



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION ET L'AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZACION DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACION  
Rome, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla. Cables: FOODAGRI, Rome. Tel. 5797



WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION  
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTÉ

1211 Genève, 27 Avenue Appia. Câbles: UNISANTE, Genève. Tél. 34 60 61

SP 10/115  
ALINORM 68/24  
(CCPR 67/Report)  
October 1967

Original: ENGLISH

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAM

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Fifth Session, Rome, 19 February - 1 March 1968

REPORT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE

ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

18 - 22 September 1967, The Hague, The Netherlands

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>
Introduction .....	1	
Terms of reference .....	1	1
Appointment of Rapporteur .....	2	2
Endorsement of tolerances .....	2	3
Tolerances at Step 4 .....	2	4
Malathion .....	3	4a
Hydrogen cyanide .....	3	4b
Methyl bromide .....	4	4c
Ethylene dibromide .....	4	4d
Definition of tolerances .....	4	5
Methods of analysis .....	5	6
Omission of Steps 6, 7 and 8 .....	6	7
Progress Report, WHO .....	6	8a
Temporary ADI .....	7	8a
Negligible Residues .....	7	8b
Progress Report, FAO .....	8	9
Temporary Tolerances .....	8	9
Practical Residue Limits .....	8,9,10	9
Safety Factors in Estimating Pesticide Residue Intakes .....	8,9	9
Unintentional Residues .....	9	10
Definition of Pesticide Residues .....	10	11
Responsibility for pesticide residues from animal feeding stuffs and other sources .....	10	12
Methods employed for estimating tolerances .....	10	13
Discussion of working paper CCPR/67/10 .....	10	14
Decision of the Committee .....	11	15
Discussion and endorsement of approach in working paper CCPR/67/9 .....	12	16
Recommendation of the Committee .....	13	17
Proposals at Step 2 .....	13	18
aldrin and dieldrin .....	13	18a
biphenyl .....	15	18b
carbaryl .....	15	18c
DDT .....	15	18d
methyl bromide and ethylene dibromide .....	16	18e
lindane (gamma - BHC) .....	16	18f
hydrogen phosphide .....	17	18h
malathion .....	18	18i
organomercury compounds .....	18	18j
piperonyl butoxide .....	18	18k
pyrethrins .....	19	18l
Priority Lists .....	19	19
Priority List I; amended .....	1	Appendix X
Priority List II; additions and deletions ....	19	19
Priority Lists III, IV and V (see Appendix X) .	20	21
Priority Lists; requests and comments .....	21	22

	<u>Page</u>	<u>Paragraph</u>
Priority Lists III, IV; recommendation .....	21	23
Allocation of future work .....	23	24
List III .....	23	24
List IV .....	24	24
Reconsideration of recommendations made at the First Session .....	25	25
Terms of reference .....	25	25
Provisional international tolerances ..	25	26
Other Business .....	26	27
List of legal tolerances .....	26	27
Glossary of terms .....	26	28
Monitoring of pesticide residues in food .....	27	29
Date of next session and tentative schedule of sessions .....	27	31

-----

APPENDICES

- I. List of Participants.
- II. Explanation of the meaning of a temporary ADI given in the Joint Report of the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues (WHO Technical Report Series 1967, 370, page 9).
- III. Methods employed in estimating tolerances, CCPR/67/9, as amended by the meeting.
- IV. Proposed tolerance, temporary tolerances and practical residue limits at Step 2.
- V. aldrin and dieldrin, practical residue limits a/
- VI. DDT, temporary tolerances and practical residue limits a/
- VII. lindane, temporary tolerances and practical residue limits a/
- VIII. heptachlor and heptachlor epoxide, practical residue limits a/
- IX. malathion; temporary tolerances a/
- X. Priority Lists: I(amended), II(revised), III, IV and V; tentative timetable of meetings.

---

a/ Comments on, additions to and variations of the proposals of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues.

Introduction

The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues held its second session in The Hague, The Netherlands, 18 - 22 September 1967. The session was opened by the Chairman Drs. A. Kruyse, Inspector General of Public Health in charge of Food Stuffs Division, The Netherlands.

The session was attended by Government delegates, experts and advisers from the following 23 countries: Argentina, Austria, Australia, Belgium, Brasil, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Switzerland, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America.

The following organizations were also represented:

EEC, EPPO, GIFAP, ISO/TC 34, IUPAC.

A list of participants including officers from FAO and WHO is set out in Appendix I.

Report of the Fourth Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

1. The Committee took note of the decision of the fourth session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, that it would not at this time make changes in the terms of

reference or working procedures of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues but that the new approaches proposed by FAO and WHO should be tried to see how they would speed up the consideration of pesticides.

Appointment of Rapporteurs.

2. The Committee decided that there was no need to appoint a rapporteur for the meeting and the secretariat should be responsible for preparing the report.
3. The Committee noted that different tolerances were in force in a number of countries regarding some of the pesticides under consideration.

However, the majority endorsed the proposed tolerances for submitting to Governments or the Commission as appropriate.

Examination of Government comments at Step 4 on tolerances proposed at the First Session.

4. The Committee considered Government comments (CCPR/67/2,3,4,5,6) at Step 4 on the tolerances proposed at the First Session for malathion, hydrogen cyanide, methyl bromide and ethylene dibromide for raw grain at the point of entry into a country or entry into trade channels within a country.

The results of the deliberation of the Committee are given below.

a. Malathion

After full discussion the Committee endorsed in the light of Government comments the proposal made at the previous session of 8 ppm malathion for raw grain and recommended that the Commission adopt it as a draft provisional standard (Step 5).

b. Hydrogen cyanide.

During discussion of the comments received from Governments on the previous proposal of 75 ppm hydrogen cyanide for raw grain the Delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany pointed out that levels of hydrogen cyanide exceeding 5 - 10 ppm were exceptional in imported grain, that the figure of 75 ppm therefore appeared too high and that it wished to give the matter further consideration. The Delegation of Poland also drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the level of 75 ppm in rice packed for retail sale would not be acceptable in that country.

Having discussed these views the Committee recommended 75 ppm hydrogen cyanide be adopted as a draft provisional standard (Step 5).

The Committee unanimously endorsed the previous proposal of 6 ppm hydrogen cyanide in flour and recommended similarly (Step 5).

c. Methyl Bromide.

The Committee unanimously recommended the adoption at Step 5 of the previous proposed tolerance for raw grain of 50 ppm inorganic bromide determined and expressed as total bromide from all sources.

d. Ethylene dibromide.

