-evaluation in 2018.

ABAMECTIN (177)

45. The JMPR Secretariat informed the Committee that the new toxicology studies for Abamectin confirmed the ADI of 0-0.001 mg/kg bw established by the 2015 JMPR.
46. The Committee noted that no Alternative GAP was available for spinach and agreed to withdraw the proposed draft MRL for spinach.

BIFENTHRIN (178)

47. The Committee noted that bifenthrin was scheduled for evaluation by the 2019 JMPR.

FENPROPIMORPH (188)

48. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for banana because of their acute consumer risk concern.
49. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

TEBUCONAZOLE (189)

50. The Committee noted that the EU, Norway and Switzerland reserved their positions on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for subgroup of beans with pods pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in EU.
51. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for subgroup of beans with pods for adoption at Step 5/8 and to withdraw the draft MRL for common bean (pods and/or immature seeds), as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

FENPYROXIMATE (193)

52. The Committee noted that the EU, Norway and Switzerland have reserved their position on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for pear; cucumbers and melon, except watermelons pending completion of their review of this compound and also have reservations on the advancement of the draft MRLs for peppers, subgroup (except marthynia, okra and roselle) and coffee beans, as these were based on residues of parent compound only; for citrus fruit, due to different extrapolation policies, and for meat (from mammals, other than marine mammals); edible offal (mammalian) and mammalian fats (except milk fats) due to the different enforcement residue definitions for animal commodities.
53. The Committee agreed to keep the proposed draft MRLs for apricot; cherries, subgroup; cherry tomato; peach; plums (subgroup); watermelon and tomato to Step 4, awaiting evaluation of the additional toxicological data by the 2020 JMPR.
54. The Committee agreed to advance all other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs and to revoke the CXL for Pome fruit, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

IMIDACLOPRID (206)

55. The Committee noted that while imidacloprid was evaluated by the 2017 JMPR, no maximum residue levels were proposed for pistachio nuts, since no trials matched GAP.

CYPRODINIL (207)

56. The Committee noted the reservation of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for pomegranate due to uncertainty over the relevance of the foliar metabolism study used to support a post-harvest use and the OECD calculator for post-harvest.
57. The JMPR Secretariat indicated that the JMPR would reconsider the available metabolism data and the MRL calculation at the 2018 JMPR.
58. The Committee agreed to keep the proposed draft MRL for pomegranate to Step 4 awaiting the outcome of the 2018 JMPR.
59. The Committee agreed to advance all other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

TRIFLOXYSTROBIN (213)

60. The Committee noted the reservation of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for cabbages, head due to the different policies on commodity definition for risk assessment.
61. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

DIFENOCONAZOLE (224)

62. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for pome fruit due to acute and chronic exposure concerns for European consumers, and for rice due to the lack of a processing study and a different approach to establishing MRLs for rice.
63. The JMPR Secretariat commented that as no data was available to derive a processing factor for husked rice, the 2017 JMPR was not able to recommend any maximum residue level for husked rice.
64. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

AZOXYSTROBIN (229)

65. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

PROTHIOCONAZOLE (232)

66. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

SPINETORAM (233)

67. The Committee noted the reservation of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for avocado due to the limited number of trials matching the critical GAP and uncertainty over the calculation of the scaling factor by the 2017 JMPR; for milks; meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); edible offal (mammalian) and mammalian fats (except milk fats) as cabbage/kale was not included in the livestock dietary burden calculations; for persimmons as the critical GAP differs from other pome fruits, and for plums (subgroup) since the inclusion of 11 additional trials resulted in a higher MRL.
68. The JMPR Secretariat commented that it was the general principle for JMPR to make use of the available data as much as possible. Since residues in persimmons were less than those in pome fruits, JMPR noted that the group MRL for pome fruits accommodated the cGAP for persimmons. According to the monograph, in the livestock dietary burden, the residue contribution from kale was not significant.
69. The Committee agreed to advance all the other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

FLUOPYRAM (243)

70. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for milks due to chronic intake concerns, for rice because of a lack of processing factors, and for dry peas (subgroup) as the number of residue trials available were considered insufficient.
71. The JMPR Secretariat indicated that processing factor data were available to derive a MRL recommendation for husked and polished rice. The JMPR agreed to the recommendation for husked rice and polished rice in 2018. For dry peas the 5 residue trials were considered in conjunction with 9 data sets for dry beans in deriving a maximum residue level recommendation.

72. The Committee agreed to withdraw the propose draft MRLs for peppers chili, dried and peppers (subgroup) currently held at Step 4 and advance all other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

ACETAMIPRID (246)

73. The Committee was informed that the 2017 JMPR was not able to recommend a maximum residue level for Pistachio as the submitted residue trials did not match the GAP.
74. The Committee agreed to withdraw the proposed draft MRL for Mustard greens as no data had been submitted for the evaluation of an alternative GAP by the 2017 JMPR.

