

INTRODUCTION

1. The 54th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) was held in Beijing, People's Republic of China, from 26 June to 1 July 2023 at the kind invitation of the Government of China. The Session was chaired by Dr Weili SHAN, Chairperson, and Dr Lifang DUAN, Vice-Chairperson, assisted by Chief Advisor Dr Xiongwu QIAO. The Session was attended by delegates from XX Member countries, one Member Organization, XX Observer Organizations and Palestine. The List of Participants is attached as Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Mr Xingwang ZHANG, Vice Minister at the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China, opened the meeting, welcoming participants, commending the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) for its extraordinary achievements over the past 60 years, in protecting consumer health, facilitating fair international trade, and contributing to sustainable development goals of the United Nations. The Vice Minister also noted that the Chinese government had consistently made strong commitments towards food safety and that in recent years, China introduced a series of major initiatives in this field, and made important progress. The Vice Minister concluded his intervention by highlighting that, effective supply, quality and the safety of food and agricultural products was a shared responsibility of all countries and that everyone should strengthen exchange and cooperation, and make joint efforts for food security and sustainable development across the world.
3. Mr Tom Heilandt, Codex Secretary, in recalling the 60th Anniversary of Codex, indicated that the Codex Secretariat had started a project to overhaul the Codex website which hosts, amongst others, databases (DB) which are at the core of Codex work on food safety standards such as the database of MRLs for pesticides. In this regard, one of the key objectives of the project was to publish the revised *Classification of Foods and Feeds* and to adapt and if necessary, rebuild the pesticides database to reflect the revised Classification. The experience gained so far with the new website and the migration of databases evidenced the need to start with a clear concept of what is needed to be able to produce a tool for all intended users. To this aim, the Codex Secretariat is now in the planning phase that would lead to the publication of the revised Classification and the new DB in the most feasible and effective way. He hoped that members and observers might use this session to make any further relevant suggestions that could contribute to this process.
4. Mr Nii Quaye-Kumah, FAO Representative ad interim to China and DPR Korea, Mr Soren Madsen on behalf WHO and Mr Steve Wearne, Chairperson of CAC, also addressed the Committee.

Division of Competence

5. 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)

6. CCPR adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the Session.
7. CCPR further agreed to establish two In-Session Working Groups (WGs):
 - i. A WG open to all Members and Observers, chaired by India, working in English, to consider the proposal for new work in Appendix II to CX/PR 23/54/14, taking into account written comments submitted in reply to CL 2023/38-PR, and to prepare a revised proposal for consideration by the plenary (Agenda Item 12); and
 - ii. A WG open to all Members and Observers, chaired by the United States of America (USA), working in English, to consider further steps and timelines to continue work on enhancement of the operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR, taking into account written comments submitted in reply to CL 2023/39-PR, and to prepare revised terms of reference for consideration by the plenary (Agenda Item 13).

APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEURS (Agenda Item 2)

8. CCPR noted that David Lunn (New Zealand) had retired and therefore would no longer be serving as rapporteur for future sessions of the Committee. CCPR acknowledged the long-standing contribution of Mr Lunn to the work of the Committee as rapporteur which extended to more than 20 years of service.
9. CCPR appointed Sarah McGrath (USA) to act as rapporteur for this Session.
10. The Chairperson recalled the core work of CCPR on the establishment of MRLs for pesticides and the importance to reflect discussion on MRLs accurately in the report of the Committee's session. He encouraged Codex members to provide rapporteurs to support the work of the Committee on this particular item.

MATTERS REFERRED TO CCPR BY CAC AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda Item 3)¹

11. CCPR noted that the document was mainly for information and that matters for action will be discussed under relevant Agenda items.
12. With regard to paragraphs 16-20 of the working document, a Member Organization indicated their support for investigating potential mechanism to address cross-cutting, overarching, and emerging issues in Codex, even if such subjects do not always yet fall naturally within the terms of reference (TOR) of existing Committees. They considered that some flexibility was proposed for dealing with such issues in the existing Committees and that such flexibility should also apply in other cases, such as the consideration of environmental issues of global concern when establishing CXLs.

Conclusion

13. CCPR:
 - (i) noted the matters for information on decisions of CAC in relation to MRLs for pesticides and other cross-cutting issues of interest to Codex being considered in CAC, the Executive Committee of CAC (CCEXEC) as well as other matters arising from the Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) and Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification Systems (CCFICS) on the removal of ortho-phenylphenols from the *General Standard for Food Additives* (CXS 192-1995) (GSFA) and the review/update of the *Principles for Traceability/Product tracing as a tool within a food inspection and certification system* (CXG 60-2006) respectively;
 - (ii) encouraged Members and Observers, on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of Codex, to plan and implement activities to build awareness of Codex and to engage high level political support for Codex work and to consider the implementation of a regional event to mark the 60th anniversary;
 - (iii) encouraged Members and Observers to actively engage in opportunities to contribute to the discussions in CCEXEC and CAC (i.e., the operationalization of the *Statements of Principle Concerning the Role of Science in the Codex Decision-Making Process and the extent to which other factors are taken into account* (SoP); the future of Codex; new food sources and production systems, and monitoring the use of Codex standards) by providing replies to relevant CLs; and
 - (iv) noted that the matters listed below would be considered under Agenda Items 7(c), 8 and 12 respectively.
 - (a) the portion of commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analyzed with regard to Group 014 (Assorted fruits – Inedible peel) and Group 006 (Assorted tropical and subtropical fruits – Inedible peel)
 - (b) coordination of work between CCPR and Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF); and
 - (c) whether ethylene oxide (EtO) meets the Codex definition for pesticides and whether coordination of work would be required between JECFA/JMPR if this compound is assessed as a contaminant by Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF).