The Committee unanimously recommended the adoption at Step 5 of the proposal made at the previous session for a tolerance for raw grain of 50 ppm inorganic bromide, determined and expressed as total bromide from all sources.

Definition of tolerances.

5. The Committee discussed the comments received from Governments on the terms "trade or import tolerance" and "acceptable consumer residue" given on page 11 of the Report of the First Session of this Committee (Alinorm/66/24) and the proposals from Delegations. The Committee's attention was drawn to a proposal of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (WHO Techn.Rep. 1967, 370) that the word "tolerance" when used alone should refer to "the concentration that is permitted in and on food" but that the word should always be qualified to indicate its precise meaning.

In the discussion some Delegations were of the opinion

that there was a need to establish two types of tolerances for pesticide residues, viz. for products entering into international trade and for products at the consumer level.

Most Delegations were of the opinion that for products in international trade only one tolerance was necessary, enforcable at the point of entry into a country.

The Committee agreed that when proposing tolerances, the stage at which the tolerances applied should be specified and that the kind of tolerance should always be stated.

The Committee decided to use the designation "tolerance" suitably qualified to indicate the point of enforcement or determination e.g. at the point of import or consumption.

Methods of analysis.


6. The Committee noted that only two Governments had commented on the methods of analysis proposed by the FAO Working Party on Pesticides Residues in May 1965 for the substances under paragraph 4 above. It decided therefore to draw attention of the Commission to the need to ask Governments for further comments, on the methods under forwarding the draft provisional standards under Step 5 and that in the future the attention of Governments should be directed toward the fact that



comments on the tolerance and the method of analysis are invited.

The Committee noted that IUPAC was working in the field of pesticide residue analysis and that a liaison between that body and the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues has been established.

Discussion of the omission of Steps 6, 7 and 8.

7. The Committee discussed whether the proposed tolerances for malathion, hydrogen cyanide, methyl bromide and ethylene dibromide could be considered as entirely uncontroversial and whether to recommend to the Commission that Steps 6,7 and 8 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards be omitted. It was pointed out to the Committee that when it recommended tolerances, the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues normally recommended methods of analysis for the pesticide residues in the foods concerned. The Committee decided by a small majority not to so recommend because insufficient Government comments on methods of analysis had been received.
- 

WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues-Progress Report

8.a. Acceptable daily intakes

The Committee took note of a verbal report on the progress of the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues. It noted that as requested by the Codex Committee ADI's

had been established for the following pesticides:

aldrin / dieldrin	lindane (gamma-BHC)
carbaryl	heptachlor (and heptachlor epoxide)
DBT	malathion ✓
dichlorvos	diazinon
diphenyl	dimethoate
ethylene dibromide ✓	phosphamidon
methyl bromide ✓	

In the absence of fully adequate toxicological data, temporary ADI's had been established for piperonyl butoxide and the pyrethrins.

→ An explanation of the meaning of a "temporary ADI" had been given in the Joint Report of the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues and is reproduced at Appendix II.

b. Negligible Residues

At the last session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues it was recommended: "that WHO should at a future meeting consider and advise on levels of residues which may be regarded as negligible from a toxicological viewpoint in connection with unintentional residues."

The Committee was advised that this matter had been brought to the attention of the WHO Scientific Group on Procedures for Investigation Intentional and Unintentional Food Additives but that no decision

could be reached on this point.

The Committee again requested that the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues should reconsider this matter at a future meeting in connection with intentional and unintentional residues.

FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues - Progress Report

9. The Committee received a verbal progress report on the work of the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues and an explanation of the meaning of "temporary tolerances" and "practical residue limits". It noted the recommendation that a "temporary tolerance" could be given in either of two circumstances :

- a. when it was derived from a temporary ADI;
- b. when it was derived from an ADI that could be exceeded when the pesticide is applied according to good agricultural practice.

In connection with the circumstance described in

b. above, the following extract of the 1967 Report of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (p.13) is relevant:

"It must be pointed out that the tolerance figures proposed for specific compounds were arrived at only after incorporating many safety factors, among them being:

- (a) a conservative approach in establishing acceptable

daily intakes;

(b) the assumption that all the food of a particular type will contain the residue;

(c) the assumption that the residue will be present in all the food to the limit of the tolerance;

(d) the adoption of high consumption figures, which would be exceeded by only about 15% of the population; where the residue is present in more than one type of food, it may be assumed that the combined high consumption figures for all such foods would be exceeded by much less than 15% of the population;

(e) where data were not available, unless the general opinion of the Working Party indicated otherwise, it was assumed that there was no disappearance of residues in storage, handling or processing before consumption by man."

The Committee also noted that such temporary tolerances were valid for a specified period during which additional data on toxicity and/or on the disappearance of the pesticide residues during storage and processing of food should become available.

10. The Committee noted the proposal that where unintentional residues occurred in foods from background or environmental contamination and if it results from the use of pesticides at an earlier stage in the food chain, that Governments

should use "practical residue limits" which would be the subject of administrative decisions based on residues actually found.

Definition of Pesticide Residues

11. The Committee received a draft definition of "Pesticide Residues" from the FAO Secretariat. The Committee was unable to arrive at a satisfactory definition and requested the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues to propose a definition for pesticide residues for the next session of the Committee. It was agreed that in the meanwhile the progress of work of this Committee would not be hindered by a lack of definition.

Residues in animal feeding stuffs and from other sources

12. The Committee recommended that it should deal with all pesticide residues, irrespective of their origin and requested the Commission to endorse this view.

Methods employed for estimating tolerances.

13. The Committee discussed a paper by the Netherlands Delegation on the Food Factor (CCPR/67/10), the estimation of the intake of pesticide residues in the Report of the Joint Meeting, (p. 11 WHO Technical Report 1967/370) and a paper by the FAO Secretariat on estimating tolerances for pesticide residues (CCPR/67/9) (See Appendix III).
14. The paper CCPR/67/10 concluded that the ninth decile

method was not the best for the estimation of the food intake. This method had been used in the calculation of tolerances by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues at its session in 1966. The document CCPR/67/10 contended amongst other arguments that the ninth decile method represented an additional safety factor, that it did not take into account the counterbalancing of the different food items and that realistic ninth decile values applicable to world-wide conditions were not available and probably would not be available within a reasonable time.

The Canadian Delegation pointed out that the additional safety factor represented by the use of the ninth decile method represented less than one order of magnitude, whereas other safety factors such as the assumption that all food of a particular type will contain the residue and the assumption that the residue will be present in all the food to the limit of the tolerance, represent additional safety factors involving several orders of magnitude (see paragraph 9).