ISOPYRAZAM (249)

75. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs to Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

PROPYLENE OXIDE (250)

76. The JMPR Secretariat informed the Committee that no MRLs could be proposed for tree nuts due to further clarifications required on the analytical method.

SAFLUFENACIL (251)

77. The Committee noted the reservation from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for mustard seed and linseed due to the different residue definition for enforcement.
78. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for mustard seed and linseed to Step 5/8.

SULFOXAFLOL (252)

79. The Committee agreed to hold the proposed draft MRL for tree nuts at Step 4 awaiting evaluation by the JMPR in 2019.

PICOXYSTROBIN (258)

80. The Committee noted the reservations from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for all commodities except barley, rye, soya bean, triticale and wheat fodders, wheat bran and wheat germ because of toxicological concerns with several triazole metabolites.
81. In response to the concern form from USA relating to the lack of a recommended maximum residue level for oil seed, the JMPR Secretariat advised that this concern would be considered by the 2018 JMPR.
82. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs to Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

FENAMIDONE (264)

83. The Committee noted that there was no alternative GAP information available for mustard greens and spinach, and agreed to withdraw the draft MRLs (currently at Step 4) for these two commodities.

IMAZAPYR (267)

84. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for barley due to the number of residue trials being lower than required by EU policy in combination with an inhomogeneous distribution of residue levels.
85. The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft MRLs for barley and barley straw and fodder (dry) for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

IMAZAMOX (276)

86. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for barley due to Imazamox being under review in the EU and because of different residue definition for enforcement.
87. The Committee agreed to forward the proposed draft MRLs for barley and barley straw and fodder (dry) for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

FLONICAMID (282)

88. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs due to a different residue definition for enforcement.
89. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for all commodities for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

FLUPYRADIFURONE (285)

90. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for the subgroups of cherries, peaches and plums because of a different residue definition for enforcement.
91. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

QUINCLORAC (287)

92. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for rape seed (the exclusion of the more toxic methyl ester metabolite from the residue definition for enforcement); for husked rice (the use of an indicative conversion factor to estimate total residues, a different residue definition for enforcement and insufficient data to derive a robust processing factor) and for all animal commodities because the livestock dietary burden was derived from the residue contributions from rape seed and rice.
93. In response, the JMPR Secretariat advised that the 2017 JMPR had reviewed the residue definition for enforcement and had confirmed its previous recommendation and that for rice, the low level of risk supported the use of an indicative conversion factor. However, noting that a member of countries have included the methyl ester metabolite in their enforcement residue definitions, the JMPR Secretariat agreed that JMPR should re-visit this issue in 2018 or 2019.
94. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

BICYCLOPYRONE (295)

95. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for edible offal (mammalian) due to an intake concern for the EU consumer.
96. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

CYCLANILIPROLE (296)

97. The Committee noted the reservation of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL except dried chili peppers, dried prunes, dried tomato and cereal fodders as a consumer risk assessment could not be completed due to the toxicological data gaps.
98. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that the toxicity of the main plant metabolite NK-1375 is lower than the parent compound, and showed no genotoxicity potential.
99. A number of Delegations commented that JMPR had used a new field use pattern anticipated residue comparison model to estimate MRLs for most plant commodities, and that the model needed to be validated to ensure that the derived MRL proposals were appropriate.
100. The JMPR Secretariat responded that the submitted data did not match GAP and that in the past, no MRL recommendations would have been made. Therefore, JMPR applied the extrapolation model to the data to derive the proposed draft MRLs (see Agenda Item 5a).
101. The Committee agreed to keep all the proposed draft MRLs the maximum residue level recommendation to Step 4 pending the evaluation of new data and revised GAP information by the 2019 JMPR. The Committee also invited JMPR to engage with national regulators to continue validation of the model.

FENAZAQUIN (297)

102. The Committee noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for cherries (subgroup) and hops (dry) because different toxicological reference values have been established in the EU, with the metabolite TBPE identified as being of higher toxicity than parent; and that no residue data relating to TBPE were reported by the JMPR.
103. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that JMPR had evaluated the toxicity of TBPE, and that the NOAEL of TBPE was set higher than the parent compound. The Delegations of the EU indicated that an additional uncertainty factor had been used to obtain the reference dose for TBPE.
104. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

FENPYRAZAMINE (298)

105. In response to comments from the Delegations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland, The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that the draft proposal for grapes should be 3 mg/kg, and 9 mg/kg for dried grapes.
106. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

ISOPROTHIOLANE (299)

107. The Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

NATAMYCIN (300)

108. The JMPR Secretariat noted that no ADI or ARfD had been established by the 2017 JMPR due to an inadequate database.

PHOSPHONIC ACID (301)

109. The JMPR Secretariat advised that the ADI of 0-0.1 mg/kg bw established for fosetyl-aluminium (302), while derived from toxicological studies on fosetyl-aluminium, also applied directly to phosphoric acid.
110. The Committee agreed to revise the expression of the ADI to more explicitly indicate this advice.
111. The proposed maximum residue levels are listed under fosetyl-aluminium (302).