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda Item 4a)²**FAO****One Health Approach and Pesticide Risk Reduction**

14. The FAO Representative informed CCPR on the updates of FAO activities under the One Health framework and pesticide risk reduction and recalled that FAO promoted integrated pest management, biopesticide and other green production practices, mentioning the Global Action on Fall Armyworm Control as a successful case. The Representative also recalled that awareness raising activities on AMU and AMR and technical networks on AMU and AMR in agriculture had been strengthened and consolidated stressing that FAO continued to support Member States in strengthening sound pesticide management and risk reduction through the lifecycle management approach, highly hazard pesticides (HHPs) and mainstreaming biodiversity are priorities.
15. The FAO Representative further noted that FAO developed new tools, including pesticide registration toolkit, e-learning course, manuals, guidelines, and database to facilitate the member countries to reduce the risk of pesticide to human and environment.

¹ CX/PR 23/54/2

² CX/PR 23/54/3

WHO*Databases available on individual food consumption and chemical hazards in food*

16. The WHO Representative presented CIFOcOss and GEMS Food databases and explained that these databases were used by JMPR for exposure assessment. The Representative recalled that both databases were freely available on the WHO website for Member States and other interested parties to use and encouraged Member States to submit relevant data to further strengthen the datasets.

Early warning alert and response to food safety emergencies

17. The Representative of WHO also highlighted the INFOSAN network and its use in the management and data exchange in food safety events of international significance, recalling that INFOSAN Emergency Contact Points were established in most Member States.

Discussion

18. A Member Organization (MO) welcomed the continuous commitment of FAO and WHO to strengthen the one health approach and highlighted the activities of JMPM, in particular that UNEP had been formally invited to join the JMPM Secretariat to reflect the importance of environmental issues in pesticide management. The MO welcomed information from FAO and WHO on the activities of JMPM, including the possibility of inviting the JMPM Secretariat and UNEP to CCPR sessions to enhance information sharing and foster possible ways of collaboration on cross-cutting issues. The MO noted the need to define harmonized measures to address environmental issues of global concern in international fora as such issues could not be addressed by one country or region alone, hence they should be considered during the establishment of Codex MRLs and included on the agenda of international cooperation and coordination activities. The MO welcomed further discussions on the possibilities to integrate such reflection in the work of CCPR.
19. A Member supported the views expressed by the MO since human, plant, animal, and environmental health were closely interlinked. The Member noted that collaboration on cross-cutting issues relevant to food safety and the environment should be discussed in CCPR during the MRL-setting process as it could contribute preventing the use of compounds of global environmental concern although environmental considerations were not in the remit of CCPR however, there would be merit in holding such discussions within the Committee.
20. Other members expressed their appreciation for FAO and WHO work on integrated pest management, biopesticides, AMU, AMR, Armyworm control and databases.
21. A Member indicated that their country encouraged integrated pest management as part of their efforts to promote sustainable development in agriculture and supported reduction of food safety incidents caused by ethylene oxide and other contaminants as informed by the INFOSAN Secretariat. Another Member enquired on the availability of a database for AMU in agriculture.
22. The Representative of FAO acknowledged the interest expressed in the activities of JMPM and that FAO and WHO could continue to update CCPR on JMPM work in future. The Representative also recognized the interest of members on other FAO activities reported in document. He noted that FAO was in process of developing a database on AMU in crop protection and encouraged Codex members to submit data to support the establishment of the database.
23. A Member requested WHO to consider mechanisms to provide capacity building in particular for African countries so they could actively contribute to the various databases so as to get information on individual food consumption data to improve dietary exposure assessment.
24. The Representative of WHO noted that the CIFOcOss database contained sufficient data, also from developing countries, to be representative, however, it was important for all countries to continue to submit data to this database to further improve the outputs of exposure assessments.

Conclusion

25. CCPR:
- (i) welcomed the report provided by FAO and WHO; and
 - (ii) noted the comments made by Delegations and clarifications provided by FAO and WHO.

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (Agenda Item 4b)³**Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture**

26. The Representative of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre introduced the item via video recalling that Member countries of the two organizations continued to seek assistance from the Joint Centre in the area of food safety and that such assistance had been provided through coordinated research and technical cooperation activities including networks, data generation and meetings. He highlighted the activities of interest to CCPR in the aforesaid areas, in particular in the area of coordinated research, he mentioned the depletion of veterinary drugs and radiometric analysis of their residues in animal matrices to support the establishment of MRLs for certain veterinary drugs, including dual use compounds, which was relevant to both, CCPR and CCRVDF; integrated radiometric and complementary techniques for mixed contaminants and residues in foods and the rapid screening for safe food.
27. The Representative also referred to the numerous capacity building projects relevant to the work of CCPR as listed in Table 1 of the working document. He recalled that the Joint Centre continued to support and promote the establishment of laboratory/food safety networks as a mechanism to strengthen capacities at national and regional level such as the Latin American and Caribbean Analytical Network (RALACA), the African Food Safety Network (AFoSaN) and a food safety network in Asia. In addition, the Joint Centre hosts a database of analytical methods to support routine analysis and surveillance programs. The Representative further noted the contribution of the Joint Centre to data generation for the establishment of MRLs, in particular for targeted pesticides for okra. The outcomes of the training course were shared with 2022 JMPR Meeting to aid discussion on this matter in CCPR.
28. The Representative also informed CCPR that the Joint Centre would host an International Symposium on Food Safety and Control at IAEA Headquarters in Vienna, Austria, in May 2024 which would address key food safety topics such as food fraud/authenticity; chemical residues and contaminants in food and feed; standard setting and risk assessment; one health holistic approach to human, animal, plant health and environment, etc. Further information on these and other activities of the Joint Centre of relevance to Codex work on pesticide residues were described in the working document.
29. Members expressed their appreciation to the work of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre and thanked the Joint Centre for their support and cooperation in strengthening food safety capacities in their countries, in particular laboratory capacities and development of laboratory networks, especially in the area of analytical methods of multi-class pesticides. This in turn allow data generation for agricultural commodities of relevant to countries and CCPR, which have made significant contributions to improving their food control systems and participation in Codex work.