15. The Committee decided to refer these matters to the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues, with the request to study and to compare the application

of the different methods in estimating food intakes,  
thus enabling Codex Committees to use the most  
realistic approach.

16. In the discussion on document CCPR/67/9 the Committee endorsed the approach suggested by the FAO Secretariat on the estimating of the intake of pesticide residues and remitted it to the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues after making the following amendments:

a. The last sentence of the fourth paragraph should read: "ADI when calculated from appropriate consumption data",

b. The second line of page 2 should be deleted,  
(CCPR/67/9 so amended is at Appendix III)

The Committee also discussed the question of establishing tolerances on the basis of good agricultural practice.

The Committee agreed that such tolerances are acceptable where the per caput daily intake of the pesticide residues calculated from the proposed tolerances and the appropriate food consumption data do not exceed the ADI.

On the other hand, in cases where the calculated daily intake apparently exceeds the ADI, the proposed tolerance may be acceptable when there are relevant data e.g. disappearance rate or total diet studies, etc. to indicate that the estimated actual intake does not

exceed the ADI.

In the meantime such tolerances might be acceptable only on a temporary basis (see Appendix III).

17. In view of the large discrepancy between intakes calculated from tolerances and those demonstrated by market basket surveys already undertaken, the Committee strongly recommended that Governments should arrange monitoring surveys (such as restaurant meals, total diet studies and market basket surveys) which would enable the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues to make an assessment of the actual intake of pesticide residues. All such data and any other data available on the residue of pesticides, metabolites and degradation products in raw and processed food should be sent directly to the Chief Crop Protection Branch, Plant Production and Protection Division, FAO Rome.

---

Proposals at Step 2 of tolerances, temporary tolerances and practical residue limits (see Appendix IV)

18. Methods of analysis.

In every case where a practical residue limit or a temporary tolerance or a tolerance is submitted to Governments the views of Governments are also required on the appropriate method of analysis included in the monographs submitted by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues.

- a. Aldrin and Dieldrin



The Committee discussed the document CCPR/67/12 entitled "Aldrin and Dieldrin", prepared by the Netherlands Delegation with the assistance of the United Kingdom Delegation, and the recommendations of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues for aldrin and dieldrin. The Committee agreed :

1. In the light of new toxicological data which have recently become available, to request the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues to reconsider the recommended acceptable daily intake figure of 0.0001 mg/kg body-weight for aldrin and dieldrin, and to consider recommendations for tolerances;
2. To invite Government comments at Step 3 on the practical residue limits shown in Appendix IV and on the analytical methods presented in the Report<sup>1)</sup> of the Joint Meeting with the addition of 0.1 ppm in egg yolk. The attention of Governments was drawn to the views of the Delegations summarised in Appendix V.  
This report will be sent to FAO and WHO, so that it can be fully discussed by the Joint Experts Meeting on Pesticide Residues.

1) Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food  
(FAO/PL : CP/15, WHO/Food Add./67,32).

b. Biphenyl

The Committee discussed the recommendation of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues and endorsed a tolerance of 110 ppm biphenyl on citrus fruit.

c. Carbaryl

The Committee took note of the fact that new toxicological information had become available on this compound and that the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues intended to review these new data at their next session. IUPAC was reviewing studies about the chemical nature of the terminal residues of carbaryl.

The Committee therefore decided to refer the ADI and the tolerances to the Joint Meeting, but requested that meat and poultry meat be included among the foods to be considered and to consider also the nature of the metabolites of carbaryl.

d. DDT

The Committee examined the recommendation of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues but noted that these were made on DDT and did not take into account the metabolites, such as DDD and DDE, which are of particular importance in certain foods. It was decided to request the Joint Meeting to reexamine the ADI but decided to submit the tolerances and practical residue limits recommended by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues

to Governments for comments. For information of Governments recommendations of Delegations regarding tolerances and practical residue levels are given in Appendix VI.

The Committee was of the opinion that it would be necessary that the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues should recommend single figures for each group of vegetables instead of proposing a range.

e. Methyl bromide and ethylene dibromide

The Committee examined the recommendations of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues regarding temporary tolerances for a number of commodities as shown in Appendix IV and noted that the tolerance of 50 ppm inorganic bromide measured as total bromide in raw cereals was already endorsed at Step 4. The Committee also endorsed the recommendations of the Joint Meeting and decided to request Governments to comment on these at Step 3. The proposed tolerances appear in Appendix IV.

f. Lindane (gamma-BHC)

The attention of the Committee was drawn to the occurrence of residues of the alpha and the beta isomers of BHC. The desirability of collecting data on this subject was expressed. The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues on the temporary

tolerances and practical residue limits shown in Appendix IV and requested Governments to comment on these in the light of the information given in Appendix VII.

g. Heptachlor and heptachlor epoxide

The Committee endorsed the temporary tolerances and practical residue limits recommended by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues and requested Governments to comment on the proposals in Appendix VI in the light of the information given in Appendix VIII.

h. Hydrogen phosphide

In discussing the proposals of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues the Committee noted that no ADI was proposed for this compound. It was drawn to the attention of the Committee that cereals treated with aluminium phosphide, if properly cleaned and washed before being processed for food, did not contain residues from the fumigant materials. The recommended tolerance of 0.1 ppm hydrogen phosphide for raw cereals in international trade was based on the fact that no residue would appear in food ready for consumption.

The Committee took note that the tolerance of 0.1 ppm was erroneously referred to as "temporary" on p.11 of the 1967 report of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues.

The Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Joint Meeting and requested Government comments on these at Step 3.

i. Malathion

It was noted that the tolerance of 8 ppm in raw cereals in international trade had already been endorsed at Step 4.

The Committee endorsed the other tolerances shown in Appendix IV, but decided to delete "and cereal products". The Committee asked Governments to comment on these proposals at Step 3 in the light of the information given in Appendix IX.

j. Organomercury compounds.

A comprehensive paper prepared by the United Kingdom delegation with the assistance of Sweden was presented, from which it appeared that high levels of mercury were found in Japanese rice.

The Japanese delegation pointed out that in the near future the use of organomercury compounds in the production of rice would be prohibited. The Committee decided to refer this paper to the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues for reconsideration of organomercury compounds.

k. Piperonyl butoxide

It was noted that the ADI established by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues was temporary and that a reappraisal would be made in five years if new toxicological data become

available. The Committee endorsed the proposals of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues as shown in Appendix IV and invited Governments to comment at Step 3 on the proposed temporary tolerances.

1. Pyrethrins

The Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues as shown in Appendix IV but noted that the ADI established was temporary and that it would be reviewed in three years if new toxicological data become available.

The Governments were requested to comment on these proposals at Step 3.