FOSETYL-ALUMINIUM (302)

112. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

TRIFLUMEZOPYRIM (303)

113. The Committee agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 as recommended by the 2017 JMPR.

Conclusion

114. The Committee:
- (a) Agreed to forward to CAC41:
 - (i) Proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix II)
 - (ii) Codex MRLs (CXLs) for revocation (Appendix III)
 - (b) Noted that:
 - (i) Draft and proposed draft MRLs retained at Steps 7 and 4 are attached as Appendices (IV and V)
 - (ii) Draft and proposed draft MRLs withdrawn are attached as Appendix (VI)

DRAFT AND PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD AND FEED (CXM 4-1989)

115. The United States of America and the Netherlands, as Chair and co-Chair of the EWG on the revision of the Classification, presented the report of the in-session WG and noted that the priorities were to address unresolved issues involved with the crop grouping and the tables on representative commodities associated with Types 04 and 05; the crop grouping for the feed commodities; and the approach for crops that do not meet the criteria for crop grouping (i.e. options 1 and 2).
116. The Committee recalled the decision¹⁰ taken at CCPR49 on the approach to the revision of the Classification to include a commodity only in one group or subgroup to avoid confusion of having two different CXLs for the same commodities and based on took decisions in relation to the allocation of commodities in certain groups and subgroups.
117. The Committee further noted that additional commodities for inclusion in different groups in Types 04 and 05 as well as editorial corrections have been included based on the written comments submitted to this session.
118. The Committee considered the recommendation on Agenda Items 7 (a-e) as follows:

¹⁰ REP17/PR, para. 112

DRAFT AND PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION OF THE CLASSIFICATION: CLASS A - PRIMARY COMMODITIES OF PLANT ORIGIN - TYPE 04 NUTS, SEEDS AND SAPS (Agenda Item 7a)¹¹

119. The Committee recalled that Type 04 included: Group 022 Tree nuts (Step 7); Group 023 Oilseeds and oilfruits (Step 7); Group 024 Seed for beverages and sweets (Step 7); and Group 025 Sap producing trees (Step 4) and endorsed the recommendations to:
- (i) Include Chilean hazelnut in Group 022 Tree nuts.
 - (ii) Maintain perilla seed in Group 023 Oilseeds and not to transfer it to Group 028 Spices as most perilla seed is used for oil and it will be difficult to distinguish between the different varieties in trade used as oilseed (seeds) or spices (leaves).
 - (iii) Include coconut, inflorescence sap and Palmyra palm, inflorescence sap in Group 025 Tree saps, without the creation of separate subgroups and modify the commodity descriptor to indicate that sap can also be collected from the inflorescence of the trees.
 - (iv) Remove specific provisions for chestnuts in the portion of the commodity to which the MRLs applies (and which is analyzed) in Group 022 Tree nuts as the general provision for tree nuts is also applicable to this commodity.
 - (v) Not to include (i) soya bean as already included in other groups in Type 02 and (ii) cupuacu (*Theobroma grandiflorum*) as already included in Group 006B (Assorted tropical and sub-tropical fruits)
 - (vi) Maintain Subgroup 023D "Other Oilseeds in Group 023 Oilseeds and oilfruits and not transfer them into the miscellaneous group.
 - (vii) Not to include additional synonym scientific names for shea nut because these are synonyms rather than the accepted name in GRIN which is the generally used authority for scientific names in the code system of the classification.

Conclusion

120. The Committee agreed to forward all groups in Type 04 (Groups 022, 023, 024 and 025) to CAC41 for adoption at Steps 8 and 5/8 (Appendix VII)

DRAFT REVISION OF THE CLASSIFICATION: CLASS A - PRIMARY COMMODITIES OF PLANT ORIGIN - TYPE 05 HERBS AND SPICES (Agenda Item 7b)¹²

121. The Committee noted that Type 05 includes Group 027 Herbs and Group 028 Spices and endorsed the recommendations to:
- (i) Maintain the subgroups of 028I Dried chili peppers and 028H Citrus peel in Class A Primary commodities of plant origin and not to relocate them into Class D Processed food.
 - (ii) Maintain Milk thistle in Group 028 Spices and not include it in Group 023 Oilseeds as milk thistle is primarily used for herbicidal/medicinal uses with little use for oil.
 - (iii) Include caraway in Subgroup 028A Spices, seeds as they are similar to other seeds of the *Apiaceae* in this group.
 - (iv) Change the entries for oregano and Marjoram to consolidate the entries for marjoram and to cross reference oregano to marjoram.