Conclusion

30. CCPR
 - (i) welcomed the information provided;
 - (ii) commended the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre for their capacity building and other activities concerning the safety of pesticides, and chemicals in general, in food and feed, using nuclear and related techniques, to strengthen capacities in developing countries;
 - (iii) noted the support of Member countries to these activities; and
 - (iv) encouraged further cooperation between Codex, Member countries and the Joint FAO/IAEA in this regard.

REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ARISING FROM THE 2022 JMPR REGULAR MEETINGS (Agenda Item 5a)⁴

31. CCPR noted the information provided by the FAO and WHO JMPR Secretariats including comments made by delegations as follows:
 - 1. Requirements for data on the impact of residues on the human intestinal microbiome**
32. The WHO JMPR Secretariat reported that JECFA has been assessing residues of veterinary drugs for their possible impact on the human microbiome for almost 20 years, specifically for two endpoints of concern: disruption of the bacterial colonization barrier and increase in bacterial resistance. To facilitate these assessments, guidance from the International Cooperation on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Veterinary Medicinal Products, VICH GL36(R), was adopted by the 66th Meeting of the JECFA Committee, for food-producing animal drugs.

³ CX/PR 23/54/4

⁴ Report of the 2022 JMPR Meeting, Section 2

33. Whilst the initial focus of JECFA was on antibiotics, it is now recognized that other drugs can have detrimental effects regarding these end-points of concern, and JECFA now systematically assesses the possible need for a mADI and mARfD for all drugs. Over the last decade evidence has accumulated that a wide range of compounds can affect the human microbiome, including pesticides. Hence, JMPR needed to consider how it would address this concern. A good starting point would be VICH GL36(R), and its provisions might be sufficient for this purpose.
34. JMPR recommended that the joint JMPR Secretariat convene a microbiome expert working group to consider the above points with a view to developing draft guidance for discussion and eventual adoption by JMPR. He reported that the process to establish this work group was underway and that work had not yet started.
35. CCPR noted that this was an important and evolving matter and welcomed the establishment of the expert working group to look into this matter.
36. Views were also expressed that:
- If the working group identified need for requirements to consider the impact on the human microbiome from pesticide use during risk assessment that the OECD should develop internationally agreed harmonized guidance for risk assessment.
 - The working group should include experts from industry and well as those involved in risk management.
 - Lessons could be learnt from JECFA especially for the assessment of compounds with dual use e.g. as veterinary drug and pesticide.
 - A harmonized framework for risk assessment would help guide national authorities as they register products as such information would be required in the registration process.
37. The WHO JMPR Secretariat confirmed that the issue of dual-use compounds was relevant because it is currently a requirement in JECFA to have an assessment of the impact of the microbiome in the evaluation of any veterinary drug. With respect to guidance available for veterinary drug residues, he explained that the VICH could be the starting point also for other types of chemicals in use in many different parts of the world and noted that the working group would start from there and would see to what degree that could be relevant also in the area of pesticides.

2. Non-linear kinetics (KMD)

38. The WHO JMPR Representative explained that non-linear kinetics was a method that could be used in the toxicological assessment of a pesticide. He informed CCPR that a working group had been established under the JMPR and were working on establishing guidance on how to use KMD. For that purpose, relevant case studies had been requested. He noted that one case study had been received from the industry, but that more case studies were desired in order to further test the methodology. He therefore requested industry to consider submitting additional test cases that could be relevant to the development of this guidance.
39. CCPR recognised the efforts of JMPR in continuously strengthening the technical capacity and considering new approaches to reduce the uncertainty of the data and therefore improve the accuracy of assessment. CCPR welcomed the establishment of the Working Group and noted the current activities of the WG on the assessment and interpretation of non-linear kinetics and encouraged members and observers to submit the relevant case studies as required by the WG for developing the guidance on the assessment and interpretation of the non-linear kinetics.

3. Interpretation and follow-up of positive results in in-vitro gene mutation assays

40. The WHO JMPR Secretariat noted that this consideration was primarily addressing data sponsors. He informed CCPR that information on genotoxicity is a key component in hazard/risk assessment of all chemical agents used for anthropic use, including pesticides. Many regulatory agencies and advisory bodies have made recommendations on strategies for genotoxicity testing and assessment. The majority of testing strategies recommend the use of a basic test battery comprising two or more in vitro tests to cover the three main mutagenicity end-points. In addition, they recommend an in vivo test as a follow-up to assess whether any genotoxic potential observed in vitro is expressed in vivo. The choice of an in vivo study is not established by default but rather should reflect the positive end-point observed in vitro.
41. He noted that if in-vivo confirmation was not received, then JMPR cannot finalise the evaluation until the data has been generated which causes delays in the work of JMPR and in the outcome of the evaluations. Therefore, it was a request to data sponsors to take this into account, to use in vitro data, but if there are genotoxic potential observed, it has to be confirmed by in vivo tests.
42. CCPR welcomed the information provided and noted a comment from a member this was a very wide area and that it was important to understand which area was being targeted and that requests should be more specific, otherwise it would be difficult to draw a conclusion.