Additions to and deletions from Priority List II

19. The Committee reexamined the Priority List II of compounds which will be examined by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues in December 1967 and decided to delete endrin from this list in view of the fact that extensive work was in progress on this compound.

A working paper on dichlorvos prepared by the United Kingdom delegation (CCPR/67/14)<sup>1)</sup> was presented, which gives an extensive review of toxicological and residue information.

In contrast to the recommendations in this working paper the Swiss delegation suggests that international

1) and CCPR/67/14 add.1.

tolerances be established for dichlorvos.

The Committee referred this paper to the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues for consideration.

20. It was pointed out to the Committee that the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues would deal with the Priority List II pesticides and all matters referred to it by the CCPR.

Establishment of Priority Lists III, IV and V

21. As agreed at its first meeting (Alinorm 66/24, para.11) the Committee based its consideration of priorities on whether pesticides were widely used on foodstuffs in international trade which leave residues which might be hazardous, taking into account the amount of the foodstuffs which are consumed.
- a. In establishing Priority List III the Committee was guided by practical aspects such as the grouping of the pesticides according to whether they were insecticides, herbicides, fungicides etc., since this would facilitate the work of the Joint Meeting. After considering several proposals the Committee decided to include only insecticides in List III for consideration by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues in 1968. This list is described in Appendix X.
- b. With regard to Priority List IV a proposal was adopted that only fungicides should be included in view of

the already heavy work load of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues at their 1969 Session.

However, it was understood that this list of priorities could be supplemented by other compounds, not necessarily fungicides, on the condition that a short paper, describing the technological need and the importance in international trade, is submitted to the third session of the CCPR.

22. During the discussion of the priority lists the following requests and comments were made:
- a. WHO requested that Governments would submit a list of manufacturers which are connected with the production of the compounds mentioned in the priority lists.
  - b. The head of the FAO Working Party invited Governments to submit statistics on the percentage of crops which were actually treated with a certain pesticide and data on the disappearance of residues during processing.
  - c. The Australian delegation drew attention to the fact that residues resulting from good agricultural practice vary from country to country and that <sup>the</sup> exporting countries should recognize the good agricultural practices of exporting countries and provide tolerances accordingly.
23. While the Committee was discussing the pesticides to be considered by future joint meetings of the FAO



Working Party and WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues, the WHO representative explored the desirability and feasibility of having the pesticides on Priority IV, along with those on Priority III, considered by the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues in 1968, instead of 1969 as proposed by this Committee. This Committee reviewed the implications of this proposed procedure upon the planned program for the development of recommendations of acceptable daily intakes, tolerances and methods of analysis. It was noted that the toxicological data on some of the pesticides are not expected to become available until 1969.

For this and other reasons it is strongly recommended that the Codex Alimentarius Commission inform the Director-General of WHO of the need to hold annual meetings in order to facilitate the development of acceptable daily intakes, tolerances and methods of analysis for pesticide residues in the interests of protecting the health of consumers and of removing barriers to international trade in food.

The FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues will hold a meeting in 1969.

Allocation of Future Work

24. The Committee agreed that it would be desirable for individual Governments to undertake work assignments and to prepare working papers for future sessions of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues. Such working papers should follow the lay-out of the monographs of the Joint Meetings (Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food, FAO, PL:CP/15, WHO/Food Add./67.32) and two copies each should be sent to the chief, Crop Protection Branch, Plant Production and Protection Division, FAO, Rome and the chief, Food Additives, WHO, Geneva in time, so that experts participating at the Joint Meetings have time to study them. Two copies should also be sent to the Chairman of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues. The type of information required has been outlined in the various monographs and reports of FAO and WHO.

List III (to be sent before 1 August 1968)

ethylene oxide	Federal Republic of Germany, assisted by the United Kingdom
azinphos methyl	Federal Republic of Germany
phosphamidon	Switzerland
endrin	United States of America
lead arsenate and calcium arsenate	Canada, assisted by the United Kingdom

fenchlorphos	United States of America
dioxathion	United States of America
ruelene <sup>R</sup>	United States of America
chlorobenzilate	Switzerland
chloropropylate	Switzerland
coumaphos	Federal Republic of Germany
oxythioquinox	Federal Republic of Germany
ethion a)	
dicofol a)	

List IV (to be sent before 1 August 1969)

binapacryl	Federal Republic of Germany
dichlofluanid	Federal Republic of Germany
organotin compounds	Netherlands
captan	United States of America
folpet	United States of America
difolatan	United States of America
ortho-phenylphenol (and sodium salt)	United States of America
dinocap a)	
quintozene a)	

---

a) no country has assumed responsibility for the preparation of working paper.

Recommendations made to the Commission at the first  
Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues.

25. Recommendations concerning the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (see page 11 of Alinorm/66/24, paragraphs 1 and 4) were made to the Fourth Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. The Commission decided that it would not make changes in the terms of reference or working procedures proposed and referred the matter back to the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues for reconsideration.

After full discussion the Committee made the following

new recommendation: "That the procedure for the establishment of tolerances, set out in paragraph 36 of the Report of the Third Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Alinorm 65/30 p. 23), should be slightly modified so that Member Governments should supply toxicological data to the Codex Committee as well as to WHO!"

26. The original proposal that "provisional international tolerances" be established which were not based on acceptable daily intake figures was again considered. The Delegation of the United Kingdom pointed out that there was still a need to establish "provisional international tolerances" for pesticides for which no ADI's had as yet been established by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues.

The Delegation questioned the validity of the mathematical calculations which were done to arrive at intakes from tolerances and the value of comparing ADI's with such calculated intakes.

The Delegation of the United Kingdom suggested that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues should be able to establish such provisional international tolerances based on good agricultural practice provided that the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues had been able to make a toxicological evaluation of the pesticides concerned and subsequently market basket surveys were carried out. The Committee decided not to make such a recommendation in the light of the new procedure adopted by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues in recommending temporary ADI's and temporary tolerances.

Other business

27. The technical secretariat of FAO undertook to prepare a list of legal tolerances for pesticides in various countries for the next session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues.
28. Upon the request of some Delegations the technical secretariat of FAO undertook to prepare a glossary giving an explanation of the meaning of the terms used in the reports of the Joint Meetings on Pesticide Residues and of the Codex

Committee on Pesticide Residues.

29. The secretariat of the Commission promised to collect data on the residues occurring in food as a result of market basket surveys, total diet studies etc. and to prepare a paper for the next session of this Committee.
30. The Australian Delegation pointed out that it is necessary to receive the relevant recommendations and conclusions of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues as soon as possible after their session. The FAO Secretariat undertook to provide such information.

