

# codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD  
HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

**Agenda Item 2**

**CX/PR 04/2**  
**February 2004**

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

**Thirty-sixth Session**  
**New Delhi, India, 19 - 24 April 2004**

#### MATTERS REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND/OR OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES

26<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission had considered different issues that are relevant to the work of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. For details of consideration see ALINORM 03/41 which is available from:

[ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/alinorm03/al03\\_41e.pdf](ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/alinorm03/al03_41e.pdf)

#### **1. GENERAL DECISIONS OF THE 26<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION (Rome, Italy, 30 June - 7 July 2003)**

##### **1.1 AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURAL MANUAL**

###### **Clarification of Rule VI.4 (Voting and Procedures)**

1. The Commission amended Rule VI.4 on Voting and Procedures to include a reference to Rule X.2 related to the adoption or amendments of Codex standards by consensus<sup>1</sup>.

###### **Membership of Regional Economic Integration Organizations**

2. The Commission amended Rule I on Membership by adding a new Rule 1.3 (current Rule 1.3 renumbered as Rule 1.4). The Commission also added a new Rule II (subsequent Rules renumbered accordingly) to allow regional economic integration organizations to exercise rights of membership within the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary bodies<sup>2</sup>.

###### **Measures to Facilitate Consensus**

3. The Commission adopted the *Measures to Facilitate Consensus* for inclusion in the Procedural Manual as a general decision of the Commission<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras. 15-18 and Appendix II.

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras. 19-24 and Appendix II.

<sup>3</sup> ALINORM 03/41, paras. 28-31 and Appendix III.

## **1.2 JOINT FAO/WHO EVALUATION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS AND OTHER FAO AND WHO WORK ON FOOD STANDARDS**

4. The Commission approved most of the proposals submitted by the Codex Secretariat for the implementation of the recommendations of the Joint FAO/WHO Evaluation of Codex Alimentarius, enacting some immediately and requesting the Codex Committee on General Principles to act in special sessions to draft the Rules required to implement others. Some selected decisions are summarized below. Further details on this matter can be found in the report of the 26<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (ALINORM 03/41, paras. 149-183).

### **1.2.1 General Aspects**

#### *Annual meetings of the Commission*

5. The Commission agreed to meet annually for the next two years, but that in future each session would consider the timing for the following session and the general nature of the agenda in order to achieve the appropriate balance between standards issues, general direction of work and policy matters, and taking into account the resources available for adequate participation.

#### *Implementation of the Evaluation*

6. The Commission decided that the responsibility for following up and monitoring progress in the implementation of the recommendations from the Evaluation Report would be entrusted to the Executive Committee. Twice-yearly sessions of the Committee would be scheduled in order to absorb the additional workload.

#### *Priorities for implementation*

7. The Commission decided that the priorities should be:
- (a) Processes for standards management, with due regard to the special needs of developing countries.
  - (b) Functions and composition of the Executive Committee, including the participation of observers in the Executive Committee and Executive Committee procedures.
  - (c) Review of the Committee structures and mandates (including Regional Committees).
  - (d) Review of Rules and Procedures including guidelines for Codex Committees.

The Commission concluded that all four priorities were of equal importance, and that the ranking was made on the grounds of speed of potential progress.

### **1.2.2 Review of Codex Committee Structure and Mandates of Codex Committees and Task Forces, including Regional Committees**

8. The Commission decided that all the Committees and Task Forces would be reviewed together bearing in mind the objective of reducing the number of meetings while also keeping them short and focused. The Commission endorsed the recommendation made by the Executive Committee concerning the selection of consultants that would be entrusted with the review,<sup>4</sup> and stressed the critical importance of transparency in the process.

### **1.2.3 Improved Processes for Standards Management**

#### *Critical review of proposals to undertake work and monitoring progress of standards development*

9. The Commission decided to endorse the critical review process, including the preparation of project documents for major standards as well as the closely related proposal to revise the **CRITERIA FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF WORK PRIORITIES** in order to ensure the relevance of Codex standards at the international level.

---

<sup>4</sup> ALINORM 03/4, para. 23.

### ***Standards management responsibility***

10. The Commission decided that the Executive Committee be the body to undertake the critical review of new work. The Commission did not favour the replacement of the Executive Committee with an Executive Board.