4. A risk-based decision tree approach for the safety evaluation of residues of pesticides, veterinary drugs, food additives and contaminants

43. The WHO JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that advice was often sought on substances for which the establishment of health-based guidance values (HBGVs) and/or recommendation of MRLs was not appropriate. JECFA had developed approaches for these situations for contaminants but for authorized chemicals there was no agreed approach. Over the years there had been discussion to develop a decision tree for the evaluation of veterinary drugs and a risk-based decision tree for evaluation of veterinary drugs had been developed but required further development.
44. JMPR had discussed the decision tree and agreed that in principle it would be of value also to their work. It would provide an opportunity to integrate issues, such as the microbiological assessment of pesticide residues and less-than-lifetime exposure, into the work of JMPR. JMPR endorsed the recommendation that a cross-committee electronic working group should be convened, to further develop the decision-tree approach with a view to generalizing this to the work of JECFA and JMPR.
45. The JMPR Secretariat informed that the working group would consist of experts from the 3 subcommittees of JECFA and JMPR and would be discussed first in the JECFA meeting scheduled for February 2024 and in the following JMPR meeting in 2024.
46. CCPR noted the information provided and welcomed the convening of the cross committee WG to further develop the decision tree approach and that JMPR continued to refine its decision-making approaches. .

5. Unnecessary use of in vivo animal studies

47. The WHO JMPR secretariat noted that this consideration overlapped with the previous consideration (3) above and that the key message was not to undertake unnecessary in vivo animal studies.
48. An observer noted that they took animal welfare very seriously and minimized the use of animal studies to the extent possible. However, working in a global environment often meant that national regulators have different requirements and different levels of acceptance of in-vivo studies and that as such, companies have no option but to undertake tests on animals for one regulator where another regulator might accept non-animal studies or scientific argument.

6. Establishment of MRLs for pesticides for okra

49. The FAO JMPR Secretariat introduced the consideration and informed CCPR of the conclusion of JMPR that introduction of a specific sub-group 12D okra (including martynia and roselle) with okra as the representative commodity (option 3) would result in appropriate MRL estimates. This conclusion was based on analysis of newly provided data, as well as data provided to 2018 JMPR and available from public literature, which indicated that there was no scientific evidence identified supporting extrapolation of residue data in chilli pepper to okra, which confirmed its recommendation from the 2018 JMPR meeting. He further explained that JMPR acknowledged difficulties in the data generation for a minor crop such as okra. JMPR had further indicated that future analysis of residues for okra, chilli pepper and related sub-groups should be based on comparable use patterns with corresponding field trials instead of monitoring data; and ideally residues should be analysed directly after the last application in these studies to minimize the variability due to plant growth and/or environmental influences.
50. CCPR considered the conclusion of JMPR. Members while acknowledging the conclusion of JMPR noted that:
 - a pragmatic risk management decision was needed to ensure that there would be MRLs for okra;
 - the option proposed by JMPR (option 3) would require okra field trials to generate data for MRL establishment which would be challenging for developing countries CCPR should consider the option 2, i.e. to create a separate subgroup with chilli pepper as the representative commodity;
 - okra was a minor crop but traded internationally and lack of MRLs could result in technical barriers to trade;
 - the conclusions of JMPR were based on limited field trial data submitted, and that members commit generating and submitting further robust data for evaluation by JMPR; and
 - the Subgroup 12B of peppers including okra should be applied while further data are generated (i.e. similar use pattern for okra and chilli pepper/side-by-side trials) to allow for a more robust assessment by JMPR and a future decision on the appropriate classification for okra.
51. The FAO JMPR Secretariat confirmed that selection of a representative crop should be based on data sets from side-by-side field residue trials or studies in different regions if possible. JMPR, noting limited resources and many compounds waiting evaluation, would try its best to conduct evaluations when data became available.

Conclusion

52. Noting that there was no agreement with the JMPR conclusion and support for maintaining the current classification pending further data generation, CCPR concluded to keep okra in Subgroup 12B in the revised classification, waiting data generation for review by JMPR. CCPR noted that there was clear guidance in the JMPR report on the type of data to be generated and that data generation would take time and agreed to assess the commitment by countries to generate and submit data for evaluation by JMPR at its next session.

7. Enhancing operational procedures of JMPR to reduce the backlog

53. The WHO JMPR Secretariat reported that JMPR had noted the discussions of CCPR52 on opportunities for enhancing the operational procedures of JMPR and CCPR to reduce the backlog of evaluations and meet the future demands of establishing Codex MRLs for pesticides, as well as establishing an electronic working group to progress the discussions. He noted that proposals had been brought forward as appropriate to the EWG through the participation of JMPR experts in the two workshops organized on the subject.
54. CCPR noted that this matter would be considered under Agenda item 13 and deferred discussion until then.

8. OECD Update to the Guidance on Residue Definitions

55. The FAO JMPR secretariat noted that JMPR was provided with a draft of the OECD Guidance Document on Residue Definitions and a brief overview of the approaches to be proposed. JMPR appreciated the OECD working group work and the opportunity to preview the work being done by the OECD. He noted that once the OECD finalized the document, JMPR would consider the procedural process in whole or in part. He noted that the document would lay a good foundation for harmonizing the legislative residue definitions.
56. CCPR noted the update provided by a member that the guidance was targeted for completion by the end of 2023 and OECD declassification and publication was expected early in 2024.
57. CCPR noted the information provided, expressed appreciation to the OECD for their work and encouraged the JMPR Secretariat and JMPR experts to work closely the OECD working group and to contribute their experience in this area of interest.

9. Information on residues in rotational crops following use on paddy rice

58. The FAO JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR had noted that according to the current edition of the FAO Manual on "Submission and evaluation of pesticide residues data for the estimation of maximum residue levels in food and feed" information on rotational crops following treatment in paddy rice are not required. JMPR had reconsidered this position, taking into account information on the agricultural practice for paddy rice cultivation and other international Guidelines (e.g. OECD TG504) indicating potential crop rotation for this crop. Therefore, uptake of soil residues by follow-on crops needed to be considered in estimating MRLs, STMR and HR values. It was decided that the information given in the FAO Manual from 2016 did not reflect current agricultural practice and considered data on rotational crops (confined rotational crop information, conditional information on field rotational crop studies) as necessary to support uses on paddy rice. The FAO Manual would be amended accordingly.
59. CCPR acknowledged the efforts of JMPR on the continuation to refine and revise the FAO manual and encouraged the further amendment of the FAO manual to reflect current agricultural practices.

