

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 - www.codexalimentarius.org

Agenda Item 12

CX/PR 21/52/16

May 2021

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

52nd Session

(Virtual)

26-30 July and 3 August 2021

ENGAGEMENT OF JMPR IN PARALLEL REVIEWS OF NEW COMPOUNDS PROPOSED PROCEDURES AND PRINCIPLES

(Prepared by the Electronic Working Group chaired by Canada
and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Kenya)

1 – INTRODUCTION

1. Background information on the discussion of this matter can be found in the reports of the CCPR50 (2018)¹ and CCPR51 (2019)² reports.
2. As agreed to at CCPR51 (2019), this electronic working group (EWG) was mandated³ to propose principles and procedures (hereafter proposed process) to enable the participation of the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) in parallel reviews of a new compound to accelerate the setting of Codex MRLs and support MRL harmonization.
3. As discussed at CCPR51, it is suggested to test the concept of parallel reviews through a pilot project in order to refine the proposed process to reflect practical, real-world considerations, and ensure that JMPR resources continue to be used efficiently.
4. The current document is meant to be a starting point to gather feedback from JMPR and CCPR Members and Observers on a process that would enable JMPR experts to conduct reviews of new compounds at the same time as national regulatory agencies (hereafter parallel reviews). The establishment of a successful parallel review process will require some flexibility to address challenges collaboratively and refine the process iteratively.
5. The present document incorporates the lessons learned from a recent Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) parallel review⁴ pilot project on veterinary drugs. Outcomes of the JECFA pilot project emphasized that complete dossiers should be made available to experts from the onset, to ensure they have the data required to complete their assessments and to mitigate impacts on project timelines (minimize delays).
6. Some participants raised concerns regarding the impact the JMPR decisions may have on decisions from national regulatory authorities. All parties will be making their regulatory decisions according to their respective regulatory requirements, guidelines and timelines. While the objective of the parallel review is to align MRLs and accelerate the setting of Codex MRLs (CXLs), every party's decision-making process remains independent. As with the current Codex MRL setting process, national pesticide registration and MRL setting will occur first, followed by the setting of a Codex MRL shortly afterwards, contingent on registration in at least one of the national authorities involved in the parallel review.

¹ REP18/PR, paras. 167-169, available at the CCPR50 website:

<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings/detail/en/?meeting=CCPR&session=50>

² REP19/PR, paras. 198-202, available at the CCPR51 website:

<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings/detail/en/?meeting=CCPR&session=51>

³ REP19/PR, para. 202.

⁴ CX/RVDF 21/25/10, available at the CCRVDF25 webpage:

<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings/detail/en/?meeting=CCRVDF&session=25>

2 – SELECTION OF PESTICIDES FOR JMPR EVALUATION

2.1 – Nomination process - timelines

- The current timelines for the nomination of new compounds would also apply to those part of a parallel review process.
 - September - November 30 – EWG on Priorities' request for nominations: Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) members/observers submit nominations for a new compound, indicating if they would like JMPR to engage in a parallel review, which countries have agreed to engage in the review, and when data packages, including the proposed GAP, will be available. (Note: Should the process be officially adopted, the nomination form would need to be amended accordingly).
 - January – EWG on Priorities circulates proposed Schedule and Priority List for Comments
 - April – CCPR agrees to forward the JMPR Evaluation Schedule for the following year to the Codex Alimentarius Committee (CAC) for approval.
 - July – CAC approves the proposed JMPR Evaluation Schedule for the following year.

2.2 – Nomination requirements and criteria for the prioritization and scheduling pesticides for evaluation by JMPR⁵

- **Nomination requirements – new pesticides⁶**

The current nomination requirements of new pesticides would also apply to those part of a parallel review process:

- An intention⁷ to register the pesticide for use in a member country, or more than one member country for pesticides that will undergo a JMPR parallel review.
- The foods or feeds proposed for consideration should be traded internationally.
- There is a commitment by the member/observer of the pesticide to provide supporting data for review in response to the JMPR “data call-in”.
- The use of the pesticide is expected to give rise to residues in or on a food or feed moving in international trade.
- The pesticide has not been already accepted for consideration.
- The nomination form has been completed.

- **Prioritization criteria⁸**

The current prioritization criteria of new pesticides would also apply to those part of a parallel review process, such as:

- Timing of data availability.
- Commitment by the member/observer to provide supporting data for review with a firm date for data submission.
- The provision of information on the foods or feeds for which CXL are sought and the number of trials for each food or feed.

