

INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) held its fifty-second session virtually, on 26 - 30 July and 3 August 2021, at the kind invitation of the Government of China. Professor Xiongwu QIAO, Counsellor of the Government of Province Shanxi, chaired the session. The Chairperson was assisted by Dr Guibiao YE, Director of CCPR Secretariat, Institute for Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs the People's Republic of China. The session was attended by XX Member Countries, one Member Organization, and XX observer organizations. The list of participants is contained in Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Mr Taolin Zhang, Vice Minister of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China, opened the meeting, welcoming participants, stressing the important role of CCPR in strengthening exchange and cooperation in pesticide regulation among different countries. He expressed China's commitment towards the work of Codex and stressed the Chinese Government's commitment to continue supporting CCPR activities.
3. Mr Carlos Watson, FAO Representative to China and DPR Korea, Mr. Soren Madsen on behalf WHO and Tom Heilandt, Codex Secretary, also addressed the Committee.

Division of Competence

4. CCPR noted the division of competence between the European Union and its Member States, according to paragraph 5, Rule II of the Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)¹

5. CCPR adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the Session.
6. CCPR agreed to discuss the following under Agenda Item 16 "Other Business" subject to availability of time:
 - Mitigation of trade impacts associated with the use of environmental inhibitors in agriculture;
 - Modification of group 14 (assorted fruits – inedible peel) of *the Guideline on the Portion of commodities to which maximum residue limits apply and which is analysed* (CXG 41-1993); and
 - Specific operational procedures to resolve CCPR backlog in MRL adoption, triggered by Covid-19 pandemic

APPOINTMENT OF RAPORTEURS (Agenda Item 2)

7. CCPR appointed Julian Cudmore (UK) and David Lunn (NZ) to act as rapporteurs.

MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY CAC AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda Item 3)²

8. CCPR noted that the document was mainly for information. Specific consideration was given to the following:

CAC's decision relevant to CCPR's work
9. CCPR noted the information referred by CAC in relation to the decisions on MRLs for pesticides, in particular the virtual procedure on the submission of the priority list to CCEXEC/CAC for approval of new work to ensure workflow between CCPR and JMPR in view of the postponement of CCPR51 from 2020 to 2021;

CCEXEC - work management review: Regular review of Codex standards
10. CCPR noted that CCPR has procedures in place for the regular review of MRLs for pesticides (i.e. periodic review). CCPR continues to explore ways to keep Codex standards for pesticides relevant to public health and international trade;

CCEXEC - timeliness of working documents
11. CCPR noted that the Codex Secretariat continues to work closely with the Chair of CCPR, Chairs of Electronic Working Groups and the Host Country Secretariat on ways forward to improve work management of CCPR;

CCEXEC – coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF
12. CCPR:
 - (i) noted the recommendations of CCEXEC in relation to cooperation of work on issues of common interests between CCPR/CCRVDF;

¹ CX/PR 21/52/1

² CX/PR 21/52/2

- (ii) noted the decision of CCRVDF25 on the definition of edible offal and that this matter would be further considered under Agenda Item 7(e).
- (iii) supported CCRVDF's request for advice from CCEXEC on a mechanism for cooperation between CCPR and CCRVDF on the establishment of harmonized MRLs for compounds with dual uses, and encouraged innovative ways of working to facilitate and promote cooperation on cross-sectoral issues between CCRVDF and CCPR as needed and to the extent possible; and
- (iv) CCPR further noted that issues related to coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF would be further considered under Agenda Item 7(e) (e.g. definition for edible offal).

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda Item 4a)³

13. CCPR noted the information provided on FAO and WHO activities other than JMPR.
14. The Representative of FAO informed CCPR that FAO was also developing a new FAO Food Safety Strategy for 2022-2031 to support Members to improve food safety at all levels by providing scientific advice and strengthening food safety capacities for sustainable and resilient agri-food systems.
15. A delegation drew attention to the FAO study "Understanding international harmonization of pesticide maximum residue limits with Codex standards: A case study on rice" and noted that this study indicated the low use of Codex MRLs by certain countries which could lead to problems in trade. He therefore urged members to adopt Codex MRLs or to express their reservations in order to provide a signal that they do not intend to adopt Codex MRLs.
16. The Representative of WHO summarized the information contained in the working document and highlighted the updates to the chapters of the Environmental Health Criteria - Principles and methods for the risk assessment of chemicals in food (EHC 240)⁴ and drew the attention of delegations to the request to update or withdraw the Guidelines for predicting dietary intake of pesticide residues vis-à-vis the update of EHC 240.

Guidelines for Predicting Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues and Chapter 6 of the EHC 240 (Dietary exposure assessment for chemicals in food (revised, 2020)

17. A delegation noted that there were overlaps between the two publications which might be confusing. Since the revised Chapter 6 of the EHC240 contained all the elements of consumer health assessment for pesticides, the Guidelines should be withdrawn. Nevertheless, as this document would still be relevant to trace the historical development of dietary intake assessments at Codex level, the delegation proposed to keep the Guidelines accessible for consultation.

Conclusion

18. CCPR:
 - (i) welcomed the report provided by FAO and WHO and noted the comments made; and
 - (ii) agreed to recommend WHO to withdraw the "Guidelines for Predicting Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues" from the list of publications following the publication of the revised Chapter 6 of the EHC240 (Dietary exposure assessment for chemicals in food – 2020).

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (Agenda Item 4b)⁵

Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture

19. CCPR noted the information provided by the Representative of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre in particular the support provided to several developing countries on building and strengthening capacities for pesticide residue analysis, monitoring and control, as well as relevant research activities and networks.

Conclusion

20. CCPR thanked the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre for the important contribution to capacity building and networking and encouraged further cooperation in this regard.

³ CX/PR 21/52/3

⁴ The revised EHC240 can be downloaded from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241572408> or <https://www.who.int/joint-fao-who-meeting-on-pesticide-residues>

⁵ CX/PR 21/52/4

REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATION ARISING FROM THE 2019 JMPR EXTRAORDINARY AND REGULAR MEETINGS (Agenda Item 5a)⁶

21. CCPR note the information provided by the FAO and WHO JMPR Secretariats including comments made by delegations as follows:

1.0 Extraordinary (extra) meetings

22. The JMPR Secretariat presented feedback on the 2019 JMPR Extraordinary Meeting. Positive outcomes of this extraordinary meeting were the increased output of JMPR in 2019 and providing valuable opportunities for the new experts to gain practical experience. The meeting also noted that the extraordinary meetings were not suitable for complex evaluations and might reduce the capacity of the regular annual JMPR meeting to conduct complex evaluations.

1.1 Update to Chapter 5 of the Environmental Health Criteria (EHC) 240: Dose–response assessment and derivation of health-based guidance values

23. As mentioned under Agenda Item 4(a), the updating of EHC 240 Chapter 5 had been completed and available on the WHO website.

1.2 Combined exposure to multiple chemicals

24. The 2019 JMPR Meeting (regular) agreed to pilot the approach based on chronic dietary exposure for compounds being evaluated for the first time.
25. The only relevant compound on the 2019 agenda for which the estimated dietary exposure exceeded 10% of the upper bound of the ADI was pyflubumide. However, this compound did not belong to an established assessment group for combined exposure to multiple pesticides. The pilot would continue in future meetings for compounds where the described criteria are met.

1.3 Guidance for the evaluation of genotoxicity of chemical substances in food

26. As already mentioned, the updating of EHC 240 sub-chapter 4.5 had been completed and was available on the WHO website.

1.4 Results for probabilistic modelling of acute dietary exposure to evaluate the IESTI equations

27. CCPR noted that this subject would be discussed under Agenda Item 11 in the context of the reporting from the eWG.

1.5 Need for a guidance on toxicological interpretation due to the shift from maximum tolerated dose (MTD)-based to kinetically-derived maximum dose (KMD)-based evaluation of pesticide residues

28. This subject is slotted for further discussions at JMPR in 2021.

1.6 Comments on chlorpyrifos

29. In subsequent discussions in JMPR, it was noted that Chlorpyrifos and Methyl-chlorpyrifos should be evaluated together. This was due to workload optimization and chemical similarity including metabolites and degradants.

1.7 Possible need for amendments to the Environmental Health Criteria (EHC) 240 guidance on appropriate use of toxicological historical control data (HCD)

30. This subject will be discussed further at JMPR in 2021.

1.8 Use of monitoring data for the estimation of maximum residue levels

31. The 2019 JMPR received monitoring data on a number of spice commodities including dried chili peppers and fresh curry leaves. The Meeting stressed its preference for supervised trials as the basis for estimating maximum residue levels and confirmed the previous decisions made by CCPR to use monitoring data only for estimation of extraneous residue levels and in general for the estimation of MRLs for spices. For estimation of maximum residue levels for dried chili peppers, supervised residue trials on peppers conducted according to GAP should be the basis.
32. The EU supported the JMPR request for supervised trials and the JMPR principle in using monitoring data.

⁶ Section 2 of the JMPR Report (2019, regular meeting)

REPORT ON RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC CONCERNS RAISED BY CCPR ARISING FROM THE 2019 JMPR REGULAR MEETING (Agenda Item 5b⁷)

33. CCPR noted that specific concerns on compounds raised by CCPR would be addressed when discussing the relevant compounds under Agenda Item 6.
34. The request⁸ from CCPR concerning okra would be considered under Agenda Item 7.

