

# CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



World Health  
Organization

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

**Agenda Item 12**

**CRD16**

**April 2019**

**ORIGINAL LANGUAGE**

## **JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES**

**51<sup>st</sup> Session**

**Macao SAR, P.R. China, 8-13 April 2019**

### **DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS**

**Comments submitted by European Union and Kenya**

#### **European Union**

##### *European Union Competence European Union Vote*

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on Priorities chaired by Australia and co-chaired by Canada, Chile and Kenya for the preparation of the discussion paper on the management of unsupported compounds with reference CX/PR 19/51/17.

The EU acknowledges that the discussion paper follows the risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues.

Paragraph 11 of the discussion paper sets out clear steps to manage unsupported compounds with public health concern. The EU supports the path proposed in paragraph 11.

As regards the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern, the EU considers that option 3 (described in paragraph 19 of the discussion paper) is fully in line with the risk analysis principles. The EU supports the path proposed in option 3.

The EU considers that options 1 and 2a could lead to the continued maintenance of CXLs which not only are not supported by submission of toxicology, residue and other relevant data, but also do not have a corresponding registration listed in the national registration database. This would violate the principle that MRLs should be set as low as reasonably achievable and impede the enforcement against illegal uses of pesticides.

Paragraph 20 of the discussion paper underlines that after 25 years, the toxicological evaluation may be outdated and no longer reliable, and that health concerns cannot be excluded in this case. The EU agrees with this notion.

Paragraph 20 of the discussion paper further recommends that after 25 years, a re-evaluation of toxicology should take place, otherwise all CXLs should be revoked. The EU supports the path proposed in paragraph 20.

#### **Kenya**

**Comment:** Kenya appreciates the discussion paper prepared by the Electronic-working group led by Canada, Costa Rica and Kenya. We believe the paper has provided possible pathways for pesticides that fall in the two key situations. Kenya supports the proposal in paragraph 11.

##### **Unsupported compounds without public health concern**

Kenya supports proposal in "Option 2b. Only those CXLs for which there are registrations listed in the NRD will be retained." Further, if relevant CXLs whose national registrations are no longer maintained, then we support Option 3, being invoked to provide time for Members, interested in maintaining a CXL to provide relevant data