10. Common pyrazole metabolites

60. The WHO JMPR Secretariat noted that this issue was mainly for the attention of data providers. He informed CCPR that at the JMPR meeting a number of pesticides under consideration had common pyrazole metabolites, which were identified by different company code numbers. The toxicological data available on these pyrazole metabolites varied across the dossiers and this resulted in different conclusions being reached for the same pyrazole metabolite. JMPR only identified this issue at the last minute and was unable to resolve it within the available time. JMPR proposed to consider this at the 2023 meeting of JMPR and invited sponsors to present information to support this activity.

Conclusion

61. CCPR noted the information provided and encouraged the Codex members and observers to submit relevant data and information to JMPR to support these activities as appropriate.

REPORT ON RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC CONCERNS RAISED BY CCPR ARISING FROM THE 2022 JMPR REGULAR MEETING (Agenda Item 5b)⁵

62. CCPR noted that specific concerns on compounds raised by CCPR would be addressed when discussing the relevant compounds under Agenda Item 6.
63. The following compounds were addressed under Section 3 of the report of the 2022 JMPR Regular Meeting:
 - Section 3.1: 081 Chlorothalonil (R=residues)
 - Section 3.2: 167 Terbufos (T=toxicology)

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

General Remarks

64. The EU informed CCPR Members that the CXLs that were adopted by the 45th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, and for which the EU had not introduced reservations during CCPR53, have now been established in the EU.
65. The EU explained to CCPR that it was current EU policy to align EU MRLs with Codex MRLs (CXLs) if two conditions were fulfilled:
 - (i) the EU sets MRLs for the commodity under consideration; and
 - (ii) the current EU MRL is lower than the CXL.
66. The EU also advised CCPR that they would make reservations to the advancement of the proposed Codex MRLs during the discussions on the specific substances if toxicological data are not available at EU level, or are available but not yet assessed at EU level, and/or if the proposed CXL is not safe for European consumers, and/or if the proposed CXLs are not sufficiently supported by data as required according to the FAO manual or other agreed requirements, and/or if the CXL is not acceptable to the EU with respect to areas such as supporting data and extrapolations, as well as environmental issues of global nature (such as the decline of pollinators or the accumulation of persistent bio-accumulative and toxic substances in the environment) as described in CX/PR 23/54/5-Add.1.
67. Switzerland advised CCPR that they would be supporting all EU reservations as their residue risk assessment approach and policies were the same as that of the EU.
68. The USA indicated that global environmental issues was beyond the mandate of CCPR, as its focus is on protection of consumer health and facilitation of global trade and requested clarification on the scope of CCPR from the Secretariat.
69. The Codex Secretariat reiterated the comments made at CCPR53 and recalled that environmental issues are outside the scope of CCPR and Codex and that these questions should rather be addressed in the broader context of the ongoing discussions on the Future of Codex in CAC and CCEXEC.
70. Qatar requested the establishment of more CXLs for rice, which is a major crop in Gulf countries. The Codex Secretariat noted that the MRLs should be established in accordance with relevant procedures established in the *Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR* as laid down in the Procedural Manual and within the framework of the EWG on Priority Lists of Pesticides.

CXLs for okra

71. The FAO JMPR Secretariat clarified that based on existing data, okra could not be included in the peppers' subgroup and MRLs for commodities in this subgroup could not be extrapolated to okra in accordance with the recommendation of the 2018 and 2022 JMPR meetings (Agenda item 5a). Concerns previously expressed under Agenda item 5a were iterated that excluding okra from MRLs from the peppers' subgroup had the potential to negatively impact trade.
72. Based on the decision taken on okra under Agenda Item 5a, CCPR agreed to take risk management decision to remove the parenthetical qualifier statement "except okra, martynia and roselle" from any entry of MRLs or CXLs for pepper (subgroup) in the database, awaiting new residue trial data that could allow JMPR to complete its evaluation. This decision was taken, noting that taking into account the evaluation by the 2022 JMPR, there might be uncertainties for producers and importers to the level of residues in okra compared to pepper. There is a need for residue trial data to confirm classification and representative commodities for okra, martynia and roselle. The indicated MRL is provisionally applied. It was also agreed to add a note to the CXL and to the CCPR remarks to further clarify the situation of these CXLs (Appendix)

⁵ Report of the 2022 JMPR Meeting, Section 3

73. The FAO JMPR Secretariat acknowledged the authority of CCPR to take this decision as risk managers but noted that deleting the parenthetical qualifier was not aligned with the JMPR scientific decision and sets a precedent which might have negative impacts on the reputation of CAC as a science based standard setting body.
74. Delegations who supported the JMPR's assessment of the available information on okra and the conclusions presented in the general considerations of the 2022 JMPR report, highlighted the importance for members and observers to provide residue trial data to JMPR so that the evaluation can be completed.
75. CCPR recalled its decision to consider the data generation commitment at the CCPR55 (2024) in order to assess the decision taken at this session (Agenda Item 5a).

015 CHLORMEQUAT

76. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for barley; wheat; edible offal (mammalian); eggs; mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); and poultry edible offal of, because clarification on the cGAP were needed in the JMPR report for barley and wheat, and the MRLs for commodities of animal origin were rounded up to a MRL considered too high. CCPR also noted the clarification made by the JMPR Secretariat that the requested details are available in the 2022 JMPR report and recommendation for animal commodities is based on the dietary burden calculation and expert judgement to cover the possible worst-case scenario.
77. 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 2022 JMPR.