PROPOSED MRLs FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED (at Steps 7 and 4) (Agenda Item 6)⁹**General Remarks**

35. The EU advised CCPR that they would be introducing reservations for a number of proposed draft and draft MRLs during the discussions on the individual compounds and that the reasons for these reservations were outlined in CRD22.
36. The EU explained to CCPR that it was current EU policy to align EU MRLs with Codex MRLs (CXLs) if three conditions were fulfilled: (i) that the EU sets MRLs for the commodity under consideration; (ii) that the current EU MRL is lower than the CXL; and (iii) that the CXL is acceptable to the EU with respect to aspects such as consumer protection, supporting data, and extrapolations.
37. In the interest of transparency, the Delegation advised CCPR that they would be making reservations during the discussions on the individual compounds where they considered the third criterion had not been met (CRD22).
38. Norway and Switzerland advised CCPR that they would be supporting all the EU reservations as their residue risk assessment approach was the same as that of the EU.
39. CCPR welcomed these clarifications, agreed that these reservations, where relevant, would be noted in the report and that general reservations related to policy differences would not be discussed further at this meeting.
40. The EU also explained that the MRLs and the currently taken positions for Thiabendazole (65), Tebuconazole (189) and Metconazole (313) might be revised in future, pending an evaluation of triazole derivative metabolites in the EU. An assessment strategy for triazole derivative metabolites has recently been adopted in the EU and is applicable since September 2019, toxicological reference values have been endorsed for these metabolites.

DIMETHOATE (27)/OMETHOATE (55)

41. CCPR was informed that the 2019 JMPR was unable to conclude on residue definitions for risk assessment for both plants and animal commodities.
42. The manufacturer informed the CCPR that additional toxicology data were available, and this would be submitted to the JMPR. CCPR agreed to maintain all the CXLs under the 4-year rule, awaiting the outcome of the JMPR evaluation of the new data.

THIABENDAZOLE (65)

43. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for mango; and sweet potato, pending the outcome of their ongoing evaluation of import tolerances.
44. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXL for mango as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

CARBENDAZIM (72)

45. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for spices, seeds (subgroup), pending the outcome of their ongoing evaluation of Benomyl (69), Carbendazim (72), Thiophanate-methyl (77).
46. CCPR noted the concern form submitted by the EU relating to on Benomyl, Carbendazim and Thiophanate-Methyl and that the re-evaluation of the toxicological properties and MRLs for carbendazim and Thiophanate-Methyl is ongoing in the EU.
47. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for spices, seeds for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

⁷ Section 3 of the JMPR Report (2019, regular meeting)

⁸ REP19/PR, paras. 43-47

⁹ CX/PR 21/52/5; CL 2020/6-PR; CX/PR 21/52/5-Add.1 (Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Egypt, EU and USA); CX/PR 21/52/5-Add.2 (United Kingdom)

CHLOROTHALONIL (81)

48. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for cranberry because a genotoxic concern could not be excluded for residues of metabolites consumers would be exposed to, and the EU did not establish toxicological reference values for the metabolite SDS-3701.
49. CCPR noted the concern form submitted by the UK on the chronic exposures for metabolite R613636, formed on processing, that exceeded the generic threshold. The UK also raised a concern that the chronic exposures for this metabolite were only estimated for cranberries, and not for other crops for which CXLs are already established, and there was no acute exposure assessment.
50. Croplife informed the CCPR that data were available to refine the exposure assessments for evaluation by JMPR.
51. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that the additional data would be considered during the regular JMPR meeting in September.
52. CCPR noted that the National Health Federation had similar concerns as those raised by the UK.
53. CCPR agreed to retain the draft MRL for cranberry at Step 4, awaiting the re-evaluation by the 2021 JMPR.

PHOSMET (103)

54. CCPR noted that when discussing Agenda Item 11 on the IESTI equation, Australia had advised that the CXL listed in the Codex database for phosmet in pome fruit (10 mg/kg) was incorrect and that the CXL should be 3 mg/kg. CCPR agreed to revise the database accordingly.

IPRODIONE (111)

55. CCPR noted the concern form submitted by the EU on the safety of iprodione residues as a result of exceedances of the EU ADI and ARfD.
56. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the JMPR did not have access to the iprodione toxicological database evaluated by the EU and strongly recommended that iprodione be prioritized for periodic re-evaluation.
57. CCPR noted Iprodione had been included in the list of 2022 periodic re-evaluations.

CYPERMETHRIN (including alpha- and zeta-cypermethrin) (118)

58. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for ginseng, dried including red ginseng, pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU.
59. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

DIFLUBENZURON (130)

60. In response to the concern from the EU relating to the plant metabolite (4-chloroaniline), the JMPR Secretariat advised that the re-evaluation conducted by JECFA had concluded that this metabolite was not a significant health concern.

METHOPRENE (147)

61. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for peanut, whole due to a chronic risk for European consumers, and a lack of studies on the metabolic behaviour after post-harvest treatment and on the nature and magnitude of residues in processed products.
62. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for peanut, whole for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

GLYPHOSATE (158)

63. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for dry beans (subgroup) (except soya beans); dry peas(subgroup), pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU.
64. CCPR noted that the National Health Federation did not agree in principle to MRLs being adopted for this compound as they believed it is an endocrine disruptor and when combined with other formulations, its toxicity is increased thousandfold, and this cumulative effect / toxicity had not been tested.
65. CropLife International informed CCPR of the recent conclusions outlined in the EU draft renewal assessment that glyphosate did not meet the EU criteria for endocrine disruption.
66. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for dry beans(subgroup) (except soya beans); and dry peas (subgroup) for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

PROPICONAZOLE (160)

67. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that in response to a request from the CCPR51, a new MRL recommendation was proposed for peaches (including apricots and nectarine) (subgroup) (Po), based on a “mean + 4*SD” calculation rather than a “3*mean” value.
68. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for peach owing to the EU consumer risk assessment not being finalized; toxicological concerns; an acute risk for EU consumers and insufficient number of trials.
69. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for peaches (including apricots and nectarine) (subgroup) (Po), with the subsequent revocation of the CXL for peach and withdrawal of the previous draft MRLs for peach, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

BUPROFEZIN (173)

70. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that in response to a concern form submitted by the EU, new data were considered by the 2019 JMPR for aniline and toxicological reference values were established. The 2019 JMPR concluded that exposure to aniline in processed commodities did not represent a public health concern.
71. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for tree nuts (group); eggs; mammalian fats (except milk fats); poultry fats; poultry meat and poultry, edible offal of, due to the potential formation of aniline from residues of buprofezin in commodities during processing. The EU noted that the JMPR evaluated new data including a new in vivo genotoxicity study not yet assessed in the EU.
72. CCPR noted that National Health Federation had similar concerns to those expressed by the EU on the consumer exposure to residues of buprofezin and its metabolite.
73. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

BIFENTHRIN (178)

74. CCPR noted the 2019 JMPR conclusion that the estimated acute dietary exposure to residues of bifenthrin in strawberries may present a public health concern.
75. For strawberries, CCPR agreed to revoke the CXL, withdraw the draft MRL currently at Step 4 and to retain the proposed draft MRL of 3 mg/kg at Step 4 waiting for advice on the availability of an alternative GAP or other information.
76. For celery and lettuce, head, CCPR agreed to keep the draft MRLs at Step 4, waiting for advice on the availability of additional data or alternative GAP information to resolve the acute intake concerns identified by the 2015 JMPR.
77. For okra, CCPR agreed to withdraw the draft MRL based on confirmation from the sponsor they had no additional data and no new GAP information.
78. CCPR agreed to revoke the CXLs for barley and barley straw and fodder, dry as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.
79. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for straw and fodder (dry) of cereal grains for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR and to include a note that this MRL excluded barley straw and fodder, dry.

CLETHODIM (187)

80. CCPR noted that the 2019 JMPR could not reach a conclusion on a residue definition for dietary risk assessment for plant and animal commodities.
81. CCPR was advised that the manufacturer would submit additional toxicology data for the metabolites of clethodim to the JMPR. CCPR agreed to retain all the CXLs under the 4-year rule, awaiting the re-evaluation by the JMPR.

TEBUCONAZOLE (189)

82. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs, pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU.
83. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

TOLCLOFOS-METHYL(191)

84. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for potato due to their acute consumer risk for European consumers.

85. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

KRESOXIM-METHYL (199)

86. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for pome fruits (group), except Japanese persimmon, for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXL, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.
87. The Observer from NHF opposed the advancement of the MRL as it was their view that the compound was a carcinogen and posed an occupational risk through inhalation or dermal contact. However, it was clarified that occupational health issues were outside the remit of CCPR and Codex.

PYRIPROXIFEN (200)

88. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for mango for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

CYPRODINIL (207)

89. CCPR noted the comment of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the proposed draft MRL for soya bean (dry), relating to the use of the proportionality approach despite the trials deviating by more than one parameter from the GAP.
90. CCPR noted the concern of the National Health Federation relating to the carcinogenicity of cyprodinil. The JMPR Secretariat informed the CCPR that new toxicological data were evaluated and the JMPR had concluded that no revisions of the existing ADI or ARfD were required. Any new data to support this concern should be submitted to the JMPR for a scientific assessment.
91. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for soya bean (dry) for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by 2019 JMPR.