Conclusion

122. The Committee agreed to forward all groups in Type 05 (Groups 027 and 028) to CAC41 for adoption at Step 8 (Appendix VIII)

¹¹ CL 2018/12-PR, CL 2018/13-PR, CX/PR 18/50/06, CX/PR 18/50/06-Add.1 (Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Egypt); CRD08 (Thailand); CRD14 (AU); CRD16 (Japan); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD20 (Paraguay); CRD21 (Mali); CRD22 (Ecuador); CRD29 (Nigeria); CRD31 (El Salvador); CRD33 (Report of the in-Session WG of the Classification)

¹² CL 2018/20-PR; CX/PR 18/50/07; CX/PR 18/50/07-Add.1 (Canada, China, Egypt, EU, Kenya, Paraguay, Turkey); CRD08 (Japan, Thailand); CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD20 (Paraguay); CRD21 (Mali); CRD29 (Nigeria); CRD30 (Republic of Korea); CRD31 (El Salvador); CRD33 (Report of the in-Session WG of the Classification)

PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION OF THE CLASSIFICATION: IMPACT OF THE REVISED COMMODITY GROUPS AND SUBGROUPS IN TYPE 03, TYPE 04 AND TYPE 05 ON THE CXLs ADOPTED BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION (Agenda Item 7c)¹³

123. The Committee agreed with the recommendations on the impact of the revised commodity groups and subgroups in Type 03 Grasses, Type 04 Nuts, seeds and saps and Type 05 Herbs and spices on the CXLs as described in [Appendix IX](#).

PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION OF THE CLASSIFICATION: CLASS C – PRIMARY FEED COMMODITIES TYPE 11 - PRIMARY FEED COMMODITIES OF PLANT ORIGIN (Agenda Item 7d)¹⁴

124. The Committee endorsed the recommendations to:
- (i) Align the structure of Class C based on the water content of feeds (high water content versus low water content) so as to facilitate crop grouping and extrapolation of MRLs.
 - (ii) Group all feed commodities under Class C and consequently transfer processed feed commodities from Class D (Processed Food of Plant Origin) to Class C.
125. The Committee agreed that the structure based on water content would allow the allocation of different type of feeds, e.g. forage, fodder, silage, etc. under the relevant groups and subgroups.

Conclusion

126. The Committee agreed with the structure for Class C – Animal Feed Commodities and that commodities to be included in the groups and subgroups would be further discussed in the EWG for consideration at CCPR51 (Appendix X)

PROPOSED DRAFT TABLES ON EXAMPLES OF REPRESENTATIVE COMMODITIES FOR COMMODITY GROUPS IN TYPE 04 AND TYPE 05 (FOR INCLUSION IN THE *PRINCIPLES AND GUIDANCE FOR THE SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVE COMMODITIES FOR THE EXTRAPOLATION OF MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES FOR COMMODITY GROUPS (CXG 84-2012)* (Agenda Item 7e)¹⁵

Table 4 (examples of representative commodities for Type 04)

127. The Committee endorsed the recommendations to:
- (i) Change the representative commodities for tree nuts to provide more guidance by adding specific examples for almonds, chestnuts, pecan, pistachios and walnuts (coconut is excluded as a representative commodity for this group)
 - (ii) Add new commodities in groups 022 to 025 based on written comments submitted to this session.
 - (iii) Bring the crops in Table 4 in line with the crops of the groups 022 to 025
 - (iv) Agreed that it is not possible to set a Group CXL for the whole Group 023 as crops in Subgroup 023D Other oilseeds vary broadly and it is not possible to identify representative commodities.

Table 5 (examples of representative commodities for Type 05)

128. The Committee endorsed the recommendations to:
- (i) Subgroup 027A Herbs (herbaceous plants): Replace the conjunction “and” with “or” to allow for flexibility when selecting commodities within the subgroup.
 - (ii) Subgroup 028D Spices, roots or rhizomes: To apply the appropriate concentration factors when considering residue data from representative commodities identified for this subgroup.