Date of the next Session

31. A paper prepared by the FAO Secretariat (CCPR/67/11(1)) setting out the proposed dates for the sessions of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues and this Committee was presented. It was pointed out in this paper that in order to facilitate the work on pesticide residues it was essential that the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues meet approximately two months after the session of this Committee. This would allow WHO and FAO to make available the report and monographs of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues in time for distribution two months before the sessions of this Committee. The FAO Secretariat stated that the monographs of the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues would be made

available by 1 July 1968.

It would also be possible for this Committee to refer urgent matters to the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues for consideration.

It was recommended that the next session of this Committee be held early October 1968 in The Netherlands.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Representatives

ARGENTINA

OBSERVER

Mr. Vicente Brunini,  
Consejero Agrícola,  
Embajada Argentina,  
Piazza dell'Esquilino 2,  
ROME, ITALY

AUSTRALIA

DELEGATES

Mr. J.D. Macfarlane,  
First Assistant Secretary,  
Department of Primary Industry,  
CANBERRA

Mr. J.T. Snelson,  
Pesticides Co-Ordinator,  
Department of Primary Industry,  
CANBERRA

Mr. J.P. Warry,  
Department of Health,  
CANBERRA

AUSTRIA

DELEGATE

Prof.Dipl.Ing. Dr. F. Beran,  
Director of the Bundesanstalt für  
Pflanzenschutz,  
Trunnerstrasse 5,  
A-1020 VIENNA



BELGIUM

DELEGATE

Prof. Em. Tilemans,  
Ministère de l'Agriculture,  
Directeur de la Station de Phytopharmacie  
de l'Etat,  
GEMELOUX.

Dr. G. Thomas,  
Conseiller au Ministère de la Santé  
publique,  
Institut d'Hygiène,  
14, rue Juliette Wytman,  
BRUXELLES.

BRASIL

OBSERVER

Diogenes da Silva Cardoso,  
Ministry of Agriculture (Plant Protection  
Service),  
RIO DE JANEIRO

CANADA

DELEGATES

Dr. H. Hurtig,  
Research Coordinator (Pesticides),  
Department of Agriculture,  
OTTAWA

Dr. D.G. Chapman,  
Assistant Director-General,  
Food and Drug Directorate,  
Department of National Health and  
Welfare,  
Tunney's Pasture,  
OTTAWA

Mr. E.R. Houghton,  
Supervisor Pesticide Unit,  
Plant Products Division,  
Department of Agriculture  
OTTAWA

DENMARK

DELEGATES

Mr. F. Bro-Rasmussen,  
The National Pesticide Laboratory,  
Amager Faelledvej 56,  
COPENHAGEN S.

Mr. Søren C. Hansen,  
The National Health Service of Denmark,  
St. Kongensgade 1,  
COPENHAGEN K.

FRANCE

DELEGATE

Mr. G. Viel,  
Directeur de Recherches,  
Institut National de la Recherche  
Agronomique,  
Laboratoire de Phytopharmacie,  
CNRA Route, St. Cyr 78,  
VERSAILLES

GERMANY, FEDERAL  
REPUBLIC OF

DELEGATES

Mr. H.P. Mollenhauer,  
Oberregierungsrat, Bundesministerium für  
Gesundheitswesen,  
Postfach 490,  
532 BAD GODESBERG

Dr. H. Drees,  
Ministerialrat, Bundesministerium für  
Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten,  
53 BONN

Prof. Dr. F. Bär,  
Bundesministerium für Gesundheitswesen,  
532 BAD GODESBERG

ADVISERS

Dr. H. Tietz,  
Bund für Lebensmittelrecht und Lebens-  
mittelkunde, e.V.,  
BONN

Dr. H. Rauscher,  
Industrieverband für Pflanzenschutz und  
Schädlingsbekämpfungsmittel e.V.,  
FRANKFURT / MAIN

Dr. A. Müller,  
Industrieverband für Pflanzenschutz und  
Schädlingsbekämpfungsmittel e.V.,  
FRANKFURT / MAIN

GHANA

DELEGATE

Dr. L.K.A. Derban,  
Ghana Medical School,  
P.O. Box M. 4236,  
ACCRA

IRELAND

DELEGATE

Professor D. Mc.Aleese,  
Agricultural Chemistry Department,  
University College,  
GLASNEVIN DUBLIN 9.

ISRAEL

DELEGATES

Dr. Ch. Resnick,  
Director Pesticides Division,  
Ministry of Agriculture,  
JAFFA

Mr. A. Eisenberg,  
Food Toxicologist,  
Ministry of Health,  
JERUSALEM

Mr. Z. Rapoport,  
Agricultural Councillor,  
Israel Embassy,  
BRUXELLES, Belgium.

Dr. J. Cohen,  
Economic Counsellor,  
Israel Embassy,  
THE HAGUE, The Netherlands

ITALY

DELEGATE

Prof. Dr. Nicolò Gandolfo,  
Istituto Superiore di Sanità  
Coro Trieste 140,  
ROMA

JAPAN

DELEGATES

Dr. Kohei Kojima,  
Technical Official,  
Environmental Sanitation Bureau,  
Ministry of Health and Welfare,  
TOKYO

NETHERLANDS

Drs. A. Kruyse,  
(Chairman of the Session)  
Inspector General of Public Health in charge  
of Foodstuffs Division,  
Dokter Reijersstraat 10,  
LEIDSCHENDAM

DELEGATES

Dr. N. van Tiel,  
Director of the Plant Protection Service  
Geertjesweg 15,  
WAGENINGEN

Drs. G.J. van Esch,  
Head of the Laboratory of Toxicology,  
National Institute of Public Health,  
Sterrenbos 1,  
UTRECHT

Dr. A.F.H. Besemer,  
Senior Scientific Officer  
Pesticides Department, Plant Protection  
Service,  
Geertjesweg 15,  
WAGENINGEN

Dr. F.E. Loosjes,  
Senior Scientific Officer  
Pesticides Department, Plant Protection  
Service,  
Geertjesweg 15,  
WAGENINGEN

Drs. S.L. Wit,  
Laboratory of Toxicology,  
National Institute of Public Health  
Sterrenbos 1,  
UTRECHT

ADVISERS

Drs. J.E. Hellingman,  
N.V. Verdugt,  
Papesteeg 10,  
TIEL.

Ir. J.B. De Letter,  
Unilever Research Laboratory Duiven,  
PB 7,  
ZEVENAAR

Drs. O.R. Offringa,  
Philips Duphar N.V.,  
WEESP.