PYRACLOSTROBIN (210)

92. CCPR noted that in response to a request from CCPR51, the 2019 JMPR had reviewed the data for spinach and the US GAP for root and tuber vegetables, and had proposed new MRLs for these commodities.
93. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for root vegetables (subgroup) except sugar beet and spinach for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs and withdrawal of the associated draft MRLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

BOSCALID (221)

94. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for pome fruit, because a lower MRL could be derived using the OECD calculator.
95. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

AZOXYSTROBIN (229)

96. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for guava for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by 2019 JMPR.

CHLORANTRANILIPROLE (230)

97. CCPR noted the comment from the EU that palm fruit (oil) is a major crop and therefore there were insufficient residue trials to derive an MRL.
98. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

SPIROTETRAMAT (234)

99. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by 2019 JMPR.

METAFLUMIZONE (236)

100. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for grape, due to their acute consumer risk for European consumers.
101. CCPR noted that the National Health Federation shared similar concerns as the EU.
102. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by 2019 JMPR.

DICAMBA (240)

103. CCPR noted the reservation from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for cotton seed; maize; and soya bean (dry), pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU.
104. CCPR noted the comment by the EU that the processing factor of soya bean hulls; and soya bean meal was derived from the GAP for dicamba-tolerant soya beans, which reflected different uses in conventional crops.
105. CCPR noted the comment from the National Health Federation on issues raised on the use of the compound in the USA and proposed withdrawal of the MRLs. The USA confirmed that the issues raised by NHF did not relate to food safety. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the JMPR had evaluated additional toxicological data and the 2019 JMPR had concluded that no revisions of the ARfD and ADI were necessary.
106. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by 2019 JMPR.

ACETAMIPRID (246)

107. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for spices, seeds for adoption at Step 5/8 and to revoke the CXL for cardamom, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

PENTHIOPYRAD (253)

108. CCPR noted the reservation from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of all proposed MRLs due to different residue definitions for risk assessment and the extrapolation methods. The EU proposed to discuss the extrapolation principle from blueberries to elderberries and guelder rose within the EWG on the revision of the Classification (Agenda item 7).
109. An observer noted that the JMPR had flexibility to decide on group extrapolation when applying extrapolation rules as there might be similar situations for other group MRLs and this did not necessarily imply revision of the classification groups nor the tables of representative commodities.
110. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

FLUXAPYROXAD (256)

111. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that in response to the specific concern regarding fluxapyroxad raised during CCPR51, the 2019 JMPR had reviewed and analysed all available data for residues of fluxapyroxad in citrus fruit, and confirmed that for foliar uses, extrapolation of residue estimates from lemon or limes to mandarins is reasonable. A technical document elaborated these issues was included in the 2019 JMPR report.
112. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent withdrawal of the associated MRLs and the revocation of the CXL for oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids) (subgroup) as recommended by the 2018 and 2019 JMPRs.

PICOXYSTROBIN (258)

113. The JMPR Secretariat indicated that in response to a public health concern raised by the EU, the 2019 JMPR had concluded that Picoxystrobin and its IN-8612 metabolite were unlikely to be genotoxic; that the EU specific data requirements (such as for endocrine disruption) were included as part of their risk assessments and that the concerns identified about dietary exposures to picoxystrobin were unlikely to represent a public health concern.
114. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for coffee beans; cotton seed; edible offal (mammalian); mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals) (fat); milks; sorghum; tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried) due to several health concerns identified in the EFSA peer review, including possible genotoxicity of picoxystrobin and its main plant metabolites.
115. In response to the reservation of the EU, the JMPR Secretariat indicated that JMPR and EFSA differed in their interpretations of the genotoxicity data for picoxystrobin and metabolites.
116. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs as recommended by the 2019 JMPR for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs.

BENZOVINDIFLUPYR (261)

117. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for bulb onions (subgroup); sugar cane to Step 5/8 with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXL for sugar cane, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

FLUENSULFONE (265)

118. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for citrus fruit (group); pome fruit (group) (except Japanese persimmon); stone fruits (group); small fruit vine climbing (subgroup); sugar cane; tree nuts (group); coffee bean; wheat, similar grains, and pseudocereals without husks (subgroup); barley, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks (subgroup); maize cereals (subgroup); sweet corns (subgroup); rice cereals (subgroup) and sorghum grain and millet (subgroup) due to the metabolism studies are not representative for the residue behaviour observed in the residue trials. The EU considered that the genotoxic potential of MeS cannot be excluded and that further genotoxicity tests would be needed to follow up on the positive results in vitro.
119. In response to the concern form submitted by the USA relating to the residue database used to recommend the pome fruit MRL and to the need for a citrus juice MRL, the JMPR Secretariat indicated that these concerns would be considered by the 2021 JMPR.
120. CCPR noted that NHF had similar concerns to those expressed by the EU.
121. CCPR agreed to return the proposed draft MRLs for apple juice; apples, dried and pome fruits (group) to Step 4, awaiting the evaluation by the 2021 JMPR and advance the other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by 2019 JMPR.

TOLFENPYRAD (269)

122. CCPR noted the 2019 JMPR conclusion that the estimated acute dietary exposure to residues of tolfenpyrad in tomatoes and eggplants may present a public health concern. CropLife advised the Meeting that no new information or alternative GAP was available at the moment.
123. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of all proposed draft MRLs except for bulb onions; citrus oil, edible; citrus pulp, dry; peppers, chili, dried pending the outcome of their ongoing import tolerance requests and that for mandarins, oranges and peppers they had identified acute consumer risks.
124. CCPR agreed to withdraw the draft MRLs for tomatoes (subgroup) and eggplants (subgroup) and advance the other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by 2019 JMPR.

MESOTRIONE (277)

125. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

ACETOCHLOR (280)

126. CCPR noted the reservations from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for soya bean (dry) and edible offal (mammalian) because of their different residue definition for enforcement.
127. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

FLONICAMID (282)

128. CCPR noted the reservations from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs because of their different residue definition for enforcement and that for oranges, they had identified an acute consumer risk for oranges.
129. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

FLUAZIFOP-P-BUTYL (283)

130. CCPR noted the reservation from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for elderberries (extrapolation from blueberries) and strawberry (dietary intake concerns).
131. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

FLUPYRADIFURONE (285)

132. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

ISOFETAMID (290)

133. The JMPR Secretariat explained that in response to a concern form submitted by the EU, the 2019 JMPR had re-evaluated the data for bush berries and pulses, resulting in new recommendations.

134. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent withdrawal of the associated MRLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

PENDIMETHALIN (292)

135. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

CYCLANILIPROLE (296)

136. CCPR noted the reservation from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for all plant commodities except for almond hulls; citrus oil, edible; elderberries; guelder rose; leafy green (subgroup); peppers chili, dried; prunes, dried; tomato, dried because their the consumer risk assessment could not be finalised and no conclusion could be drawn on the genotoxicity and the general toxicity of several metabolites and that for leaves of Brassicaceae (subgroup), the number of trials were insufficient to recommend an MRL.
137. The National Health Federation proposed to retain the MRLs at Step 4 in view of data gaps as indicated by the EU.
138. The JMPR secretariat in response to the EU comment on data gaps for leaves of Brassicaceae, that the recommendations were based on 5 trials, while only 4 trials are required
139. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent withdrawal of the associated MRLs, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

FENAZAQUIN (297)

140. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

FOSETYL-ALUMINIUM (302)

141. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for coffee beans because of insufficient number of residue trials.
142. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXL for mammalian fats (except milk fat), as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

MANDESTROBIN (307)

143. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRL for rape seed due to their different residue definition for risk assessment.
144. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

PYDIFLUMETOFEN (309)

145. CCPR noted the 2019 JMPR conclusion that the estimated acute dietary exposure to residues of pydiflumetofen in leafy greens (subgroup) may present a public health concern. CropLife advised CCPR that no new information or alternative GAP was available at the moment.
146. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of all the proposed draft MRLs except those for the animal feed commodities; processed commodities; martynia pending the outcome of the ongoing approval procedure in the EU and that they had identified an acute intake concern for the subgroup of stems and petioles.
147. CCPR agreed to withdraw the draft MRLs for leafy greens (subgroup) and advance the other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

PYRIOFENONE (310)

148. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

AFIDOPYROPEN (312)

149. CCPR noted that the concern form on Afidopyropen submitted by the USA was withdrawn during this Session because JMPR had agreed to review their dietary intake assessment to take into account the scaling factor used when calculating the sum of parent plus M4401007 residues and consider the practicality of the low MRL proposed for milk.
150. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of all the proposed draft MRLs except those for the animal feed commodities and processed commodities due to their concern on the evaluation of metabolites, their acute consumer risk concern (for leaves of Brassicaceae), and the representative crop selection (for herbs).

151. In response to a question from Republic of Korea, the JMPR Secretariat clarified that since the US pome fruits group did not include Japanese persimmon, the MRL was proposed for pome fruits except persimmon.
152. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs to Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

METCONAZOLE (313)

153. CCPR noted that in response to the concern form submitted by the USA, JMPR had agreed to reconsider the data available to support an MRL for wheat grain.
154. CCPR noted the reservations from the EU, Norway and Switzerland on the advancement of all the proposed draft MRLs, except those for animal feed commodities and processed commodities pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU.
155. CCPR was informed by EU that they considered that the proposed draft MRL for peach should be lower (according to the OECD calculator) and that the number of residue trials were insufficient to support an MRL for plums (subgroup)
156. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

PYFLUBUMIDE (314)

157. CCPR noted the 2019 JMPR conclusion that the estimated acute dietary exposure to residues of pyflubumide in apples and tea, green, black may present a public health concern. CropLife advised the Meeting that within the next 12 months, new toxicology data would be available for evaluation by JMPR.
158. CCPR agreed to retain the proposed MRLs for apple; tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried) to step 4, awaiting the JMPR re-evaluation.