- **Scheduling criteria⁹**

7. The current scheduling criteria requires a pesticide to be registered for use in a country and formulation labels available to allow the scheduling of a compound for JMPR evaluation in the following year.
8. Considering that a parallel review implies the JMPR assessment of a pesticide prior to its registration in a country, a new sub-paragraph would be needed to acknowledge this new sub-category as follows:

Only pesticides nominated for a parallel review will be exempted from the requirement for a national registration at the time of scheduling. In order for CCPR to agree to having a pesticide evaluated by the JMPR as part of a parallel review, the complete data package as required by JMPR (see data categories in section 4.2.) must be made available at, or shortly after the CCPR meeting. This will allow JMPR to initiate the parallel review process as soon as the product nominations are approved by CAC in July of each year.

⁵ The latest edition of the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR can be found in the Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) available on the Codex website at: <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/publications/en/>

⁶ CAC Procedural Manual, Section IV – Risk Analysis, Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR, sub-section 5.2.2, paragraph 61
⁷ A complete data package may have been submitted to participating countries – or – countries have agreed to participate in a parallel review.

⁸ CAC Procedural Manual, Section IV – Risk Analysis, Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR, sub-section 5.2.2, paragraph 62

⁹ CAC Procedural Manual, Section IV – Risk Analysis, Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR, sub-section 5.2.2, paragraph 63

3 – JMPR CALL FOR DATA

9. The JMPR Secretariat typically develops the JMPR assignment list, and assigns compounds for review by FAO/WHO experts in the last quarter of the calendar year. The JMPR call for data is typically undertaken in November with a submission deadline of late-December. It is suggested that the JMPR Secretariat consider early planning for parallel reviews (i.e. early identification of evaluators and early data-intake).

4 – PARALLEL REVIEW

4.1 – Project management

10. It is suggested to identify a global project manager to oversee the parallel review, in close collaboration with the WHO/FAO JMPR Secretariat/JMPR reviewers and national points of contact (governments). The global project manager would liaise with all parties including the sponsors and ensure that the identified timelines and milestones are met throughout the process which includes the conduct of the data completeness check.

4.2 - Interaction between national and JMPR reviewers


11. The nature of parallel reviews implies that it is conducted concurrently with national reviews and that the interaction between reviewers may occur to discuss scientific matters related to the data packages.
12. To optimize the participation of the JMPR in the parallel review process, the JMPR reviewers would be assigned following the endorsement of the schedule by CAC in July, and submission of the JMPR dossier could also occur shortly thereafter (prior to the regular data call-in). The JMPR Secretariat will carefully select the JMPR reviewers to ensure they are not the same experts as the ones involved in the national registration process.
13. To support information-sharing and the engagement of the JMPR reviewers in the parallel review, the contact information of the JMPR reviewer would be provided to the global project manager responsible for coordinating the joint review.
14. The concept of parallel reviews also requires that the exact same data package for toxicology, product chemistry, residue chemistry, including metabolism and environmental fate, be provided to national regulatory agencies and JMPR.
15. In the event that additional toxicology or residue chemistry information is provided to one party, sponsors must ensure that it is provided to all other parties, including JMPR, such that data packages under review remain identical.

4.3 - Parallel review timelines

16. Other than an earlier review start by national authorities, it is possible that the parallel review will take place over two JMPR Meetings (see table 1; while timelines are outdated they are intended for reference purposes only). Should that be the case, there would be an opportunity for the JMPR reviewer engaged in the parallel review to discuss metabolites /residue definition for MRL enforcement during the JMPR meeting of the first cycle (about a year following the beginning of the parallel review).

4.4 - Changes to the draft label

17. Should final conditions of registration (i.e., application rate, number of applications, etc) in member countries differ from the GAP reviewed by the JMPR, the expert would apply the FAO 25% variation rules, proportionality or any other applicable approach, to determine whether the recommended maximum residue limits must be recalculated and the dietary risk assessments reviewed.
18. JMPR recommendations to the CCPR occur by consensus. Should changes to the GAP go beyond the principles established by JMPR, and occur following the JMPR annual meeting, the JMPR reviewer would update the evaluation accordingly, consult with participating countries/sponsor and seek endorsement from the JMPR Meeting. The post-review update should be completed prior to the finalization and distribution of the JMPR final report in February, or postponed to the following JMPR Annual Meeting. Considerations should be given to alternative means for decision-making outside of the annual JMPR Meetings, such as teleconferences and email correspondence.
19. The table below is meant to illustrate potential timelines for a parallel review and how they could align with key CCPR/JMPR milestones. Twenty-two months were used as the proxy for national reviews. The timelines for public consultations and product registration would differ per participating countries; the proxy used for public consultation and product registration is three months.