022 DIAZINON

78. The JMPR Secretariat reported that due to a lack of data on metabolites of diazinon, the experts were unable to derive a residue definition for this compound. CCPR agreed to revoke all CXLs as recommended by the 2022 JMPR and remove this compound from Codex Pesticides List.

027 DIMETHOATE/ 055 OMETHOATE

79. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for mandarins, subgroup of (including mandarins-like hybrids); avocado; brussels sprouts; tomato; yard-long bean (pods); dry beans, subgroup of (except soya bean); rape seed; wheat; edible offal (mammalian); mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; eggs; poultry fats; poultry meats; and poultry, edible offal of, due to the health concerns identified in the EFSA peer review.
80. CCPR further noted that the proposed draft MRLs for oranges, subgroup of, may present a public health concern due to the acute reference dose, as indicated by JMPR.
81. The FAO JMPR Secretariat clarified that the entries of citrus fruits (group) (excluding kumquats) and citrus pulp, dried, were based on extrapolation of an evaluation of oranges, sweet, sour (subgroup) and therefore may also present a health concern. The data sponsor indicated that they had provided additional data to JMPR that could be evaluated at the next opportunity. CCPR agreed to revoke the CXL for citrus fruits (group) (excluding kumquats) and withdraw the MRL for citrus pulp, dried, and to advance the proposed draft MRLs for oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids) (subgroup) and orange pulp, dried, to Step 4, awaiting further consideration by JMPR.
82. CCPR agreed to advance the remaining proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 and to revoke all other existing CXLs.
83. CCPR further agreed that because omethoate results from an application of dimethoate, the same conclusions above would apply: to revoke the CXL for citrus pulp, dried, and to advance the proposed draft MRLs for oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids) (subgroup) and orange pulp, dried, to Step 4, awaiting further evaluation by JMPR. In addition, CCPR agreed to revoke the omethoate CXLs for spices, fruits and berries, and spices, roots and rhizomes, because additional data were not submitted during periodic review and MRLs were revoked for these commodities under dimethoate. CCPR noted editorial corrections by JMPR of the entries for the categories of citrus pulp, dried (0.032 mg/kg corrected to 0.4 mg/kg) and wheat bran, processed (0.105 mg/kg corrected to 0.15 mg/kg).

051 METHIDATHION

84. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that data submitted for the scheduled periodic review of methidathion were insufficient to reach a conclusion on the residue definition. CCPR agreed to withdraw all CXLs for methidathion and remove it from the database, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

064 QUINTOZENE

85. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR it was unable to conclude on a residue definition for dietary risk assessment for plant commodities and a residue definition for compliance and risk assessment for animal commodities. The JMPR Secretariat further informed CCPR that exposure to some metabolites may exceed the TTC approach for genotoxic compounds (0.0025 µg/kg bw/day). The data sponsor informed CCPR that additional toxicology data would be made available, and CCPR agreed to maintain the CXLs under the 4-year rule, awaiting the JMPR evaluation of the new data.

081 CHLOROTHALONIL

86. In response to the concern form submitted by the UK in 2019, the JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that exposure to the metabolite R613636 from the use of Chlorothalonil is not expected to be a safety concern.
87. CCPR noted some concerns from EU regarding processing studies that may underestimate exposure to residues, that processing studies for animal products were not available, and that the genotoxic potential of metabolites R613636, R182281 (SDS-3701) and R417888 is inconclusive.
88. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that they did consider EU's comments, but that their evaluation was conducted using the standard TTC approach and the conclusions are appropriately conservative to protect human health.

105 DITHIOCARBAMATE / 050 MANCOZEB

89. CCPR noted a reservation by the EU and Switzerland to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for Cottonseed; Longan; Maize; Rice, husked; and soya bean; pending the ongoing review in the EU, and a reservation by the United Arab Emirates to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for polished rice that was determined by extrapolation from husked rice.
90. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that although they were not able to determine a processing factor between husked rice and polished rice, the proposed MRLs for these two commodities are appropriate because the residue level in polished rice should be lower than that in husked rice. The JMPR Secretariat further clarified that the periodic review of dithiocarbamates is complete, and the residue definition has been confirmed.
91. CCPR noted that the MRL for cotton seed contained an error and should be corrected to 0.4 mg/kg. CCPR agreed to advance all proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by JMPR 2022.

138 METALAXYL

92. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for pineapple and ginseng, dried including red ginseng, for adoption at Step 5/8, and noted the explanation made by JMPR that a processing factor for ginseng extract could not be established and therefore the experts could not recommend an MRL for this commodity.

167 TERBUFOS

93. CCPR noted the clarification made by JMPR in response to the concerns raised by CCPR53 and additional concerns submitted by the EU regarding the outdated toxicological assessment of terbufos and the lack of support from the manufacturer. The EU suggested that, taking into account the lack of data support and potential public health concern, all existing Codex MRLs should be withdrawn.
94. The JMPR Secretariat noted that terbufos is already on the priority list for periodic review and that, on the basis of available evidence, the ARfD and ADI did not need to be reviewed ahead of the schedule.
95. Any data needed to support the periodic review of terbufos would be discussed by the EWG on Codex schedules and priority list.

178 BIFENTHRIN

96. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for avocado; peanut; pomegranate; eggplants (subgroup); and pepper (subgroup) (except okra, martynia and roselle) pending the ongoing review in the EU.
97. CCPR agreed to withdraw the proposed draft MRLs for peaches (including apricots and nectarine) (subgroup); and pome fruits (group) due to short-term exposure exceedance of the ARfD identified by JMPR would lead to a public health concern.
98. CCPR agreed to advance the other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the CXLs for eggplant; peppers (subgroup); and peppers chili, dried, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.
99. CCPR further agreed to remove the parenthetical qualifier statement "except okra, martynia, and roselle" from peppers (subgroup) and add the footnote as stated in the section on general remarks.