PYRIDATE (315)

159. CCPR noted that the 2019 JMPR had established an ADI of 0-0.2 mg/kg bw and an ARfD of 2 mg/kg bw for pyridate and that these differed from the toxicological reference values derived in the EU.

PYRIFLUQUINAZON (316)

160. CCPR noted that the 2019 JMPR was not able to derive a residue definition for dietary risk assessment for animal commodities.
161. In response to a question from CropLife on whether an MRL could be proposed for tea (not an animal feed commodity), the JMPR Secretariat indicated that 2019 JMPR did not propose any MRL without the completion of the residue definition for dietary risk assessment.

TRIFLUMURON (317)

162. CCPR noted that the 2019 JMPR was not able to derive a residue definition for dietary risk assessment for plant and animal commodities and that new toxicology (genotoxicity) data would be re-evaluated by the 2021 JMPR.

VALIFENALATE (318)

163. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

Conclusion

164. CCPR:
 - (i) agreed to forward to CAC44:
 - a) MRLs for adoption by CAC44 at Step 5/8 (Appendix II).
 - b) Codex MRLs (CXLs) for revocation by CAC44 (Appendix III).
 - (ii) noted that:
 - a) MRLs retained at 4 and 7 are attached as Appendices IV and V (for information).
 - b) MRLs in the Step Procedure which have been withdrawn are attached as Appendix VI (discontinuation of work).

REVISION OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD AND FEED (Agenda Item 7)

165. The USA and The Netherlands, as Chair and co-Chair of the EWG, introduced the item and explained the key points of discussions, outcomes and outstanding issues identified by the EWG in revising Class C/D and the corresponding tables of representative commodities as identified in the working documents listed in the Agenda.

166. The EWG Chairs further explained that comments submitted in reply to CL 2021/37-PR, as contained in CX/PR 21/52/6-Add.1 and various CRDs, on additional proposals for inclusion in Class C/D and the tables of representative commodities, as well as feedback on questions raised by the EWG under Agenda Item 7(d) in CX/PR 21/52/7, were addressed in a pre-meeting to facilitate discussion and decision-making by CCPR.
167. The EWG Chairs further clarified that the revised Class C/D and their associated tables on representative commodities, as presented in CRDs 27 and 28, addressed all written comments submitted by Codex members and observers to this Session.
168. CCPR agreed to consider the revised Class C/D, and the associated tables of representative commodities, as presented in CRDs 27/28 and made the following decisions and agreed with/noted the following comments:

CLASS C: PRIMARY ANIMAL FEED COMMODITIES (Agenda Item 7a)¹⁰

Revised Class C and Table 7

169. CCPR noted general support for the revised Class C and Table 7 on examples of representative commodities for this class as presented in CRD27.
170. CCPR made a correction to Subgroup 052A, by the addition of sweet potato, vines and made the consequential amendment to Table 7 on examples of representative commodities (Agenda Item 7c).

Conclusion

171. CCPR agreed to forward the revised Class C: Primary animal feed commodities and Table 7: Examples of representative commodities for Class C as amended to Step 5/8 for adoption by CAC44 and to include Table 7 in the *Principles and Guidelines for the Selection of Representative Commodities for the extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Group* (CXG 84-2012) (Appendix VII).

CLASS D: PROCESSED FOODS OF PLANT ORIGIN (Agenda Item 7b)¹¹

Revised Class C and Table 8

172. CCPR noted general support for the revised Class D and Table 8 on examples of representative commodities for this class as presented in CRD28, and made additional amendments as follows:
- Transferred tomato juice to the group fruit juices to align with the *General Standard for Fruit Juices and Nectars* (CXS 247-2005) where tomato juice was considered and standardized as a fruit juice.
 - Deleted Ginseng (dried) from Subgroup 066C Teas – Herbal teas from roots as it was already included under Group 056, Dried vegetables, noting that it was not possible to have a commodity under more than one group;
 - To refer to ginger rhizome, dried under Group 056 and ginger leaves under Subgroup 057A, dried herbs of herbaceous plants, to clearly distinguish the two commodities from each other
 - Made the consequential amendments to Table 8 on examples of representative commodities for this class (Agenda Item 7c).

Transfer of commodities from Class D to Class C

173. CCPR noted general support for the transfer of commodities from Class C to Class D as presented in CX/PR 21/52/7-Appendix II.

Conclusion

174. CCPR:
- (i) agreed to forward the revised Class D: Processed food of plant origin and Table 8: Examples of representative commodities for Class D as amended to Step 5/8 for adoption by CAC44 and to include Table 8 in the *Principles and Guidelines for the Selection of Representative Commodities for the extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Group* (CXG 84-2012) (Appendix VIII); and
 - (ii) agreed with the transfer of commodities from Class C to Class D (Appendix IX)

¹⁰ CX/PR 21/52/6 ; CX/PR 21/52/6 Add.1 (Australia, Canada, Egypt, Iran, Japan, Thailand, IFU)

¹¹ CX/PR 21/52/7 ; CX/PR 21/52/6 Add.1 (Australia, Canada, Egypt, Iran, Japan, Thailand, IFU)

TABLE ON EXAMPLES OF REPRESENTATIVE COMMODITIES FOR COMMODITY GROUPS IN DIFFERENT TYPES UNDER CLASS C AND CLASS D (FOR INCLUSION IN THE PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE SELECTION OF REPRESENTATIVE COMMODITIES FOR THE EXTRAPOLATION OF MRLs FOR PESTICIDES TO COMMODITY GROUPS (CXG 84-2012) (Agenda Item 7c)¹²

175. CCPR recalled that some of the commodity groups did not include examples of representative commodities, but that alternative approaches were available for extrapolation as per the footnotes 1 and 2. In order to allow flexibility, CCPR agreed to amend Footnote 2 of Table 8 to allow also for consideration of OECD guideline to be considered for extrapolation of processed commodities.

Conclusion

176. See Agenda Items 7(a/b).

IMPACT OF THE REVISED TYPES IN CLASS C AND CLASS D ON CXLs (Agenda Item 7d)¹³

Impact of the revised Class C/D on CXLs

177. CCPR agreed with the recommendations on the impact of the revised Class C/D on CXLs as described in CX/PR 21/52/9, Appendices I and II (Appendix X).

Removal of the term “fodder” from the revised Class C

178. The EWG Chairs further drew the attention of CCPR to the paper prepared by Japan (CX/PR 21/52/9, Appendix II) to address the implications for CXLs following the decision to replace the term “fodder” by other terms more specific to describe feed commodities such as silage, straw or hay, and agreed to forward this paper to JMPR for their use when setting MRLs for feed commodities under the revised Class C vis-à-vis existing CXLs for “fodder” (Appendix XI).

Other matters: Okra

179. CCPR recalled its previous discussion¹⁴ on extrapolation of MRLs for okra, martynia and roselle and the feedback¹⁵ from JMPR concerning the difficulties to extrapolate MRLs for this commodity from the Subgroup Pepper, and agreed that the EWG on the revision of the Classification should consider representative commodities from which MRLs for okra could be extrapolated. Recalling the decision of CCPR51 that monitoring data on residues of pesticides in okra should be submitted, CCPR agreed that the EWG should take into account this monitoring data when considering this matter. Delegations expressed the importance to resolve this matter as okra was an important commodity for their countries and it would be difficult to establish single MRLs for this commodity.

Terms of Reference of the EWG on the revision of the Classification

180. CCPR agreed to re-establish the EWG on classification, chaired by USA and co-chaired by The Netherlands, working in English with the following TORs:
- (i) Consider the issue of okra and an appropriate representative commodity taking into account monitoring data submitted;
 - (ii) Continue to work on edible animal tissues (including edible offal) in collaboration with the CCRVDF EWG on edible animal tissue (see Agenda Item 7e, paragraph XX); and
 - (iii) Initiate consideration of Class B, Primary Food Commodities of Animal Origin and Class E, Processed Foods of Animal Origin.

CLASS B – PRIMARY FOOD COMMODITIES OF ANIMAL ORIGIN: Harmonization of meat mammalian MRLs between CCPR and CCRVDF (Agenda Item 7e)¹⁶

181. The Codex Secretariat introduced the item and provided an account of the previous discussion at CCPR51 as described in CL 2020/13-PR concerning the general recommendation of CCEXEC in relation to collaboration and synchronization of work between CCPR and CCRVDF on issues of common interest to both committees such as the harmonization of a definition for edible offal (and other edible tissues of animal origin) to establish harmonized MRLs for compounds with dual uses for edible tissues/food of animal origin.

