CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

World Health Organization

E

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

Agenda Item 3 **CX/PR 17/49/02**
March 2017

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

49th Session
Beijing, P.R. China, 24-29 April 2017

MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE 39TH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Matters for Information

Adoption of maximum residue limits for pesticides at Step 5/8

Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides

1. CAC39 (July 2016) adopted proposed draft MRLs for pesticide/commodity combinations at Step 5/8 noting the reservations of the European Union and Norway.[1]

Adoption of standards and related texts at Step 5

2. The Commission adopted the following texts at Step 5:

- Proposed draft revision to the *Classification of Food and Feed* (Group 020 Grasses of cereal grains)[2].
- Proposed draft Guidelines on performance criteria for methods of analysis for the determination of pesticide residues in food[3].

Revocation of maximum residue limits for pesticides

3. The Commission revoked a number of Codex MRLs for pesticide/commodity combinations following the revision of MRLs for pesticides.[4]

Discontinuation of work

4. CAC39 noted discontinuation of work on a number of proposed draft and draft MRLs for pesticide/ commodity combinations in the Step Procedure.[5]

Approval of new work

5. The Commission approved the priority list of pesticides scheduled for evaluation and re-evaluation by the FAO/WHO Joint Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR).[6]

Consistency of the risk analysis texts across the relevant committees

Committee on General Principles

6. CCGP30 (April 2016) agreed to recommend to CAC39 that the Secretariat should address minor numbering issues in the texts for the Committees on Contaminants in Foods, Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods and Pesticide Residues with the relevant committees.

---

[1] REP16/PR, paras. 28-114, Appendix II; REP16/CAC, paras. 75-76, Appendix III
[2] REP16/PR, paras. 135-141, Appendix X; REP16/CAC, Appendix IV
[3] REP16/PR, paras. 159-163, Appendix XI; REP16/CAC, Appendix IV
[4] REP16/PR, paras. 28-114, Appendix III; REP16/CAC, Appendix V
[5] REP16/PR, paras. 28-114, Appendix VI; REP16/CAC, Appendix VII
[6] REP16/PR, paras. 164-183, Appendix XII; REP16/CAC, Appendix VI

7. The Committee noted the concerns that delegations had expressed on the periodic review and that the Commission would take note of that.

8. Several delegations were of the opinion that the task requested of CCGP had been completed and that the item should not be maintained on the agenda of this Committee.

9. Other delegations[7] expressed their reservation as they felt the paper on the consistency of the risk analysis texts across the relevant committees (prepared by the Codex Secretariat in collaboration with FAO and WHO) did not fulfil the mandate given to the Secretariat by CAC and that the item should be maintained on the agenda of the Committee.[8]

Codex Alimentarius Commission

10. The Commission endorsed the recommendations of CCGP that the Secretariat should address minor numbering issues in the texts for CCCF, CCRVDF and CCPR with the relevant committees.

11. The Commission further noted that CCGP had completed work on the consistency of the risk analysis principles within Codex.

12. Delegations from Latin America expressed their concern that the task given to the CCGP by CAC30 (2007) to review all relevant texts on risk analysis principles applied by Codex committees as a whole in order to ensure consistency throughout Codex had not been completed, especially with regard to the periodic review of pesticides applied by CCPR. They referred in particular to the decision of CAC37 (2014) whereby at its next session "*CCGP would address the concerns raised when considering the consistencies of risk analysis principles of different committees*". In their view, therefore the item should be maintained on the agenda of CCGP.

13. The Commission noted the reservation of delegations from Latin America[9] in relation to the risk analysis principles applied by CCPR for the reasons given above and to the discontinuation of the discussion on the consistency of the risk analysis principles across Codex committees in CCGP because they considered that the mandate given by CAC to CCGP had not been completed and therefore requested that the matter continue to remain on the agenda of CCGP.[10]

[7] Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Jamaica, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay
[8] REP16/GP, paras. 40-58
[9] Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay
[10] REP16/CAC, paras. 169-181