



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

50th Session

Haikou, P.R. China, 9-14 April 2018

Consideration of Opportunities and Challenges Related to the Participation of the JMPR in an International Joint Review of a New Compound

(Proposal from Canada)

Introduction

1. Agricultural producers throughout the world rely on pesticides to improve crop quality and yield, and to protect the food supply. The safety of pesticides is ensured by national governments through registration processes.
2. The process for registering pesticides varies between countries, with some relying on Codex maximum residue limits (CXLs) to a greater extent than others.
3. While some countries may have a regulatory framework that allows the registration of new pesticides, growers from these countries are often unable to export their products to countries relying on CXLs, as a CXL may not yet exist.

Considerations

4. Acknowledging the challenges some countries are facing when it comes to enabling growers to access the newest products, including those that are applied in the production of minor-use crops;
5. Recognizing that it is desirable from a socio-economic perspective for farmers worldwide to have access to the latest tools available to address agronomic challenges, and to sustain safe and viable agricultural production;
6. Recognizing that many countries rely on CXLs to support domestic use of pesticides and to enable interregional or international trade of agricultural products;

Proposal

7. There is interest from Canada, Australia, Costa Rica, Kenya, Mexico, Uganda, and the United States, to explore whether such challenges could be addressed through the participation of the JMPR in an independent, parallel review with national authorities.
8. Specifically, Canada, with support from Australia, Costa Rica, Kenya, Mexico, Uganda, and the United States, proposes the creation of an electronic working group (e-WG) encouraging all delegations and JMPR to engage in an open and transparent discussion on the opportunities and potential challenges that may be associated with the participation of the JMPR in an international joint review of a new compound.
9. Canada, Costa Rica and Kenya volunteer to co-chair the e-WG.
10. The participation of the JMPR in the Sulfoxaflor joint assessment in 2011 may be used as a case study to discuss challenges identified as a result of this joint review between the JMPR and national authorities, including:

- a. the capacity for JMPR to conduct an independent, parallel review;
 - b. the financial and human resource implications for JMPR;
 - c. the harmonization of residue definitions¹;
 - d. late changes to the proposed GAP; and
 - e. others.
11. Notwithstanding the challenges noted above, some of the benefits of a joint review with JMPR would include the timely establishment of CXLs as well as trade facilitation of major and minor crops between the countries where the pesticide is registered and those relying on CXLs.
 12. The results of the e-WG's discussions throughout 2018 would be presented for plenary discussion at CCPR51 in 2019. Preliminary findings will be circulated to CCPR membership in advance of the meeting.

¹ As mentioned in the 2017 JMPR report (article 3.2.2.5), a presentation was made to the 2017 JMPR by Bayer AG CropScience (M. Kaethner) on the *Harmonization of the residue definition – determining the level of interest in a pilot project to achieve more harmonized residue definitions*. The proposal outlined a process in which, during a review of a new compound by JMPR, a dialogue between national regulators and FAO/WHO experts would be established to try and reach non-binding harmonized residue definitions, including the residue definition for enforcement which forms the basis of the CXLs.