¹² CX/PR 21/52/8; CX/PR 21/52/6 Add.1 (Australia, Canada, Egypt, Iran, Japan, Thailand, IFU)

¹³ CX/PR 21/52/9

¹⁴ REP19/PR, paras. 43-47

¹⁵ Report of the 2019 JMPR Regular Meeting, Chapter 3, Replies from JMPR to CCPR Concerns, Section 3.9

¹⁶ REP19/PR, paras.157-165, Appendix VIII; CL 2020/13-PR; CX/PR 21/52/10 (Australia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Egypt, EU, Iran, Thailand and Uruguay)

182. The Secretariat informed CCPR of the decision of CCRVDF25 (2021) to send a definition for edible offal based on a proposal from CCPR51 as contained in REP21/RVDF, Appendix IV, to CAC44 for final adoption. CCRVDF had encouraged CCPR to adopt the same definition in the framework of collaboration on issues of common interests to both committees i.e. definition of edible offal for the establishment of harmonized MRLs for edible tissues/food of animal origin.
183. The Secretariat further recalled that the adoption of the same definition by CCPR would be dependent on the decision on whether CCPR would align the terminology used for setting MRLs for food of animal origin, in particular the use of the term “muscle” applied by CCRVDF/JECFA as opposed to the term “meat” customarily used by CCPR/JMPR for MRLs, and other descriptors such as “fat” and “skin” which are also used when establishing MRLs for food of animal origin in CCPR/CCRVDF or agreement on definitions that would enable a common understanding on these terms as proposed by the JECFA/JMPR Working Group on the Revision of the Guidance Document for Residue Definition which was distributed for comments under CL 2020/13-PR as instructed by CCPR51.
184. On the question on situations where the skin could be considered as edible offal, the Secretariat clarified that the definition as proposed by CCRVDF clarified that the skin attached to the muscle/fat would be excluded from the definition of edible offal to differentiate from situations where skin could be considered as edible offal and that this discussion was recorded in REP21/RVDF.
185. The Secretariat indicated that it might be difficult for CCPR to discuss the replies to CL 2020/13-PR and the definition for edible offal as agreed by CCRVDF25 in this plenary meeting. As the EWG/Classification would start the revision of Class B – Primary Food Commodities of Animal Origin, the consideration of the definition of edible offal, and the related harmonized terminology for the use of the terms meat/muscle, fat and skin in CCPR/CCRVDF could be charged to the EWG/Classification who can continue to liaise with the CCRVDF EWG/Edible Offal established by CCRVDF25 to collaborate on issues of common interest to these committees.

Conclusion

186. CCPR agreed to task the EWG/Classification with the consideration of this issue in view of the revision of Class B – Primary Food Commodities of Animal Origin as follows:
 - (i) To consider the replies to CL 2020/13-PR on the harmonization of meat mammalian MRLs between CCPR and CCRVDF (Classification of Food and Feed: Class B – Primary Commodity of Animal Origin) and the definition of edible offal as recommended by CCRVDF and to continue to cooperate with the CCRVDF-EWG/edible offal to facilitate the harmonization of terminology/definitions that can facilitate the establishment of harmonized MRLs for compounds with dual uses for food of animal origin (See Agenda Item 7, paragraph XX, point (ii)).

IMPACT OF THE REVISED CLASS A ON CXLs IN THE CODEX DATABASE FOR RESIDUES OF PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED (Agenda Item 7f)¹⁷

187. The Codex Secretariat introduced the item and explained that in 2018 CCPR concluded the revision of Class A – Primary Commodities of Plant Origin. Following the revision of the different types/groups under the different classes, the EWG on the Revision of the Classification led by the United States of America and the Netherlands had provided a description of the impact of the revised Types/Groups under Class A on the CXLs. This implied a throughout review of the commodity codes and associated CXLs currently available in the Database (DB) to adjust the CXLs to the new commodity codes without losing CXLs nor expanding the CXLs to commodities without undergoing a JMPR safety assessment. This exercise may lead to situations where CCPR could be informed of the adjustments while others where such adjustments may require further discussion by CCPR before proceeding further.
188. In order to assess the impact of the revised Class A on the existing CXLs, the Codex Secretariat hired a consultant, Dr Jeevan Khurana, to conduct a throughout review of the CXLs in the database vis-à-vis the revised Class A. His report was presented in the Annex to this document for information. The Secretariat further explained that a Circular Letter (CL) would be distributed requesting comments on the issues raised in the document, in particular Part II which may require advice from CCPR before implementation. Following endorsement and agreement by CCPR, the CXLs in the database would be adjusted accordingly.
189. Dr Khurana made a brief presentation of the revision of the Classification of Food and Feed in relation to Class A: Primary Food Commodities of Plant Origin, the impact of the revised Class A on existing CXLs in the Codex database and how they could be implemented as described in Part I (for information and endorsement by CCPR) and Part II (for discussion and agreement by CCPR) of the document.

¹⁷ CX/PR 21/52/11

Conclusion

190. CCPR thanked the Codex Secretariat and Dr Khurana for the information provided and agreed to consider this matter further at its next session.

GUIDELINES FOR COMPOUNDS OF LOW PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS THAT MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CXLs OR DO NOT GIVE RISE TO RESIDUES (AT STEP 4) (Agenda Item 8)¹⁸

191. Chile, as Chair of the EWG, introduced the item and summarized the information provided in the working document i.e. background, work process, key points of discussion in the EWG, conclusions and recommendations for consideration by CCPR. He further introduced the results of the pre-meeting session recalling the general support expressed by members and observers on the work carried out by the EWG.
192. The EWG Chair noted that in the pre-meeting session:
- Comments were received on the scope; definitions; criteria; and examples of compounds that fit in the different criteria proposed in the Guidelines.
 - Clarification was provided vis-à-vis CCPR51's decision¹⁹, that the examples would not remain as an integral part of the Guidelines; however, they were useful to support the development of the Guidelines and could be made available on the Codex website as a reference once the Guidelines were completed.
 - There was general agreement to re-establish the EWG to continue the work on the Guidelines based on the comments received in reply to CL 2021/38-PR.
193. The EWG Chair proposed that the Guidelines be advanced to Step 5 for adoption by CAC44 and to re-establish the EWG to further refine the document taking into account all the written comments submitted to the session and additional comments made during the pre-meeting session and the plenary session.
194. There was general support to advance the Guidelines to Step 5 and to re-establish the EWG. However, one delegation proposed to return the Guidelines to Step 2/3 for further discussion and drafting by the EWG in view of the substantial written comments received.

Conclusion

195. CCPR agreed to:
- (i) advance the Guidelines for adoption at Step 5 for adoption by CAC 44 (Appendix XII); and
 - (ii) re-establish the EWG, chaired by Chile and co-chaired by India and USA, working in English and Spanish, with the following Terms of Reference (TORs):
 - (iii) To further develop the Guidelines as presented in CX/PR 21/52/12, Addendum 1 and taking into consideration the written comments submitted and those received during the pre-meeting and plenary sessions.
 - (iv) To provide examples of compounds to facilitate the development of the Guidelines. Examples will not remain in the final document, but they could be made available to Codex members, for instance, on the Codex website.
 - (v) Based on the above considerations, to present a revised proposal with a view to finalizing the Guidelines at CCPR53.

REVIEW OF MASS SPECTROMETRY PROVISIONS IN THE GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF MASS SPECTROMETRY FOR THE IDENTIFICATION, CONFIRMATION AND QUANTITATIVE DETERMINATION OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES (CXG 56- 2005) AND THE GUIDELINES ON PERFORMANCE CRITERIA OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN FOOD AND FEED (CXG 90-2017) (Agenda Item 9)²⁰

196. Iran, as Chair of the EWG introduced the item and reminded CCPR of the background for the work, the process followed by the EWG and the key comments received to a questionnaire circulated to members of the EWG on the opportunity to revoke CXG56 and whether there was room to transfer some provisions from CXG56 to CXG90 for completeness. He explained that the mandate²¹ of the EWG had not been fully addressed and proposed that the EWG be re-established to complete its mandate as agreed by CCPR51.

¹⁸ CX/PR 21/52/12; CX/PR 21/52/12-Add.1 (Australia, Canada, Chile, Egypt, Iran, Indonesia, Thailand, USA, CropLife International and FoodDrinkEurope)

¹⁹ REP19/PR, para. 206

²⁰ CX/PR 21/52/13

²¹ REP19/PR, para. 185

Discussion

197. CCPR noted general support to continue working on this matter. In general, delegations supported revocation of CXG56 and the transfer of relevant provisions to CXG90 if appropriate to avoid duplication. The following views were expressed:
- CXG90 was a more updated, complete, and robust document in general and with respect to mass spectrometry. CXG56 should be revoked, however, some provisions from CXG56 could be transferred to CX90 e.g. other detection and confirmatory methods contained in CXG56 including Table 6 on Detection methods suitable for screening (Phase 1) and confirmation (Phase 2) of residues. In addition, the acceptance criteria in CXG90 should be updated taking into account the latest guide SANTE/12682/2019.3.
 - CXG90 adequately addressed mass spectrometry and took into account provisions described in CXG56. These guidelines should thus be revoked to avoid duplication. Some other methods such as thin layer chromatography and derivatization could be included in CXG90.
 - The timeliness and correctness of CXG56 should be assessed vis-à-vis provisions for mass spectrometry in CXG90 in order to transfer relevant provisions to CXG90 and to revoke CXG56. Likewise, provisions for mass spectrometry in CXG90 should be assessed in order to determine whether they need to be updated or whether other provisions, not contained in CXG56, should be included for completeness.
 - Specific technical comments should be addressed in the EWG to enable completion of work in accordance with its mandate, in particular the second part of the mandate.