Conclusion

129. The Committee agreed to forward Table 4 (examples of representative commodities for Type 04) and Table 5 (examples of representative commodities for Type 05) to CAC41 for adoption at Step 5/8 and inclusion in the *Principles and Guidance for the selection of representative commodities for the extrapolation of maximum residue limits for pesticides for commodity groups (CXG 84-2012)*.

¹³ CX/PR 18/50/08; CRD 08 (Japan, Thailand); CRD 14 (AU); CRD16 (Japan); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD21 (Mali); CRD22 (Ecuador); CRD29 (Nigeria); CRD33 (Report of the in-Session WG of the Classification)

¹⁴ CL 2018/14-PR; CX/PR 18/50/09; CRD08 (Thailand); CRD 14 (AU); CRD19 (Indonesia); CRD21 (Mali), CRD33 (Report of in-Session WG of the Classification)

¹⁵ CL 2018/15-PR, CX/PR 18/50/10; CX/PR 18/50/10-Add.1 (Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Egypt, EU, Kenya, USA); CRD08 (Japan, Thailand); CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD21 (Mali); CRD22 (Ecuador); CRD25 (Morocco); CRD33 (Report of the in-Session WG of the Classification)

DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEM WITHIN THE CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD AND FEED TO PROVIDE CODES FOR COMMODITIES NOT MEETING THE CRITERIA FOR FROP GROUPING (Agenda Item 7f)¹⁶

130. The Committee endorsed the recommendation to adopt Option 1 namely “to create a separate Type within each Class of the Classification to provide a list of commodities and codes that do not meet the criteria for inclusion in a crop group” as a system within the Classification to provide codes for commodities that do not meet the criteria for grouping.

OTHER MATTERS

131. The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by The Netherlands, working in English with the following TOR:
- (i) Continue the work on the revision of Class C, Animal Feed Commodities, based on the structure provided in Appendix X.
 - (ii) Consider the proposal to add subgroups to the groups that would include processed commodities. This may involve the relocation of commodities from Class D.
 - (iii) Consider new commodities for Class C.
 - (iv) Initiate work on Type 12 Secondary food commodities of plant origin in Class D
 - (v) Assign codes to miscellaneous commodities.

DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE REVIEW OF THE IESTI EQUATIONS (Agenda Item 8)¹⁷

132. The Netherlands, as Chair of the In-session WG on the review of the IESTI equations, informed the Committee that the comments submitted in CRDs on TOR (i) - (iii) of the EWG had been considered and recommendations were made for consideration by the Committee as follows.

TOR (i) Recommendation related to information on history, background and use of the IESTI equations:

133. The Committee considered (i) whether the information on history, background and use of the IESTI equations was complete and met the requirements of related TOR (i) of the EWG and (ii) where to publish the information to make it more visibly available to Codex members, observers and other interested stakeholders i.e. as an appendix to the report or as an information document on a dedicated place on the Codex website.
134. The Committee noted the following views expressed by delegations:
- (i) The document compiles factual information therefore there are no conflicting information in the document, and can be posted on the Codex website as an information document.
 - (ii) Member countries need more time to read the information provided in the document as it was available late.
 - (iii) It was premature to post the document as an information document on the Codex website as the information as currently presented may change in future.
 - (iv) The information provided was to support discussion in the EWG as per TOR (ii) and (iii)¹⁸ and did not meet the criteria for information document as agreed by CAC.
 - (v) The information could be published when work on the review of the IESTI equations is complete thus decision on¹⁹ this matter should be postponed.

Conclusion

135. The Committee agreed to make available the “*information document on history, background and use of the IESTI*” as an Appendix to this report (Appendix XI).

TOR (ii) Advantages and disadvantages that arise from the current IESTI equations and their impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals and trade

136. The Committee agree to continue the review of the current IESTI equations and their impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals and trade (including illustrative comments and advantages and challenges).

¹⁶ CL 2018/21-PR; CX/PR 18/50/11; CX/PR 18/50/11-Add.1 (Australia, Canada, China, Egypt, EU, Kenya, USA); CRD08 (Japan); CRD14 (AU), CRD21 (Mali); CRD22 (Ecuador); CRD33 (Report of the in-Session WG of the Classification)

¹⁷ CX/PR 18/50/12; CRD09 (Review of the IESTI equations – reading guide for TOR (ii) and (iii)); CRD10 (China, EU, Kenya, AgroCare); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD19 (Indonesia); CRD20 (Paraguay); CRD23 (CropLife); CRD24 (USA); CRD27 (Netherlands)

¹⁸ REP17/PR, para. 161

¹⁹ REP14/CAC, para.105 and REP14/GP, para. 86

TOR (iii) Information on blending and bulking

137. The Committee agreed to delete the reference to “Table 3 Appendix 2 of CX/PR 17/49/12” to ensure a more focused Scope and manageable work for the EWG.
138. The Committee noted the relevance of the issues outlined in Table 3 Appendix 2 of CX/PR 17/49/12* and considered that although they are predominantly within the remit of FAO/WHO and/or JMPR, they are important for the holistic consideration of the IESTI equation. The Committee determined for it to be appropriate to return to this table at a future Session of the Committee.