Dr. H.G.S. van Raalte,  
Shell Internationale Research Mij.,  
C. van Bylandtlaan 30,  
's-GRAVENHAGE

NEW ZEALAND

DELEGATE

Dr. A.T. Johns,  
Assistant Director-General of the  
Department of Agriculture  
P.O. Box 2298,  
WELLINGTON C 1.

NORWAY

DELEGATE

Prof. O. Dybing,  
The Veterinary College of Norway,  
Department of Pharmacology and Toxicologie,  
Ulleválsveien 72,  
OSLO 4.

POLAND

DELEGATES

Dr. T. Kaźmierczak,  
Ministry of Foreign Trade  
Quality Inspection Office  
Stepinska 9,  
WARSAW 36.

Mrs. E. Cwiertniewska,  
Ministry of Health and Public Welfare,  
Institute of Food Hygiene,  
24 Chocimskastr.  
WARSAW

SWITZERLAND

DELEGATE

Dr. H. Forster,  
Municipal Chemist,  
Ausstellungsstrasse 90,  
ZURICH

ADVISERS

Mr. E. Hutter,  
Swiss Society of Chemical Industries  
Gottfried Kellerstrasse 7,  
ZURICH

Dr. K. Imhof,  
Ursina Ltd.,  
Brunnadernstrasse 42,  
BERN.

Mr. M. Spindler,  
J.R. Geigy A.G.  
BASEL.

THAILAND

DELEGATE

Mr. Chuvid Ratanachai,  
Chief of Food and Drug Control Division  
Ministry of Public Health  
BANGKOK

TURKEY

DELEGATES

Mr. Talip Oden,  
Chief of the Laboratory, Plant Protection  
Chemicals and Equipment Institute,  
ANKARA.

Mrs. Cana Otaci,  
Chief of the Residue Laboratory, Plant  
Protection Institute,  
ISTANBUL

UNITED KINGDOM

DELEGATES

Dr. R. de B. Ashworth,  
Senior Principal Scientific Officer  
Plant Pathology Laboratory  
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food  
Harpenden,  
HERTFORDSHIRE.

Mr. P.N.M. Moore,  
Principal Ministry of Agriculture,  
Fisheries and Food,  
Great Westminster House,  
Horseferry Road,  
LONDON S.W. 1.



Mr. T.P. O'Mara,  
Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of  
Health,  
Russell Square,  
LONDON W.C. 1.

Dr. E.E. Turtle,  
Senior Principal Scientific Officer,  
Infestation Control Laboratory,  
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and  
Food,  
Hook Rise South, Tolworth, Surbiton,  
SURREY

ADVISERS

Dr. D.E. Stevenson,  
"Shell" Research Ltd., Tunstall Laboratory  
Broad Oak Road,  
SITTINGBOURNE, KENT.

Mr. J. Wilen,  
c/o H.J. Heinz and Company Ltd.,  
Hayes,  
MIDDLESEX.

UNITED STATES OF  
AMERICA

DELEGATES

Dr. O.G. Fitzhugh,  
Division of Toxicological Evaluation  
Food and Drug Administration,  
Department of Health,  
Education and Welfare,  
WASHINGTON D.C. 20204.

Dr. K.C. Walker,  
Assistant to the Deputy Administrator  
Farm Research, Agricultural Research  
Service,  
U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250

OBSERVER

Mr. G.E. Hilbert,  
U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250

ADVISERS

Dr. J.P. Frawley,  
Hercules, Inc.  
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE

Dr. R.F. Glasser,  
Shell Chemical Company,  
110 West 51st Street,  
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10020

Mr. G.E. Lynn,  
The Dow Chemical Company,  
MIDLAND, MICHIGAN

FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANISATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Dr. L.G. Lodomery,  
Food Standards Officer,  
FAO, ROME, ITALY

Dr. F.W. Whittimore,  
Crop Protection Branch,  
FAO, ROME, ITALY

WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION

Dr. F.C. Lu,  
Chief, Food Additives,  
WHO GENEVA, Switzerland

Prof. R. Truhaut,  
Temporary Advisor WHO,  
GENEVA, Switzerland

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Dr. S. Dormal - van den Bruel,  
Direction Générale de l'Agriculture  
Berlaymont  
129, rue Stevin,  
BRUXELLES 4, Belgium

EUROPEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION

Prof. Dipl. Ing. Dr. F. Beran,  
Trunnerstrasse 5,  
A-1020 VIENNA

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF PESTICIDE  
MANUFACTURERS (GIFAP)

Mr. J. de Bruin,  
c/o Philips Duphar N.V.,  
Apollolaan 151,  
AMSTERDAM-Z.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION

Technical Committee 34 (ISO/TC 34) and Sub-Committees (ISO/TC 34/SC5)

Ir. J.E. Rees,  
Government Dairy Station  
Vreewijkstraat 12b,  
LEIDEN

Ir. L.G.M.T. Tuinstra,  
Government Dairy Station  
Vreewijkstraat 12b,  
LEIDEN

TECHNICAL SECRETARIAT

Drs. L.J. Schuddeboom,  
Direction of Public Health Foodstuffs  
Division  
Dokter Reijersstraat 10,  
LEIDSCHENDAM

Ir. L.P. Flipse,  
Head Bureau of Pesticides  
Committee for Phytopharmacy,  
Geertjesweg 15,  
WAGENINGEN

Mrs.Drs. E.A.H. van Heemstra-Lequin,  
Laboratory of Toxicology  
National Institute of Public Health  
Sterrenbos 1,  
UTRECHT

Drs. F.W. v.d. Kreek,  
Direction of Public Health  
Foodstuffs Division  
Dokter Reijersstraat 10,  
LEIDSCHENDAM

Drs. H.G. Verschuuren,  
Laboratory of Toxicology  
National Institute of Public Health,  
Sterrenbos 1,  
UTRECHT

ORGANIZATIONAL SECRETARIAT

Mr. I.A. Alkema,  
Direction of Public Health,  
Foodstuffs Division  
Dokter Reijersstraat 10,  
LEIDSCHENDAM

Mr. J. Drijver,  
International Agricultural Centre  
Generaal Foulkesweg 1,  
WAGENINGEN.

Explanation of the meaning of a temporary ADI given  
in the Joint Report of the FAO Working Party on Pesticide  
Residues and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide  
Residues (WHO Technical Report Series 1967, 370, page 9)

The present (Joint Expert) meeting agreed to adhere to the principles set out in earlier reports concerning the establishment of acceptable daily intakes. However, it also agreed to using a greater margin of safety in cases where several long-term studies have been reported and where the lowest dosage showed an effect of questionable significance. This was done for a few pesticides. The possibility of adopting what have been referred to as temporary acceptable daily intakes (temporary ADI's)<sup>2</sup> has also been considered in order to arrive at temporary tolerance figures. As a result, some temporary ADI's have now been estimated for some pesticides with the condition that additional necessary toxicological information be available within a specified period of time.