Conclusion

198. CCPR agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Iran, and co-chaired by India, working in English only, with the following TORs:
- (i) To determine if CXG 90-2017 adequately cover mass spectrometry and if so, to propose revocation of CXG 56-2005.
 - (ii) If there are provisions from CXG 56-2005 that could be relevant but not included in CXG 90-2017, to look into the feasibility to merge the two documents, and:
 - a) if appropriate to present a proposal for new work, and
 - b) if possible, to present an outline of the merged guidelines for consideration at CCPR53.

DISCUSSION PAPER ON MONITORING THE PURITY AND STABILITY OF CERTIFIED REFERENCE MATERIAL OF MULTI-CLASS PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (Agenda Item 10)²²

199. India, also on behalf of Argentina, introduced the item, reminded CCPR of the background for the work, the work process followed in the development of the discussion paper and key issues discussed in the paper. He informed CCPR that further work was needed on this topic and recommended that the EWG be re-established to further develop the discussion paper for consideration by CCPR53.

Discussion

200. CCPR noted the general support to continue with this work in the EWG and noted the following views:
- To consider the opportunity to broaden the scope of the work as CRMs were also used in the analysis of other analytes, such as contaminants, food additives, etc., and to request the advice of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) in this regard.
 - To limit the scope of the work to pesticide residues only as, although CRMs also applied to other analytes and it might be preferable to develop horizontal guidance in this regard, there were likely to be many specific issues related to pesticide residues which might require special attention by CCPR and to keep CCMAS informed of this work.
 - The guidance could be further expanded to other analytes by CCMAS if Codex members wish to do so.
 - This work would be useful to harmonize criteria amongst regulatory agencies on the use of CRMs beyond the expiry date with regard to their purity and stability after long storage period and might thus significantly reduced testing costs.

- The guidance should also cover intermediate and working standards related to CRMs as they greatly impact on their purity and stability for prolonged storage conditions.
- It might be difficult to establish harmonized criteria for the use/validity of CRMs after their expiry date as these materials already came labelled with expiry dates and storage conditions which are specific to certain pesticides or food matrices as prescribed by the manufacturer. In addition, the use of CRMs differed from laboratory to laboratory. These issues should be thoroughly discussed in the EWG in order to start work on this matter.

Conclusion

201. CCPR agreed to establish an EWG chaired by India, and co-chaired by Iran, working in English, with the following TORs:
- (i) The EWG should further develop the discussion paper to consider the need, feasibility and relevance:
 - a) To develop harmonized guidelines/analytical protocol on the monitoring of purity and stability of CRMs of multi-class pesticides during prolonged storage, including intermediate and working standards.
 - b) To develop harmonized criteria for the use of CRMs beyond the expiry date as per certified analysis.
 - (ii) Should there be support in the EWG to develop such work, to submit a project document for the new work proposal as an annex to the discussion paper for consideration by CCPR53.
202. CCPR further agreed to inform CCMAS about this work.

DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE REVIEW OF THE IESTI EQUATIONS (Agenda Item 11)²³

203. The European Union, as Chair of the EWG, introduced the item, provided background and history of discussions on this issue to date, the work process in the EWG, key points of discussion as well as discussions in the pre-meeting session and its recommendations. She indicated to CCPR that the delegations in the pre-meeting session had concluded that that no further discussion in the EWG was necessary at this time and that pending feedback from JMPR a decision could be taken at CCPR53 if any further work was needed.

Discussion

Recommendations of the EWG

204. While there was agreement on forwarding the sections as recommended by the EWG to JMPR for their further consideration, there were diverse views expressed on the need for the EWG to continue discussions on the IESTI equations.
205. The United States of America noted that it had been an active participant in the EWG and that while there were divergent views on the conservatism of the IESTI calculations, it believed that:
- the EWG paper provided a complete summary of the discussion of the advantages and challenges of the current IESTI equations; and
 - the EWG was able to collect information to help substantiate the degree of bulking and blending of commodities that are evaluated by JMPR using the Case 3 IESTI Equation; and that the work was complete and should be submitted to JMPR for their evaluation of the degree to which commodities are bulked and blended before entering international trade.
206. The United States of America, supported by other delegations and observers, noted that given the exploratory EWG had completed its terms of reference and that FAO/WHO's published findings concluded that the current equations already provided a high level of protection, no additional exploratory work on the IESTI equations was necessary at this time.
207. These delegations and observers were therefore of the view that the current IESTI equations were protective; that they were still valid for risk assessment and so provided a good estimation of short-term exposure; that over-estimation of the actual acute dietary exposure might be unnecessary and could result in overly conservative MRLs; that all necessary explanatory work had been done by the EWG, so no further work was required at this time. CCPR should await feedback from JMPR on the information provided in CX/PR 21/52/15 to consider pursuing this work further in the Committee.

²³ CX/PR 21/52/15; CL 2021/42-PR; CX/PR 21/52/15-Add.1 (Canada, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, EU, Iraq, Japan, Thailand, Philippines, Uruguay, USA, CropLife International)

208. The European Union, supported by Switzerland and Norway, considered that the publication of Crépet *et al* was not robust enough to provide risk managers with all the necessary information to conclude that the current IESTI equations are sufficiently protective. The EU had identified some serious deficiencies in the study design and the methodology used that compromised the validity of the study. In particular, the exposure calculation was based on a limited subset of food products not sufficiently representative for the total food intake, and therefore, was likely to underestimate the overall exposure. The EU considered that the benchmark of the outcomes of the IESTI equations to probabilistic distribution of actual exposure was not finalized with this paper and that TOR(i) – Part 3 was not sufficiently addressed.
209. The EU agreed with the advantages and challenges identified in the discussion paper, CX/PR 21/52/15. Addressing these challenges, including those related to risk communication, to ensure consumer protection should remain a high priority for CCPR. The EU therefore strongly supported the follow-up by JMPR on the work presented in the discussion paper analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the parameters of the IESTI equations. The EU was of the view that risk communication remained an issue that could only be addressed with a more substantial review of the existing equations. The EU therefore strongly supported the re-establishment of the EWG to continue work towards an internationally harmonized and reliable IESTI methodology underpinned by robust scientific evidence and was willing to chair the EWG and to drive the work forward at the international level as it was important to have a harmonized approach at international level. However, regardless of the decision of CCPR, and independently of the re-establishment of the EWG, the EU would consider how to address the identified challenges, which might lead to the modification of the methodology at EU level.
210. A delegation further pointed out that at the national level, they were facing issues with management and communication of risks on the basis of the existing IESTI equations and that an increasing number of private operators were using these equations to sell results of pesticide residues along with the question on a toxicological value of acute exposure that is derived by these equations. Inspection services were called upon to intervene when residues exceeded the MRL, therefore work should continue to respond to the problems of risk management and communication.
211. These delegations were therefore of the view that there were still issues related to the level of protection and risk communication in relation to the IESTI equations and therefore the EWG should continue its work on the review of the IESTI equations to further explore the challenges identified in the paper and their communication, which could only be addressed with a more comprehensive review of the methodology.
212. Another delegation agreed that there was still need for further work to address the risk management and risk communication challenges and also acknowledged the fact that quantitative consumer protection goals had not been clearly formulated by CCPR and information on actual level of protection from the current IESTI equation had not been available in the past. This delegation also raised an issue that for the exposure assessment all countries need to be considered so that the current equation allows exposure to actual distribution.
213. An observer clarified that there were problems with the residue values exceeding the MRL because there were two IESTI equations used, one at JMPR with certain variability factors, and in the EU, using different variability factors and therefore when complaints on risk communication made, it was because the EU was using a different version and that this muddles the discussion in CCPR.

FAO/WHO benchmarking exercise

214. Australia noted that the FAO/WHO benchmarking exercise utilized an incorrect MRL for phosmet and that this information should be passed onto JMPR. The CXL listed in the Codex database for phosmet in pome fruit (10mg/kg) is incorrect. The CXL should be 3mg/kg as adopted by CAC in 2008. The delegation noted that phosmet was one of the pesticides included in the FAO/WHO benchmarking exercise and apple was the main source of exposure.
215. The United States of America disagreed that the FAO/WHO benchmarking of the IESTI equations was deficient and did not provide realistic exposure estimates to evaluate the IESTI methodology. This delegation highlighted that the FAO/WHO benchmarking of the IESTI equation culminated in a 2020 publication in the Journal of Food Control. This published work was led by a scientist from the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupation Health and Safety (ANSES) contracted to do this by FAO/WHO. It concluded extensive technical consultation with an international group of dietary exposure assessment experts from Canada, Korea, Australia, The Netherlands, the UK, and the USA. The publication supports the draft FAO/WHO findings that were discussed at CCPR51 (2019), concluding “our results indicate that, with only a few exceptions, most of the CXLs established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission would provide a high level of protection even if risk managers do not request a specific level of protection from risk assessors.” This delegation further stated that it believed that scientific assessment of the FAO/WHO approach was the remit of JMPR and therefore, CCPR, was not the appropriate forum for scientific deliberation and should base its conclusions on the guidance and recommendations of JMPR.

Consideration by JMPR

216. The WHO JMPR Secretariat expressed his appreciation for the discussion paper and indicated that JMPR would take a look at the different elements in the paper and provide its views to CCPR53 under the General Considerations of the JMPR report.