Conclusion

139. The Committee agreed to:
- (a) Re-establish the EWG on IESTI, Chaired by the Netherlands, and co-Chaired Brazil and Uganda working in English, with the following mandate:
- (i) To review and provide illustrative comments on advantages and challenges that arise from the current IESTI equations and their impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals and trade.
- (ii) To gather relevant information on bulking and blending, in order to feed into the risk assessors work through the JMPR Secretariat.
- (iii) On the basis of the above considerations develop a discussion paper providing recommendations for consideration at CCPR 51.
- (b) Append the information as part of the CCPR report (Appendix XII)

ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES (Agenda Item 9)²⁰

140. Australia, as Chair of the EWG on Priorities, opened the discussion on Codex Schedules and Priorities and thanked EWG members, the co-chair from Germany and the United States of America for assistance in the preparation of the proposed 2019 schedule.
141. The EWG Chair indicated two key discussion points i.e. the proposed 2019 Schedule of JMPR evaluations and consideration of future management of unsupported older compounds both noted in CRD02.

2019 Schedule for JMPR evaluations

142. The EWG Chair provided the list of seven new compounds to be scheduled for JMPR evaluation plus one reserve compound.
143. The EWG Chair advised the Committee that there were 19 confirmed new uses and other evaluations listed in the proposed Schedule of new uses and other evaluations for the 2019 extraordinary meeting. One further nomination was presented making the full quota of 20. Four of these were confirmed as also requiring toxicological review. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that ‘data call-in’ would occur in May 2019.
144. The EWG Chair advised the Committee that there were 13 confirmed new use and other evaluations listed in the proposed 2019 Schedule of new uses and other evaluations (normal meeting) and four unconfirmed nominations, the latter four given a reserve status. In addition, 13 compounds were listed for evaluation of monitoring data in support of spice MRLs. The sponsor of the compound cyclaniliprole indicated that revised labels would be provided in support of a re-evaluation of residue data initially undertaken in 2017. The revised labels would be included in the existing new use and other evaluation nomination for cyclaniliprole.
145. During discussions on the new use and other evaluation schedules, the Committee reconfirmed the principle of avoiding nominations for the same compound on two or more consecutive years. The Committee further confirmed that consecutive nominations would only be allowed where Schedule quota was not full. Where the Schedule quota was full, nominators would be asked to consider consolidating consecutive nominations into one.
146. The EWG Chair advised that there were 10 compounds in the proposed 2019 Schedule of periodic reviews with only four supported by a sponsor. The EWG Chair indicated that the six remaining compounds were unsupported and five were the subject of a public health concern. No data package was presented in support of the compound, bromopropylate (70) for the 2018 periodic review and as such was added to the list of unsupported compounds.

²⁰ CX/PR 18/50/13; CRD12 (China, EU, Kenya, AgroCare); CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana), CRD21 (Mali)

147. The Committee indicated that a commitment of members/observers to provide support/data for the periodic review of the seven unsupported compounds was required prior to CCPR51. If this was the case, the 4-year rule may apply. If not, a recommendation would be put to CCPR to remove the seven compounds from the Codex Pesticide List and all CXLs revoked.
148. The Committee confirmed the 2019 Schedule of JMPR evaluations.

Periodic Review and unsupported compounds

149. The EWG Chair opened discussion on unsupported compounds in the periodic review. It was noted that in addition to the seven unsupported compounds in the 2019 Schedule of periodic evaluations, approximately 20 unsupported compounds were listed in Table 2A and 2B.
150. The Committee noted two key situations which arose in the periodic review: unsupported compounds and unsupported compounds with public health concerns.
151. The JMPR Secretariat advised that the public health concerns lodged against the six unsupported compounds namely aldicarb (177), almitraz (122), azinphos-methyl (002), dicloran (83), fenarimol (192), phosalone (60) in the 2019 Schedule of periodic evaluations would be reviewed by the WHO in 2019. The FAO representative advised that countries should envisage immediate strategies e.g. alternative gaps to reduce the exposure when possible or phase out those highly hazardous pesticides.
152. Several members indicated the need for the preparation of a discussion paper to consider strategies for the management of unsupported compounds.
153. The Committee indicated that the EWG Priorities would utilize the Codex IT Portal to continue maintenance of the CCPR schedules and priority lists, and to prepare a discussion paper on the management of unsupported compounds. All EWG members would be able to participate in both activities.