### ***Time-bound decision-making***

11. The Commission decided that the body responsible for standards management (i.e. the Executive Committee) should review the status of development of draft standards at the end of a specified time-frame, normally not more than five years, and report its findings to the Commission. The time-frame could be less than five years, where this was appropriate or had been established during the critical review process for new work.

### ***Simplified procedures for standards development***

12. The Commission decided to retain the 8-Step process, with the existing mechanisms to accelerate the process when necessary.

### ***Use of facilitators and Establishment of electronic and/or physical working groups***

13. The Commission agreed in principle to all three proposals but decided that the modalities would require clarification by the body responsible for reviewing the Procedural Manual. With respect to electronic working groups, the Commission noted that these were an avenue for exchanging views and not for decision making. Physical working groups should be ad hoc, open to all members, take account the problems of developing country participation and only be established where there is consensus in the Committee to do so and other strategies have been considered.

### ***Adoption of Standards***

14. The Commission decided that adoption of standards with a limited amendment should be allowed, provided that the draft standard had been forwarded to the Commission on the basis of consensus, based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

## **1.2.4 Review of the Rules of Procedure and Other Procedural Matters**

### ***Responsibility for the Procedural Review***

15. The Commission decided that the procedural review would be undertaken by the Codex Committee on General Principles, at special sessions and under a limited time-frame. The Commission agreed that the Committee would need clear instructions, terms of reference from the Commission and support from the Codex Secretariat.

### ***Amendment of the Codex Mandate***

16. The Commission decided that the current Codex Mandate as expressed in Article 1 of the Statutes of the Commission, should be retained but that it might be discussed in the future.

### ***Criteria for the establishment of work priorities***

17. The Commission requested the Codex Committee on General Principles to redraft the *Criteria for Work Priorities* to reflect the current priorities of the Commission and in a manner that would provide explicit judgment tools for assessing work proposals against priorities.

### 1.3 RISK ANALYSIS<sup>5</sup>

18. While considering the Risk Analysis Policies of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (for details see ALINIORM 03/41, paras 142-148) it adopted the Draft Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius elaborated by the Committee on General Principles and **requested that relevant Codex Committees** develop or complete specific guidelines on risk analysis in their respective areas, for inclusion in the Procedural Manual, as recommended in the Action Plan mentioned above. The Commission noted that these texts would be submitted to the Committee on General Principles in order to ensure coordination of work and consistency with the overarching Working Principles.

19. The Committee is therefore invited to consider what work in this regard is necessary in this regard.

### 1.4 FAO/WHO TRUST FUND<sup>6</sup>

20. The Commission welcomed the progress made on the FAO/WHO Trust Fund for Participation of Developing Countries in Codex Standard Setting Procedures and expressed hope that it would achieve the desirable threshold before the end of 2003, so that it would be operational by the time of the next Session of the Commission.

### 1.5 OTHER MATTERS ARISING FROM FAO/WHO AND OIE

#### *Scientific advice*

21. The Commission welcomed the progress made by FAO and WHO in the preparation of the Consultative Study on the Provision of Scientific Advice and expressed appreciation on the progress already made. The Commission indicated the need to involve in the process all stakeholders and the importance to ensure adequate interaction between risk assessors and risk managers. It was suggested that the process should also consider mechanisms to avoid duplication of efforts.

22. The Commission noted the efforts of FAO and WHO in improving transparency in the selection of experts and in working procedures and the enhanced timeliness and quality of scientific advice provided to Codex.

23. The Commission acknowledged the large amount of requests for scientific advice raised through the Codex system. It recognized the need for Codex to prioritize its requests in coordination with the Secretariats of the FAO/WHO Scientific Committees and of the *ad hoc* Expert Consultations, considering also the needs of scientific advice of developing countries.

24. The Commission noted the need for Member Countries to provide appropriate data, experts and other necessary resources to facilitate the timely provision of the advice requested. It stressed the importance of considering data from developing countries. In this regard it pointed out that FAO/WHO should help developing countries to generate data required to set international standards. It welcomed the resolution of the World Health Assembly in this regard and the efforts already made by FAO and WHO.