---

<sup>2</sup>For information on the significance and limitations of the establishment of such figures the reader is referred to the Report of the Scientific Group on Procedures for Investigating Intentional and Unintentional Food Additives (WHO Techn.Rep.Ser., 1967, 348).

These temporary ADI's have involved the application of a large safety factor. (Sometimes it is still impossible to estimate any ADI at all). The figure will be reviewed within a specified period of time as set out in the relevant monographs. If no action has been taken to provide the further evidence required, it will be assumed that neither the manufacturers nor the user countries are interested in continuing the use of the pesticide.

Methods employed in estimating tolerances, CCPR/67/9,  
as amended by the meeting.

The methods used by the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues in estimating tolerances at the last Joint Meeting are fully discussed in Section 2.3 pages 10 through 13 of SP.10/115.

However, due to the recent development of multi-detection methods for pesticide residue analysis, rapid procedures are now becoming available which permit the determination of the amount of pesticide residue in food at any stage of production, distribution and processing. In some countries these procedures are now being employed to monitor the food supply and obtain a realistic measurement of potential pesticide ingestion by the consumer. These monitoring programmes include "restaurant meal studies", "total diet studies" and "market basket surveys". In countries in which such surveys have been carried out, the ADI's for individual pesticides are not being exceeded, even though a purely arithmetical calculation from tolerances on raw agricultural products (trade tolerances) might suggest otherwise. Monitoring programmes are useful for determining the actual residue ingested by the consumer and whether a tolerance required by good agricultural practice is approaching or exceeding



the ADI.

It is appreciated that there will be regional, seasonal and annual variations in this results of such monitoring of residues ingested by the consumer and that both food produced within the country and imported food will be subject to such variations. However, the mean values obtained in such annual surveys will be most useful.

In the monographs resulting from the 1966 Joint FAO/WHO meeting on Pesticide Residues, many safety factors have been incorporated (e.g. the assumption that all food of a particular type will contain residue and, in some instances, no disappearance of residues instorage, handling or processing before consumption by man).

Accordingly, the FAO Working Party on Residues is considering that in its future work, the proposed tolerances will be based primarily on the requirements of good agricultural practice, except where these tolerances on raw agricultural products might exceed the ADI when calculated from appropriate consumption data.

In these latter cases, they shall be designated as a "temporary tolerance" for a period not to exceed

five years. The necessity for a five-year "temporary tolerance" would result from one or more of the following situations:

- a) Incomplete information on the chemical nature of the terminal residue on the raw agricultural product or the processed food as ingested by man.
- b) Inadequate information on losses of residue during storage, handling or consumption in man (including metabolic balance sheets in plants and animals).
- c) Incomplete information on actual intake of residues by consumers.

During this period, the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues would recommend that each member country using significant quantities of the pesticides under review or importing food containing these residues, should conduct a monitoring programme to analyse residues actually occurring in the diet of the population to determine actual consumer intake. These data should be submitted directly to the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues for review as to the effectiveness of the proposed tolerances in maintaining pesticide residue intake below the ADI.

Since the ADI is established on the assumption of a daily life-time ingestion, the five-year period for temporary tolerances will only be concerned with less than 10% of the life span of man.

It is considered that the FAO Working Party must take such additional steps in proposing residue tolerances in order to ensure that food products and conservation can be expanded with adequate realisation of the necessity for safeguarding the interests of the consumer.

Furthermore, the FAO Working Party respectfully wishes to draw to the attention of the member countries of this Codex Committee the needs for additional research as outlined in the individual monographs, information on member country patterns of pesticide use, residues resulting from experimental programmes, residues found in commerce and losses of residues during storage and food processing. These data will be most important in the future for the purpose of proposing international tolerances for pesticide residues which will be practical and safe for both the user and consumer. These data should be available to the FAO Working Party on Pesticide Residues early in the year in which this Codex Committee proposes a pesticide for evaluation of its residues by the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues.

PROPOSED TOLERANCE, TEMPORARY TOLERANCES AND PRACTICALRESIDUE LIMITS AT STEP 2 +)

<u>TOLERANCES</u>	<u>ppm</u>	<u>Food</u>
diphenyl	110	Citrus
hydrogen phosphide	0.1	Raw cereals
malathion	8.0	Fruit and dried fruit (excluding citrus) Nuts
	4.0	Citrus fruit
	6.0	Leafy vegetables
	3.0	Other vegetables
<u>TEMPORARY TOLERANCES</u>		
ethylene dibromide and methyl bromide ++)	400	Dried eggs,spices,herbs
	250	Dried figs
	75	Avocadoes
	100	Dried raisins, dates
	50	Dried peaches
	20	Dried prunes
	30	Other dried fruits
	30	Citrus fruit, strawberries
	20	Other fresh fruit

+) Governments are requested to comment on these proposals at Step 3 of the Procedure for the Elaboration of Codex Standards.

++) Expressed as total inorganic bromide.

lindane

ppm

Food

0.5

Raw cereals

3.0

Vegetables, small fruits

0.1

Milk products (on fat basis)

0.1

Root vegetables (other than potatoes)

Cole crops

Head lettuce

Spinach

Other leafy vegetables

heptachlor and  
heptachlor epoxide

(from application to seed  
and soil only)

piperonyl butoxide

20

Raw cereals

8.0

Fruit (for canning)

Dried fruit

Dried vegetables

Oil seeds

Tree nuts

pyrethrins

3.0

Raw cereals

1.0

Fruit (for canning)

Dried fruit

Dried vegetables

Oil seeds

Tree nuts

PRACTICAL RESIDUE LIMITS

aldrin and dieldrin

0.003

Whole milk

0.2

Meat (on fat basis)

	<u>ppm</u>	<u>Food</u>
	0.05	Vegetables
lindane	0.004	Whole milk
	0.7	Meat and poultry (on fat basis)
heptachlor and heptachlor epoxide	0.05	Meat (on fat basis)
	0.05	Potatoes
	0.002	Whole milk
	0.025	Milk products (on fat basis)

ALDRIN AND DIELDRIN

CCPR 67/Report  
Appendix V.

Comments on, additions to and variations of the Joint Meeting's  
Proposals for practical residue limits (temporary) in ppm.