Conclusion

217. CCPR agreed to:
- (i) make available as information documents on the Codex website the following (Appendix XIII):
 - a) Section 1 - Benefits/advantages and challenges of the current IESTI methodology; and
 - b) Section 3 - Review of the parameters of the IESTI equations: findings of FAO/WHO and of published in peer reviewed literature.
 - (ii) forward sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 of CX/PR 21/52/15 (Appendix XIII) to JMPR as follows:
 - a) Section 1 - Benefits/advantages and challenges of the current IESTI methodology: To forward this section to JMPR to further discuss the challenges identified in Table 2 of the discussion paper and consider a possible way forward to address the challenges on issues that fall under the remit of JMPR.
 - b) Section 2 - Benchmarking of IESTI calculations against probabilistic exposure estimates: To forward this section and the comments submitted in response to CL 2021/42-PR (CX/PR 21/52/15-Add. 1) to JMPR for further consideration to support the discussion on the need for a possible revision of the IESTI equations and to consider the final version of the acute probabilistic exposure assessment published in the paper of Crépet et al (2021).
 - c) Section 3 - Review of the parameters of the IESTI equations: findings of FAO/WHO and of published in peer reviewed literature: To forward this section to JMPR for further follow-up discussions (e.g. to discuss the need for developing further guidance on how to derive certain input values such as LP, U, Ue, VF).
 - d) Section 4 - Information on bulking and blending relevant for IESTI Case 3: To forward this section and Appendix I of the discussion paper to JMPR for further evaluation/consideration. The information should support discussions in JMPR to decide whether the list of commodities for which the exposure calculation is performed according to IESTI Case 3 needs to be revised.
 - (iii) request JMPR to report their considerations on the benchmarking of the IESTI equations to the probabilistic distribution of actual exposures presented in Crépet *et al* the back to CCPR53; and
 - (iv) suspend the work of the EWG awaiting the feedback from JMPR. Based on the feedback from JMPR a decision should be taken at CCPR53 if the EWG needs to continue the work.

ENGAGEMENT OF JMPR IN PARALLEL REVIEWS OF NEW COMPOUNDS: PROPOSED PROCEDURES AND PRINCIPLES (Agenda Item 12)²⁴

218. Canada, as the Chair of the EWG, introduced the item, stressing that the parallel reviews of new compounds was initially drafted to grant countries more timely access to new compounds, to harmonize MRLs to facilitate trade and to optimize resources between national agencies and JMPR reviews. The EWG Chair further presented the document, highlighting key principles and procedures to carry out the parallel reviews as described in Section 2-7 of CX/PR 21/52/16 and recommended CCPR to test the procedure through a pilot project to determine its feasibility for implementation and the need for further refinements. He also recommended to re-establish the EWG to consider criteria for the selection of a global project manager, for consideration by CCPR53. He noted that the parallel process should not add to the workload of JMPR nor delay ongoing activities; and that early identification of parallel reviews was necessary to enable scheduling by JMPR. He reemphasized the pilot would only occur when there was sufficient capacity or ability of JMPR to participate in a parallel review.
219. CCPR noted the overall support for the parallel review and the pilot as well as further work in the EWG to clarify the selection of a global project manager.
220. CCPR further noted the following views expressed by member country delegations:

²⁴ CX/PR 21/52/16; CL 2021/43-PR CX/PR 21/52/16-Add.1 (Australia, Cuba, Egypt, Japan, Thailand, Philippines, USA, CropLife International and IFT)

- Support for the recommendations of the EWG and to move forward with the pilot to test the proposed process to ensure that it is feasible to apply in the real world, that it reflects current practices on establishment of MRLs for international trade and that the process does contribute to the use of JMPR resources efficiently.
- Parallel reviews should not add to the current workload of JMPR and the pilot should be tested when JMPR was able to effectively participate in this exercise.
- Parallel reviews would contribute to give flexibility to the establishment of harmonized safe MRLs to ensure public health and fair practices in trade and to shorten the time for their establishment, the proposed process should therefore be supported.
- Comments/concerns that may have been expressed in comments submitted to this Session could be addressed by testing the proposed process through the pilot.

221. CCPR also noted the following views from observers:

- Different national/registration systems could present a challenge to the establishment of the pilot, overloading the already busy agenda of JMPR.
- Accelerating the approval of new MRLs should be considered carefully and rather be done in a slow and deliberate way.
- Parallel reviews could be beneficial for trade to get harmonized safe MRLs adopted within the framework of CCPR in a timely manner. As parallel reviews apply to new compounds, they are usually much less toxic to animals, plants, humans and the environment than a number of the older compounds and so this process would be beneficial to the industry and consumers. In addition, given the constraints of JMPR, it might help to increase the capacity of JMPR to recommend more MRLs for to protect public health and facilitate international trade and so the pilot should proceed when resources are available.
- In addition to facilitate MRL harmonization and trade, parallel reviews could assist in ensuring food security and food safety for a growing population, e.g. by harmonizing toxicology end points. The same approach had been carried out successfully in other committees such as the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF).

222. The WHO JMPR Secretariat indicated its willingness to engage in a pilot test of a parallel review and explained that the rationale for wanting a parallel review path and the desire to get Codex MRLs earlier than it is presently possible for new compounds was understood. The JMPR also recognized that it could be useful to have the procedure in place for quick operationalization. However, some context pertaining to the current situation of JMPR was needed.

223. The capacity of JMPR was determined by several factors, including:

- Availability of a sufficiently complete data packages.
- Availability of enough evaluators with the right professional profiles (monographer, reviewers and specialists).
- Availability of time for discussions and drawing up conclusions in the annual meeting itself.

224. With the operational setup and current resource availability in JMPR, and in a situation where there was a list of compounds waiting to be evaluated or re-evaluated, the JMPR Secretariat clarified that establishing a parallel review stream would not lead to more evaluations. Rather, it would change the order of evaluations by establishing a fast lane for selected compounds.

225. In case a parallel review candidate did not deliver a sufficiently complete data package upfront, or if, for other reasons, its evaluation would stretch over multiple annual JMPR meetings, it might reduce the resources available for evaluation of other new compound.

Conclusion

226. CCPR agreed:

- (i) to encourage data sponsors 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);
- (ii) 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;
- (iii) that the proposed principles and procedures would document the actual outcomes as to accelerate the establishment of Codex MRLs and harmonization with international MRLs; and

- (iv) to keep the principles and procedures for parallel reviews of a new compounds available as a reference for CCPR (Appendix XIV).

227. CCPR also agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Canada and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Kenya, working in English and Spanish, with the following TOR:

- (i) to develop a discussion paper outlining the criteria for selecting a global project manager. The global project manager would be responsible for overseeing the parallel review in close collaboration with the JMPR Secretariat, JMPR reviewers, national authorities involved in the parallel review as well as the manufacturer of the nominated pesticide.

DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW (Agenda Item 13)²⁵

228. Chile, as Chair of the EWG, introduced the item, provided the background to discussions on this issue, the work process of the EWG, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The EWG Chair recommended CCPR to decide on an approach for the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review based on the proposals presented by the EWG Appendix I, Section II, TOR (iv), taking into account the advantages and challenges arising from Options 2b and 3 as described in Appendix I: Section I, TOR (iii).

Discussion

229. CCPR considered the two options and noted diverse views in support for Option 2b or Option 3.

230. Those delegations supporting Option 2b noted that this option would:

- allow for the maintenance of CXLs for pesticides that were widely used and having no public health concern; and in this way would not impede international trade nor negatively impact on farmers;
- allow that only CXLs for pesticides that have registered uses and are listed in the national registration database would be maintained;
- help to maintain more CXLs which helps to facilitate international trade, to reduce the existing gap between developed and developing countries, and to simplify the procedure for periodic review. It was preferable for JMPR to review the updated GAP information and propose new recommended CXLs rather than the deletion of CXLs for compounds without public health concern.

231. Those delegations supporting Option 3 noted the following:

- The current procedure to periodically re-evaluate safety of pesticides should be retained in order to protect the health of consumers as well as the reliability of Codex. Pesticides with very old CXLs were likely to be phased out and were no longer subject to re-evaluation process in many countries, as information or health concern is often discovered during the evaluation process; and that since the CXLs were established, the science / risk assessments have changed and the JMPR evaluation of 15/20 years ago might no longer be valid. Updated reviews by JMPR using more modern standards were necessary.
- Option 3 was more realistic, was consistent with the Risk Analysis Principles in the Procedural Manual, and would therefore not require any changes to the Procedural Manual. This option would allow work on the national registration database to identify compounds that might need a specific way to deal with them;
- Option 3 would provide trust in Codex safety standards vis-à-vis protection of public health. The 4-year rule was sufficient to address data requirements to ensure that only CXLs that had been periodically re-evaluated and proven to be sufficiently health protective based on the latest science available would remain in use.
- Option 3 would ensure that CXLs would not be retained for compounds that may not have been reviewed against updated safety standards/protocols for several years.
- Countries should make sure that the toxicological data on which the CXL is based is relevant and up to date. CCPR should therefore keep the periodic review under its purview to enable re-evaluation of toxicological data at some point. With Option 3, where toxicological data would become available at 15 years, but allowing for the use of these compounds up to a period of 25 years after its re-assessment could be an option, because it would give countries 10 years to generate and submit the required data or for countries to adapt their agriculture to no longer use these compounds.