Compounds with only external animal use

154. The Committee:
- (i) noted that the compound flumethrin (195) has animal product CXLs related only to external animal use. This compound would be forwarded to JECFA for evaluation and consideration of CCRVDF.
 - (ii) indicated that all compounds for which the existing CXLs are related to similar uses, i.e. external animal use only, will be identified prior to the next session of CCPR by the EWG Priorities.
 - (iii) The Codex Secretariat will duly inform the JECFA Secretariat and the CCRVDF about the identified compounds and related existing CXLs.
 - (iv) CXLs for flumethrin currently available on the Codex database for MRLs for pesticides will remain as such until the establishment of CXLs as veterinary drugs.

155. Conclusion

156. The Committee agreed:
- (i) To forward the proposed Schedule of pesticides for evaluation by the 2019 JMPR to CAC41 for approval (Appendix XIII).
 - (ii) To re-convene the EWG on Priorities, chaired by Australia and co-chaired by Canada, Chile and Kenya working in English. The EWG is tasked with providing a report on the schedules and priority list, and a discussion paper on the management of unsupported compounds, for consideration by CCPR51.

NATIONAL REGISTRATION DATABASE OF PESTICIDES (Agenda Item 10)²¹

157. Germany, as co-Chair of the EWG on Priorities, introduced the work on the National Registration Database of Pesticides and highlighted key points raised in the discussion paper as follows: the exercise showed that there was a need to refine the excel worksheet to better facilitate inputs from member countries; the preferable time interval would be 5 years-time with 20-30 compounds added to the database each year – however further confirmation from CCPR would be required in this regard; the replies did not account for wide geographical coverage nevertheless, they gave an indication of the registered uses of pesticides e.g. most of the replies indicated registered uses while few replies indicated non or very limited registered uses for certain compounds.

²¹ CX/PR 18/50/14; CRD13 (Colombia, EU, Kenya); CRD14 (AU); CRD17 (Ghana); CRD20 (Paraguay); CRD21 (Mali)

158. Delegations generally supported further development of a national registration database of pesticides and provided the following views: the information requested in the excel worksheet should fit the purposes of the database (see paragraph XX); the information required should be simplified in order not to create unnecessary burden on Codex member countries; the need to indicate registration of compounds for non-food uses should be further clarified; the issue of how to report mixtures of active compounds in the excel worksheet should be explored; there is a need to facilitate access to the repository of excel worksheets as well as their uploading and downloading onto the Codex website to facilitate inputs, updating and data analysis – the Codex Secretariat noted that this issue would further be examined with the FAO IT division and the EWG Chair; it was indicated that the number of compounds to be added to the database should be no more than 5-10 (instead of the proposed 20-30 active substances) and the time cycle for updating registered uses should be 2-3 years rather than 5 years as this exercise could be resource-intensive and changes in the registration status that may occur during the year(s).
159. The EWG Priorities Chair reconfirmed the key objectives of the registration database which were to provide members with a data source to facilitate support of commodities no longer supported in a periodic re-evaluation and to determine the global registration status of unsupported compounds. The EWG Chair indicated that the complexity of the project warranted a separate EWG. The Committee supported this view.

Conclusion

160. The Committee agreed:
- (i) to establish an EWG to continue to develop this project chaired by Germany and co-chaired by Australia working in English
 - (ii) that the Codex Secretariat will issue a CL inviting members to lodge proposals to simplify and improve the excel worksheet including other data/information relevant to the further development of the database; to provide comments on the range of active substances that should be added to the database and the time interval to submit updated information; and to report back on the findings to the next session of CCPR.

OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 11)²²

Discussion Paper on Bio-pesticides

161. Chile presented a proposal for new work on bio-pesticides and observed that in Codex there were no specific guidelines on bio-pesticides and that countries were beginning to develop national regulations with different approaches, which could lead to repercussions in international trade. Chile noted that the work on bio-pesticides was within the remit of CCPR, and proposed that the Committee consider work on elaboration of guidelines for bio-pesticides which would support the harmonization of national regulations on bio-pesticides by covering aspects such as: definitions, classification, a list of compounds that are considered to be exempted from MRLs or that do not give rise to residues, etc. Codex harmonised guidelines would help national risk management authorities in the decision making process in countries where specific regulations on bio-pesticides were lacking. Chile proposed to establish a EWG to assist in undertaking the preliminary work.
162. The Committee generally supported the proposal on bio-pesticides and noted that: this was a new area that lacked internationally harmonised guidelines and yet was increasing growth in the use of bio-pesticides globally and therefore it merited exploring. A concern was raised on the use of the prefix “bio” as in some regions its use was associated to organic production, and alternative option could be “guidelines for compounds of low public health concerns that could be exempted from the establishment of CXLs”