208 FAMOXADONE

100. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for bulb onions, subgroup of; cane berries, subgroup of; fruiting vegetables-cucurbits, subgroup of; peppers, chili; and peppers, sweet (including pimento or pimienta), and the EU suggestion that JMPR consider deriving a separate MRL for cucumbers and summer squashes based on available residue trials. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that the number of residue trials submitted for the various commodities was sufficient for their analysis.
101. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, to revoke the CXLs for cucumber, squash, summer, and tomato, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

211 FLUDIOXONIL

102. The EU and Switzerland introduced the reservations on the advancement of all the proposed draft MRLs pending the ongoing periodic reevaluation in the EU. The EU noted that, for tree nuts (except Canarium nut, Chilean hazelnut, and pistachios), the combined data set for almonds and pecan nuts should be used for deriving the MRL.
103. The JMPR Secretariat responded that the recommendation of MRL for tree nuts (except Canarium nut, Chilean hazelnut, and pistachios) was based on the more critical data set due to significant findings in almond.
104. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, and to revoke the proposed MRLs for beans (dry); beans with pods (*Phaseolus* spp., immature pods and succulent seeds); chick-pea (dry); lentil (dry); peas (dry); peas (pods and succulent=immature seeds); and snap bean (young pods), as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

216 INDOXACARB

105. CCPR noted the reservation of EU and Switzerland to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for bushberries, subgroup of, beans with pods, subgroup of (except soya bean), beetroot, milks, and swine meat because of an acute intake concern for EU consumers; and the proposed draft MRLs for beans, dry, subgroup of (except cowpea, mung bean and soya bean); maize cereals, subgroup of; tree nuts, edible offal (mammalian); mammalian fats (except milk fats); and meat (from mammals other than marine mammals), because of the uncertainties on the toxicity and genotoxicity metabolites and degradation for metabolites (IN-P0036, KT413, IN-MP819, IN-TMG00, and IN-MK638).
106. CCPR noted a concern form submitted by EU requesting that JMPR prioritize the periodic review of indoxacarb, based on concerns with the existing toxicological reference values last evaluated in 2005 and insufficient data on metabolites that may present a health concern. JMPR acknowledged the concerns of EU but concluded that metabolite residues are unlikely to be detected above method LOQ and therefore unlikely to be a health concern. On the evidence presented by the EU in the concern form, JMPR did not agree to reprioritize the periodic review of indoxacarb.
107. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, and to revoke associated CXLs and the CXL for maize fodder (dry) as recommended by JMPR 2022.

224 DIFENOCONAZOLE

108. CCPR noted the comment from China that the commodity names of pencil yam and pencil yam, dried, should be corrected to pseudoginseng (VR 2952) and pseudoginseng, dried (DV 2952), due to an editorial error in the English translation of crop names in the residue trial data submitted. The new commodity codes for pseudoginseng were provided by the EWG Chair on the Revision of the Classification of Food and Feed.
109. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for goji berry; fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits, group (except goji berry and pepper, chili); pseudoginseng; ginger, rhizome; tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried), pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic review in EU. The EU noted that an assessment strategy for triazole derivatives metabolites (TDMs) is applicable in the EU and the residue definitions for risk assessment and toxicological reference values have been revised. The EU notes that an assessment for TDMs has not been carried out for difenoconazole.
110. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 and revoke the associated CXLs for fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits (group) and tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried), as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

229 AZOXYSTROBIN

111. 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 JMPR 2022.

230 CHLORANTRANILIPROLE

112. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for avocado and tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried), for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

231 MANDIPROPAMID

113. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for bulb onions, subgroup of; ginseng dried, including red ginseng, due to ongoing evaluations and for eggplants, subgroup of, due to the extrapolation from residue trials in sweet peppers.
114. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that it was agreed to extrapolate data from residue trials in peppers for the proposed draft MRLs for eggplants (subgroup), and that an explanation of this extrapolation is provided in the 2018 JMPR report.
115. CCPR agreed to advance all proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, including MRLs for subgroups bulb onions and fruiting vegetables, cucurbits, with the subsequent revocation of associated CXLs and relevant individual onion and cucurbit commodities, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR. CCPR further agreed to remove the parenthetical qualifier statement "except okra, martynia, and roselle" from peppers (subgroup) and add the footnote as stated in the section on general remarks.

246 ACETAMIPRID

116. India noted that the MRL for cardamom was established in 2019 based on extrapolation from spices, seeds, subgroup of; however, India believes this extrapolation is not correct because it is accurately described under the spices, fruit or berry subgroup. India requested that an MRL of 0.1 mg/kg be re-established based on this information. The JMPR Secretariat agreed with this observation, and CCPR agreed to advance the MRL of 0.1 mg/kg for cardamom seed for adoption at Step 5/8.

247 EMAMECTIN BENZOATE

117. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for flowerhead brassicas (subgroup) and milks because different critical GAPs were used in EU on individual brassicas and the MRL for milk was set too high. CCPR also noted the clarification made by the JMPR Secretariat that recommendation for subgroup of flowerhead brassicas is based on similar residue data set and MRLs for milk is based on the highest residue.
118. CCPR agreed to advance all proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

248 FLUTRIAFOL

119. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for rice; rice hay and/or straw; rice, hulls; rice, husked; and rice, polished, which were based on a GAP which is currently unsupported. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for all rice commodities to Step 4, awaiting additional data from the sponsor and the outcome of the JMPR re-evaluation.
120. CCPR agreed to advance the remaining proposed draft MRLs (other than rice and associated commodities) for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

252 SULFOXAFLOL

121. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for artichoke, globe and sunflower seeds, subgroup of, pending the outcome of an ongoing evaluation in the EU.
122. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for artichoke, globe and sunflower seeds, subgroup of, for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

261 BENZOVINDIFLUPYR

123. CCPR agreed to advance all of the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by JMPR 2022.

285 FLUPYRADIFURONE

124. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for pineapple, sesame seed, and sunflower seeds, subgroup of, for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

287 QUINCLORAC

125. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for cranberries and rape seeds because the residue definition did not include the metabolite quinclorac methyl ester, and it was not possible to conclude from the JMPR report if quinclorac methyl ester is an authorized active ingredient.
126. CropLife International informed CCPR that the data sponsor has already provided the information about the formulations to EU in response to this question.
127. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for cranberry and rape seed for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by JMPR 2022.