	<u>Joint Meeting Proposal</u>	<u>AUSTRALIA</u>	<u>AUSTRIA</u>	<u>BELGIUM</u>	<u>CANADA</u>	<u>FRANCE</u>	<u>NETHERLANDS</u>	<u>U.S.A.</u>
Milk 1)	0.003	0.008	0.004		0.004		0.003	0.012
Meat 1) (on fat basis)	0.2	0.25	0.2		0.25		0.2	0.25
Vegetables	0.05	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	> 0.05	0.05	0.1
Milk products 2) (on fat basis)	--	0.2	0.1		0.1			0.3
Egg yolk 2)	--	0.1	0.1		0.1			0.1

1) open spaces : no comment on the proposal

2) newly proposed during the Second Session of Codex Committee on  
Pesticide Residues.

open spaces : to be studied.

DDT

Comments on, additions to and variations of the Joint Meeting's proposals for recommended temporary tolerances and practical residue limits (temporary) in ppm.

	Joint Meeting Proposal 1)	AUSTRALIA	AUSTRIA	BELGIUM	CANADA	GERMANY	NETHER- LANDS	NEW ZEALAND	U.K.	U.S.A.
		2)	2)	2)	2)	2)	2)	2)	2)	2)
Recommended tolerances 3)	berries	1.0	1 - 3		0					
	citrus	4.0	for		0					
	other tree fruit	7.0	the	1.0		0 <sup>4)</sup>	1.0			
	vegetables	1.0-7.0	whole	1.0		0 <sup>4)</sup>	1.0			
Newly proposed 5,6)	meat, fish, poultry (on fat basis)	7.0	range			0				
	apple, pears, grapes and cabbage	--				1.0				
	wide range of foods	--			7.0					7.0
	apples	--							5.0	
Practical Residue limits <sup>3)</sup>	black currants	--							3.0	
	milk	0.005	»0.005		0.04			»0.005	0.02	0.05
Newly proposed	milk products (on fat basis)	0.2	»0.2		1.0			»0.2	1.0	1.25
	meat etc. (on fat basis) <sup>5)</sup>	--						«7.0		
	eggs		0.5							

1) metabolites not included

2) metabolites included

3) open spaces: no comment on the proposal

4) Germany proposed for some fruits and vegetables 1.0

5) proposal during the Second Session of CCPR

6) open spaces: no proposal made





ALINORM 68/24  
(CCPR 67/Report)  
(SP 10/115)  
November 1967

CORRIGENDA  
(applies to the English version only)

Report of the Second Session of the  
Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

Appendix VII      LINDANE

- (a)      The second horizontal column under "Newly proposed 2,3"  
should read:

egg, whole	0.1	ppm
egg yolk	0.2	ppm
hog fat	4.0	ppm
cattle fat	7.0	ppm

- (b)      Delete fourth horizontal column "Newly proposed (practical  
residue limits) 2,3"

LINDANE

Comments on, additions to and variations of the Joint Meeting's proposals  
for Recommended temporary tolerances and practical residue limits (temporary) in ppm

		Joint Meeting Proposal	<u>AUSTRALIA</u>	<u>CANADA</u>	<u>NETHERLANDS</u>	<u>U.K.</u>
Recommen- ded tole- rances 1)	cereals	0.5				
	vegetables, small fruits	3.0			2.0	
	milk products (on fat basis)	0.1	1.25			0.2
Newly 2,3) proposed	egg, whole		1.1			
	egg yolk		1.2			
Practical Residue limits 1)	milk	0.004				0.005
	meat and poultry (on fat basis)	0.7	2.0			
Newly 2,3) proposed	hog fat			4.0		
	cattle fat			7.0		

- 1) open spaces: no comment on the proposal
- 2) during the Second Session of CCPR
- 3) open spaces: to be studied.

HEPTACHLOR AND HEPTACHLOR EPOXIDE

Comments on, additions to and variations of the Joint Meeting's proposals for practical residue limits (temporary) in ppm

	<u>Joint Meeting Proposal</u>	<u>CANADA</u>	<u>U.S.A.</u>
Meat (on fat basis)	0.05	0.25	0.1
Potatoes 1)	0.05		
Milk	0.002	0.004	0.012
Milk products (on fat basis)	0.025	0.1	0.3

1) open spaces : no comment on the proposal.

MALATHION

Comments on, additions to and variations of the Joint

Meeting's proposals for recommended temporary tolerances in ppm

<u>Joint Meeting Proposal</u>	<u>CANADA</u>	<u>NETHERLANDS</u>	<u>U.S.A.</u>
Fruit and dried fruit (excluding citrus), nuts, cereals 1) 8.0			
Citrus fruit 1) 4.0	8.0		8.0
Vegetables, leafy 6.0	8.0	3.0	8.0
Vegetables, other 1) 3.0	8.0		8.0
Meat (cattle, poultry hog, sheep) 2,3) --	4.0		4.0

1) open spaces : no comment on the proposal

2) newly proposed during the Second Session of CCPR

3) open spaces : to be studied.

PRIORITY LISTS

Priority I :  
(amended)

DDT and metabolites  
lindane  
aldrin and dieldrin  
heptachlor  
malathion  
carbaryl  
hydrogen phosphide (as derived from aluminium phosphide)  
ethylene dibromide (as such)  
methyl bromide (as such)  
piperonyl butoxide  
pyrethrins  
diphenyl  
organic mercury compounds

Priority II :  
(revised)

carbon disulfide  
carbon tetrachloride  
chlordan  
demeton-S-methyl  
diazinon  
dichlorvos  
dimethoate  
dithiocarbamates  
endosulfan  
ethylene dichloride

parathion

MGK 264

Priority III : Insecticides

azinthos methyl

phosphamidon

endrin

ethylene oxide

lead arsenate

calcium arsenate

ethion

dicofol

fenchlorphos

dioxathion

ruelene <sup>R</sup>

chlorobenzilate

chloropropylate

coumafos

oxythioquinox

Priority IV : fungicides

binapacryl

dinocap

quintozene

dichlofluanid

captan

folpet

difolatan

organotin compounds

ortho-phenylphenol (+ sodium salt)

Priority V : herbicides

atrazin

simazin

promethryn

barban

di-allate

paraquat

diquat

2,4-D

2,4,5-T

Pyrazon (=PCA)

Consideration of Priority lists by the Joint Meeting of Experts on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) and the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) 1/

	<u>JMPR</u>	<u>CCPR</u>
I	Dec. 1967 <sup>2/</sup>	
II	Dec. 1967	Oct. 1968
III	Dec. 1968	1969
IV	1969	1970
V	1970	1971

1/ Tentative time-table of meetings.

2/ Reconsideration of the amended List I which has already been evaluated by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues in November 1966.