Table 1: Scenario – projected timelines (over 2 JMPR Meetings)

5 - RISK ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

20. The JMPR experts engaged in the parallel review would review data packages and provide scientific advice according to the existing evaluation methodologies of the JMPR:
21. FAO Manual on the Submission and evaluation of pesticide residues data for the estimation of MRLs
 - JMPR Guidance Document for WHO monographers and reviewers
22. It is also expected that the parallel review will build on the latest OECD guidance on definition of residues¹⁰, which will facilitate alignment of residue definitions for MRL enforcement to the extent possible. It is recommended that alignment of crop categories be discussed between parties.
23. There is recognition that parallel reviews may contribute to alignment of decisions between parties (e.g. MRLs, residue definitions, etc.). However, as all parties will conduct their risk assessment based on their organizational requirements and methodologies, reaching consensus may not be achievable. While differences should be discussed, individual review/registration processes should continue as planned to avoid delays.

6 – SUBMISSION OF FINAL LABEL

24. JMPR's proposed MRLs are typically presented to CCPR in February of each year. At that time, pesticides assessed under the parallel review process should be registered in at least one country, and final label and proof of registration submitted to the JMPR Secretariat. Inability to complete this step of the parallel review would postpone the JMPR MRL recommendation to the following year.

7 – INTERACTION BETWEEN JMPR REVIEWERS AND THIRD PARTIES (NATIONAL REGULATORS, SPONSOR)

25. Evaluators may wish to communicate with the data sponsor throughout the evaluation process to seek clarification or request that additional data be submitted. It is suggested to centralize communications with and from the data sponsor through the global project manager. The objective of centralizing communications would be to streamline communications with the sponsor, promote transparency, and ensure all reviewers receive the same additional data/information or clarifications from the sponsor.

¹⁰ OECD currently working on a revision of its 2009 *Guidance Document on Definition of Residue*, in collaboration with JECFA, FAO and WHO experts.

8 – CONCLUSIONS

26. The procedures and principles described above could be tested through a pilot project which may allow further improvements to the proposal described in Sections 2-7. As such, the process remains flexible to adjust as experience is gained with the implementation of the pilot project. The proposed process could be then considered by CCPR as to where it could reside and whether a revision of the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR would be appropriate to this aim.
27. Should CCPR be agreeable to the pilot project, Canada as lead country of the EWG could coordinate with Australia as Chair of the EWG on Priorities, the JMPR Secretariat and other relevant stakeholders (e.g. CropLife) on the identification of a new compound and the timelines for the pilot project and to report back on their findings to CCPR53 (2022).

9 – RECOMMENDATIONS

28. CCPR is invited:
 - a. To consider the proposed principles and procedures for parallel reviews of new compounds as described in Sections 2-7 and determine whether they are robust enough to provide the basis for the implementation of a pilot project; if so,
 - b. To encourage data sponsors considering product registration in more than one country in the near-future to nominate compounds for the parallel review pilot in coordination with the Chair of the EWG/Priorities and the FAO/WHO JMPR Secretariats for consideration by CCPR53 (2022).
 - c. To test the procedure through a pilot project in order to refine the proposed process to reflect practical, real-world considerations, and ensure that JMPR resources continue to be used efficiently.
 - d. To agree that the proposed process will document the actual outcomes to accelerate the establishment of Codex MRLs and harmonization with international MRLs.

APPENDIX I**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS¹¹**

CHAIRS: Mrs. Monique Thomas, Pest Management Regulatory Agency, monique.thomas@canada.ca
Mrs. Nathalie Doré, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, nathalie.dore@canada.ca

VICE CHAIRS: Mrs. Verónica Picado Pomar, Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado, vpicado@sfe.go.cr
Mrs. Lucy Namu, Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service, lnamu@kephis.org