Conclusion

163. The Committee endorsed Chile’s proposal and agreed to establish a EWG, chaired by Chile, and co-chaired by India and the United States of America and working in English, with the following mandate:
- (i) Provide background (such as trade problems and possible risk to Human Health) for justifying new work under the mandate of CCPR.
 - (ii) To develop a proposal for guidelines to harmonize concepts to recognize biological and mineral compounds used as pesticides of low public health concern which are or should be exempted of CXLs and/or that do not give rise to residues.
 - (iii) Provide classification of such compounds and possible lists or criteria, etc.
 - (iv) Provide a revised project document scoping the work.
 - (v) On the basis of the above considerations, present a proposal on future work for consideration at CCPR51.

²² CRD03 (Chile); CRD11 (Canada), CRD15 (Iran), CRD18 (India)

Discussion paper on the uniform management approach to address the issue of endocrine disrupting chemicals in food

164. India presented a proposal for new work on guidelines for “Uniform Risk Management Guidelines to address Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals as Pesticides in Food”, and stressed that there was a lack of harmonized guidance on regulating endocrine disrupting chemicals which has emerged as a major concern among countries. The absence of this may result, not only in possible removal of many crop protection chemicals from the market, which could create major trade concerns in near future, despite their previously established safety in use. India requested CCPR to endorse new work on the development of uniform risk management guidelines to address the issue of EDCs as pesticides in food.
165. The Committee deliberated on the proposal and recognized the importance of this issue in trade, however noted that there was no evidence that trade disruption, arising from the presence or withdrawal of CXLs, had occurred. The Committee also pointed out that EDCs could arise from a wide range of sources, that the issue was broad and went beyond the mandate of CCPR.

Conclusion

166. The Committee could not recommend starting the proposed new work at this time. The Committee also suggested that India could raise the concern to CAC on its own, as a member of the Commission.

Revision of the Guidelines on the use of mass spectrometry for the identification, confirmation and quantitative determination of residues (CXG 56-2005).

167. Iran presented a proposal for new work on the revision of CXG 56-2005 and highlighted the gaps in the guidelines that required addressing e.g. the title of the guidelines does not match the content; CXG focuses on confirmation test only; apparent editorial mistakes in the text; CXG covers mass spectrometry in general which requires more detail guidance, etc.
168. The Committee acknowledged the relevance of the issue and emphasized the need for CXG 56-2005 to be harmonized with the *Guidelines on Performance Criteria for Methods of Analysis for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Food and Feed* (GL 90-2017).

Conclusion

169. The Committee endorsed Iran's proposal and agreed to establish an EWG, Chaired by Iran, and co-Chaired by Costa Rica working in English only with the following TOR:
- (i) To prepare a discussion paper on the background, issues and solutions including a project document and an outline of the revised CXG for consideration at CCPR51.
 - (ii) To harmonize CXG 56 with GL 90 and other relevant Codex documents

Consideration of opportunities and challenges related to the participation of the JMPR in an international joint review of a new compound

170. Canada introduced a proposal to conduct an assessment of the benefits, challenges and proposed possible solutions to the participation of the JMPR in an international joint review of a new compound. Specifically, Canada suggested the creation of an EWG that would perform the assessment and develop a discussion paper to be presented for discussion at CCPR 51.

Conclusion

171. The Committee endorsed Canada's proposal and agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by Canada, and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Kenya and working in English with the following TOR:
- (i) To identify and assess the benefits, challenges and proposed solutions to the participation of the JMPR in an international joint review of a new compound, using previous national and international experience to inform the assessment, such as the sulfoxaflor pilot project;
 - (ii) This assessment of benefits, challenges and proposed solutions will include but will not be limited to considerations such as resource efficiencies, timelines, enhanced communication and cooperation between competent authorities and the JMPR Secretariat, and science policy issues; and,
 - (iii) On the basis of the above considerations, to develop a discussion paper to be presented for discussion at CCPR51.
172. The Committee encouraged all delegations and the JMPR Secretariat to actively participate in the EWG and engage in an open and transparent discussion on the aforementioned topic.

Information by Japan on new MRLs for Fosetyl-AI

173. Japan shared information with the Committee on the new MRLs for fosetyl-AI that were established due to public health concerns, however the main challenge remain the absence of valid analytical methods for this compound, and called for sharing of analytical methods.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 12)

174. The Committee was informed that its 51st session was tentatively scheduled to be held in China, in one-year time, the final arrangements being subject to confirmation by the Host Country and the Codex Secretariats.