²⁵ CX/PR 21/52/17; CL 2021/44-PR; CX/PR 21/52/17-Add.1 (Australia, Canada, Chile, Egypt, Iran, Thailand and USA)

- Option 2b might be a disincentive to manufacturers to support compounds for periodic reviews going forward and could result in unnecessary maintenance of CXLs which did not reflect current state of the art in science. This option did not follow the current Risk Analysis Principles which should not be amended to allow the implementation of this option.
232. A delegation supported the efforts to develop a clear process for managing unsupported compounds and determining when CXLs are retained, and that selecting a management option would require balancing the need for a robust listing of CXLs that supported international trade while ensuring that the risk assessments are not based on obsolete chemistry, toxicology or GAP information. Therefore, CXLs should not be revoked unless clear public health concerns were raised and evaluated by JMPR. Recognizing that some members support option 3 and given that this option might result in the loss of CXLs with no impact on public health, it was necessary for CCPR to (i) further define the scope of the problem, (ii) understand the barriers that limit support, and (iii) propose solutions that might be adopted by CCPR to expand the capacity to generate data required by JMPR on unsupported compounds; and proposed that the EWG should be re-established to consider these questions before option 3 could be fully considered by CCPR.
233. Views were also expressed that regardless of the option chosen:
- Capacity building and collaboration between national authorities and the industry to generate relevant data were of upmost importance to implement either option to enable countries, in particular developing countries, to support the evaluation of compounds for periodic reviews.
 - It was important to have precise information on the studies that are necessary in order to support a compound for review by JMPR especially for crops of interest for developing countries or a given region.
234. In view of the divergent views expressed in support of either options, CCPR agreed to re-establish the EWG to further explore options 2b and 3.

Conclusion

235. CCPR agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Chile, and co-chaired by Australia, India and Kenya, working in English and Spanish, with the following TORs:
- (i) To further develop a management proposal for unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review based on Option 2b or 3:
 - a) Option 2b - Only those CXLs for which there are registrations listed in the national registration database (NRD) will be retained and if so, to outline the amendments required in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR to operate this option
 - or
 - b) Option 3 - Codex members and observers are granted 4 years to fulfil the data requirements to maintain the CXLs. (i.e., 4-year rule). If members or observers are unable to address the data requirements, all CXLs are to be revoked
 - (ii) The proposal should take into consideration the discussion paper presented in CX/PR 21/52/17, Appendix I, and the written comments submitted and those received during the plenary session.
 - (iii) To further develop the recommendations under CX/PR 21/52/17, Appendix I, TOR (ii) – explore options for efficient data support that could be addressed by Codex, FAO/WHO, JMPR, governments and the industry to further assist countries in implementing either options.
 - (iv) Based on the above considerations, to present a management proposal for consideration by CCPR53.

NATIONAL REGISTRATIONS OF PESTICIDES (Agenda Item 14)²⁶

236. Germany, as Chair of the EWG, introduced the item, recalling the progress in the past years by CCPR to improve the administration and management of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR in particular the periodic review of pesticides. Based on the comments received in the EWG, the EWG Chair proposed to reconvene the EWG under the same Terms of Reference²⁷ as agreed by CCPR51.

²⁶ CX/PR 21/52/18

²⁷ REP19/PR, para. 232

Discussion

237. CCPR noted support for this work especially in light of its usefulness to contribute to the work on the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern schedule for periodic review; and therefore support for the proposal to re-establish the EWG and further noted that more data were required to complete the work of the EWG on tables 2A list of compounds for periodic review by JMPR and 2B list of compounds that have been last evaluated 15 years ago or more but not yet scheduled for period review.
238. The Codex Secretariat clarified that the four compounds revoked by CCPR would consequently be removed from the National Registration Database. She further clarified that two compounds which had been put under the 4-year rule, would be included in the database (see Agenda Item 15). She further informed CCPR that the Codex Secretariat would issue a Circular Letter (CL) requesting comments on selected compounds including reporting problems with the current approach and encouraged countries to provide relevant information and data for assessment by the EWG and further consideration by CCPR53.

Conclusion

239. CCPR agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Germany and co-chaired by Australia, working in English, with the following ToRs:
- (i) To provide an improved National Registration Database with about 20 compounds every year from Tables 2A and 2B for which data are requested;
 - (ii) To compile the data from all respondents;
 - (iii) To analyze the compiled data in view of the needs for the establishment of the Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR; and
 - (iv) To report back on the findings to CCPR53.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR (Agenda Item 15)²⁸

240. Australia, as Chair of the EWG on Priorities, introduced the item on Codex Schedules and Priorities and introduced the revised Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides.

2022 Schedule for JMPR evaluations

241. The EWG Chair provided the list of 6 compounds proposed for the 2022 Schedule of new compounds. The Observer from CropLife International questioned the status of compounds from the 2021 schedule for JMPR evaluations. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that JMPR would manage scheduling of all compounds that had been identified in the JMPR call for data - and complete these evaluations when possible. CCPR was advised not to reschedule onto the 2022 list any compounds not yet evaluated but for which a call for data had already been issued.
242. The EWG Chair advised CCPR that there were 20 confirmed nominations listed in the proposed 2022 Schedule for new use and other evaluations, with four reserve compounds.
243. CCPR was advised that CRD02 listed 6 nominations in the 2022 Schedule of Periodic Reviews, however a recent request to implement the 4-year rule had been received for Pirimicarb (101), in addition to the previously received 4-year rule requests for Clethodim (187), Hydrogen Phosphide (46) and Guazatine (114). These extensions would allow the sponsors time to compile the necessary data for JMPR assessment. After removal of pirimicarb under the 4-year rule, the proposed schedule for Periodic Reviews would include five compounds.
244. A member noted the complexity associated with periodic review of dithiocarbamates, which comprised a number of compounds, making it more complicated than periodic review of a single compound. The Observer from CropLife International advised CCPR that a number of their members were working cooperatively towards provision of data to support an evaluation of dithiocarbamates in 2022 and hoped that this evaluation would proceed on schedule. The JMPR Secretariat reminded CCPR of difficulties in conducting complex reviews in virtual meetings due to the COVID-19 restrictions and highlighted the limitation on statistical resources available to JMPR.

²⁸ CX/PR 21/52/19; CX/PR 21/52/19-Add.1 (Public health concerns to schedule compounds for periodic review by JMPR submitted by the EU); CRD02-Appendix A

Public Health Concerns

245. The EWG Chair reminded CCPR of the procedure for raising public health concerns as outlined in the *Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR* (Procedural Manual). CCPR was advised of the public health concern raised by the EU against Propiconazole (160), Chlorothalonil (81), Chlorpyrifos (17) and Chlorpyrifos-Methyl (90). In addition, a PHC was raised by the UK for chlorothalonil. JMPR indicated that it would provide an independent assessment of the issues raised in the concern forms.

Unsupported Compounds Designated for Deletion from CCPR Pesticide List

246. The EWG Chair reminded CCPR that six compounds: Amitraz (122), Bromide ion (47), Bromopropylate (70), Dichloran (83), Fenarimol (192) and Fenbutatin Oxide (109), were flagged for removal from the CCPR Pesticide List at earlier meetings on the basis of public health concerns and/or lack of support.
247. The EWG Chair noted that unsupported compounds would be discussed further under Agenda Item 13, but proposed to CCPR that Bromide Ion (47), Bromopropylate (70), Dichloran (83) and Fenarimol (192) be removed from the CCPR Pesticide List and that two compounds, Amitraz (122) and Fenbutatin Oxide (109), be retained under the 4-year rule assuming a sponsor was identified and agreed to conduct any necessary studies to update any requisite information. The EU advised CCPR that it supported removal of the compounds that are no longer supported by a manufacturer and for which public health concerns have been identified. The USA and Canada supported the proposal to retain amitraz (122) and fenbutatin oxide (109) assuming a sponsor was identified.

Other matters

248. CropLife International recognized the full schedule of JMPR and hoped that it be could managed in a virtual setting. The Observer enquired how the backlog would be handled in case the evaluations could not be completed and referred to CRD11 where some thoughts were given on how the backlog that had built up due to the COVID19 pandemic for CCPR and JMPR could be resolved or reduced by proposing pragmatic solutions to allow CCPR and JMPR to work more effectively and efficiently in emergency situations and thus become more resilient. The Observer indicated its support to any undertaking that could be put in place by CCPR and/or JMPR to address this issue and provide constructive input to help meet the objective of the Codex and CCPR mandates to ensure public health and trade facilitation. The Observer looked forward to further discussion on this matter under Agenda Item 16 (see Agenda Item 1).

Conclusion

249. CCPR agreed:
- (i) To forward the proposed Schedule of Pesticides for evaluation by the 2022 JMPR to CAC for approval (Appendix XV).
 - (ii) To remove from the CCPR Pesticide List the compounds: bromide ion (47), bromopropylate (70), dichloran (83) and fenarimol (192) and retain amitraz (122) and fenbutatin oxide (109) under the 4-year rule pending identification of a sponsor by the next meeting of CCPR.
 - (iii) To re-convene the EWG on Priorities, chaired by Australia and working in English. The EWG will be tasked with providing a report on the schedules and priority list for consideration at the next meeting of CCPR.

OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 16)

250. CCPR noted that due to time limitations, the three items proposed under Agenda Item 1 would be discussed at its next session.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 17)

251. CCPR was informed that its 53rd Session was tentatively scheduled to be held in China, in 2022, the final arrangements being *subject* to confirmation by the Host Country and the Codex Secretariats.