Member Countries / Organization	Contact	Title
Australia	Jason Lutze	Executive Director, Risk Assessment Capability Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA)
	James Deller	Australian Pesticide and Veterinary Medicines Authority
Austria	Mag. Ingo Grosssteiner	Austrian Agency for Health and Food Safety (AGES), Expert Department for Residue Behaviour and Physical-Chemical Properties, Institute for Plant Protection Products, Division for Food Security
Brazil	Carlos Ramos Venancio	General Coordinator of Pesticide Control, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply - MAPA
Canada	Nancy Ing	Regulatory Policy and Risk Management Specialist Health Canada
Chile	Roxana Vera	Jefa Sub departamento de Acuerdos Internacionales y Coordinadora del Subcomité Nacional del Codex Sobre Residuos de Plaguicidas
	Eduardo Aylwin	Chilean Food Safety and Quality Agency, ACHIPIA
China	Ercheng Zhao	Beijing Academy of Agriculture and Forestry Science
Costa Rica	Verónica Picado Pomar	Coordinator National Committee CCPR
	Mrs. Amanda Lasso C	Codex Secretariat
	Mrs. Tatiana Vasquez	Pesticide Registration Officer
Egypt	Mariam Barsoum Onsy	Food Standards Specialist, Egyptian Organization for Standardization & Quality (EOS), Ministry of Trade and Industry
European Union	Mr Volker Wachtler	European Commission
	Marc Leguen de Lacroix	European Commission
France	Florence Gerault	Ministry of Agriculture
Germany	Christian Sieke	Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR), Department Pesticides Safety, Unit Residues and Analytical Methods
	Monika Schumacher	Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Section 313 "Residues and Contaminants in Food, Food Contact Materials"

¹¹ Please contact the focal point of the Member Country or Observer Organization for the details of the delegates. The list of Codex contact points for members and observers are available from the Codex website at: <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/members/en/>
<http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/observers/observers/obs-list/en/>

Member Countries / Organization	Contact	Title
Ghana	Dr. Paul Osei-Fosu	Head of Food and Agriculture Department Ghana Standards Authority
Honduras	Juan Carlos Paguada	Coordinador del CCPR Honduras
India	Dr. K.K. Sharma	Network Coordinator, AINP on Pesticide Residues, IARI
	Dr. Vandana Tripathy	ICAR-IARI
	Dr. Sarita Bhalla	Consultant (Pharmacology), Medical Toxicologist, Central Insecticides Board & Registration Committee
Iran	Roya Noorbakhsh	
Japan	Dr. Yukiko YAMADA	Senior Advisor Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan
	Mr. Keisuke AWA	Assistant Director Organization: Pharmaceutical Safety and Environmental Health Bureau Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan
	Hidetaka Kobayashi	Deputy Director, Agricultural Chemicals Office Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Kazakhstan	Alexandr Razzaryonov	Ministry of Health of the Republic of Kazakhstan
Maroc	Ouazzani Sanae	Codex Secretariat
Mexico	Tania Fosado	Codex Contact Point, Mexico
New Zealand	Dave Lunn	Principal Adviser Residues Ministry for Primary Industries
	Warren Hughes	Principal Adviser ACVM Ministry for Primary Industries
Nigeria	IBITAYO Femi James	Assistant Chief Livestock Development Officer (Animal Feeds and Feed Security Division) Department of Animal Husbandry Services Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
North Macedonia	Maja Lukareva	Food and Veterinary Agency
Peru	Humberto Reyes Cervantes	Director en Inocuidad Agroalimentaria/coordinador titular del Comité de plaguicidas, SENASA
	Miguel Portocarrero Berrocal	Especialista en Inocuidad Agroalimentaria/coordinador alterno del comité de plaguicidas, SENASA
	Juan Carlos Huiza Trujillo	Secretario Técnico del Comité Nacional del Codex, DIGESA (Dirección General de Salud Ambiental)Minsa /Perú
South Korea	Park Yu-min	Ministry of Food and Drug Safety
	Hwang Kiseon	MAFRA
Thailand	Ms. Namaporn Attaviroj	Senior Standards Officer Office of Standard Development, National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards,

Member Countries / Organization	Contact	Title
	Ms. Chutima Sornsumrarn	Standards Officer Office of Standard Development, National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards
United Kingdom	Julian Cudmore	Chemicals Regulation Division, Health and Safety Executive
	David Williams	Pesticides Team Leader, Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs
United States of America	Aaron Niman	Member, U.S. Delegation to CCPR U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Observers	Contact	Title
AgroCare	Rodrigo de Santiago	
CropLife International	Wibke Meyer	Regulatory Affairs Manager CropLife International
International Federation of Wines and Spirits	Laura Gelezuinas	
FMC Corporation	Peter Horne	
International Council of Grocery Manufacturers Associations	Kirsten Scott	Director, Health and Nutrition Policy
International Organisation of Spice Trade Associations	Laura Shumow	
Tea and Herbal Infusions Europe	Cordelia Kraft	