#### *FAO/WHO Workshop on the provision of scientific advice to Codex and member countries, 27 - 29 January 2004*

25. FAO and WHO are implementing a consultative process on means to improve the provision of scientific advice to Codex and to FAO/WHO Member Countries. The study will review issues related to the independence, transparency, timeliness, efficiency, integrity, sustainability and quality of the advice. FAO and WHO are committed to carrying out the review process in an open and transparent manner and intend to harness all available opinions and viewpoints from interested parties.

---

<sup>5</sup> ALINORM 03/26/6, ALINORM 03/33A Appendix IV.

<sup>6</sup> For details of consideration see ALINORM 03/41, paras 184-189.

25. The steps in the consultative process have been agreed upon by FAO and WHO and consist of a Planning Meeting, an Electronic Forum, a Workshop and an Expert Consultation, which are scheduled to take place over the next year.

27. The forthcoming Workshop is the second step in the FAO/WHO consultative process. During the workshop experts will be asked to agree upon a set of priority issues, which if addressed, would significantly improve the management and working procedures of FAO and WHO in the provision of scientific advice.

28. Background information for the Workshop includes the background papers prepared for the e-forum and the analysis of the comments received from participants to the forum.

29. There will be an up-dated information from FAO/WHO on this issue during the meeting.

### ***2003 Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), Geneva, 15-24 September 2003***

The Meeting evaluated 23 pesticides, including four new compounds and nine compounds re-evaluated within the Periodic Review Programme of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR). The meeting allocated acceptable daily intakes (ADIs) and acute reference doses (acute RfDs) and estimated maximum residue levels which it recommended for use as maximum residue limits (MRLs) by the CCPR. These proposed draft limits were circulated for government comments at Step 3. General items from the 2003 JMPR report will be considered under Agenda Item 3.

The 2003 JMPR report would be available to the delegates at the 36<sup>th</sup> session of the CCPR .

## **2. DECISIONS OF THE COMMISSION CONCERNING THE WORK OF THE COMMITTEE**

### **Draft Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides (MRLs)<sup>7</sup>**

30. The Commission noted the proposal by the Delegation of France and **returned to Step 6** the draft MRLs for amitrole (079) and carbendazim (072) in order to clarify problems with method of determination and draft MRLs for piperonyl butoxide (062) in order to clarify the nature of its use and **adopted** all other draft MRLs at Step 8 and Steps 5/8 as proposed.

31. The Commission also revoked Codex Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides as presented in ALINORM 03/24, Appendix IV and ALINORM 03/24A, Appendix VI.

### **Draft Extraneous Maximum Residue Limits (DDT in Poultry Meat)<sup>8</sup>**

32. The Commission **adopted** the draft Extraneous Maximum Residue Limit for DDT in poultry meat at Step 8.

### **Draft Guidelines on Good Laboratory Practice in Pesticide Residue Analysis<sup>9</sup>**

33. The Commission **adopted** the draft Guidelines at Step 8.

### **Recommended Methods of Analysis for Pesticide Residues: Proposed Draft Amendments to the Introduction Section<sup>10</sup>**

34. The Commission **adopted** the proposed draft amendments at Steps 5 and 8.

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 03/24, Appendix II; ALINORM 03/24A, Appendix III and Appendix IV.

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 03/24A, para. 140.

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 03/24A, Appendix III.

<sup>10</sup> ALINORM 03/24A, Appendix V.

**Proposed Draft Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues<sup>11</sup>**

35. The Commission **advanced** the Proposed Draft Maximum Residue Limits to Step 6.

**NEW WORK**

36. The Commission approved the following new work for the Committee:

- Priority List of Pesticides (new pesticides and pesticides under periodic review)
- Proposed Draft Guidelines on the Use of Mass Spectrometry (MS) for Identification, Confirmation and Quantitative Determination of Residues
- Periodic review of the Existing Texts Relating to Methods of Analysis and Sampling for the Determination of Residues for Compliance with MRLs
- Proposed Draft Guidelines on the Estimation of Uncertainty of Results
- Proposed Revised Criteria for Prioritization Process of Compounds for Evaluation by JMPR

---

<sup>11</sup> ALINORM 03/24A, Appendix V.