294 SPIROMESIFEN

128. The JMPR Secretariat noted that the commodities of citrus pulp, dried, and soya bean oil were inadvertently deleted from the database and should be restored, and that the commodity of eggplant should be listed as having been advanced to step 3.
129. CCPR agree to advance all of the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

297 FENAZAQUIN

130. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for lemons and limes (including citron), subgroup of; oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids), subgroup of; pummelo and grapefruits (including shaddock-like hybrids, among other grapefruit), subgroup of; mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids), subgroup of; apples; plums (including fresh prunes), subgroup of; peaches (including apricots and nectarine), subgroup of; cane berries, subgroup of; bush berries, subgroup of; small fruit vine climbing, subgroup of; low growing berries, subgroup of; avocado; fruiting vegetables, cucurbits; tomatoes, subgroup of; peppers, subgroup of (except martynia, okra and roselle); eggplants, subgroup of; edible offal (mammalian); mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); and milks, pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU, and due to diverging residue definitions and an acute risk for peaches.
131. CCPR agreed to advance all of the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

312 AFIDOPYROPEN

132. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for edible offal (mammalian); eggs; mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; poultry, edible offal of; poultry, fats; poultry, meat; sorghum; and strawberries, due to the lack of available toxicological data at EU level and pending the outcome of the review by the EU. EU also noted that the parent compound may not be a valid marker substance for animal-derived products and requested clarification on the commodity description used. EU further noted that the OECD calculator suggested lower MRLs for sorghum and strawberries, and that they do not agree that the differences noted between the OECD MRLs and JMPR MRLs are insignificant.
133. CCPR noted the clarifications by the JMPR Secretariat that the residue definitions are reconsidered during the registration review programme and the recommendation for sorghum and strawberries are based on OECD calculator and expert judgement to cover the possible worse cases.
134. CCPR agreed to advance all of the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

315 PYRIDATE

135. CCPR noted that JMPR was unable to establish residue definitions of pyridate for dietary risk assessment for plant and animal commodities and therefore could not establish any MRLs. JMPR requested additional high-quality data from the sponsor for future evaluations.

317 TRIFLUMURON

136. CCPR noted the request by EU for additional information on the conversion factor used in the calculation of the MRL for soya bean, dry. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that this information is contained in the report.
137. CCPR agreed to advance all of the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

320 MEFENTRIFLUCONAZOLE

138. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for Pome fruits (group) because an acute intake concern for European consumers in pears.
139. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for Tree nuts (group) because of the difference in GAP between pistachios compared to other tree nuts and an insufficient number of residue trials for determining the MRL. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that the differences in GAP did not result in a significant difference and that the proposed draft MRLs for tree nuts (group) set using the combined data from pistachios and other tree nuts was appropriate.
140. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for sugar cane because no analytical method is available. The JMPR Secretariat responded that the analytical methods for plant commodities can be used for sugar cane.
141. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation to the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals), milks, mammalian fats (except milk fats), eggs, poultry fats, poultry meat, and poultry, edible offal, because the EU residue definition is not compatible with the one used by JMPR.
142. CCPR noted the concern form submitted by the United States requesting that head lettuce be evaluated separately from the subgroup of leafy vegetables, as the residue data available for head lettuce was considerably lower than that for other types of leafy greens. EU also expressed opposition to the MRLs established for leafy greens, subgroup, and leaves of Brassicaceae, subgroup, due to short-term exposure issues. The JMPR Secretariat agreed with these observations and recommended that these commodities be evaluated separately .
143. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRL for leafy greens (subgroup) to step 4, and to withdraw the proposed draft MRL for leaves of Brassicaceae, subgroup, awaiting the outcome of the 2023 JMPR evaluation. CCPR agreed to advance all of the remaining proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by JMPR 2022. CCPR further agreed to remove the parenthetical qualifier statement “except okra, martynia, and roselle” from peppers (subgroup) and add the footnote as stated in the section on general remarks.

324 TETRANILIPROLE

144. CCPR noted the reservations from the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of all the proposed draft MRLs for cabbage, head; cherries, subgroup of; edible offal (mammalian); eggs; flowerhead Brassicaceae, subgroup of; fruiting vegetables, other than cucurbits, group of; leaves of brassicaceas, subgroup of, lemons and limes (including citron), subgroup of; maize cereals, subgroup of; mammalian fats; mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids), subgroup of; meat from mammals other than marine mammals; milks; oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids), subgroup of; peaches (including nectarines and apricots), subgroup of; plums, subgroup of; pome fruits, group of, excluding Japanese persimmon; poultry, edible offal; poultry fat; poultry meat; pummelos and grapefruits (including shaddock-like hybrids, among other grapefruit), subgroup of; rice husked; small fruit vine climbing, subgroup of; soya bean (dry); sweet corn (corn-on-the-cob); tree nuts, group of, tuberous and corm vegetables, subgroup of and pepper, chili, dried, pending the outcome of the review by the EU.
145. The EU noted that the proposed residue definition for enforcement for animal-derived commodities is incomplete as it does not include the metabolite (tetraniliprole-despyridyl-N-methyl- quinazolinone) in eggs, liver and muscle, that the OECD MRL calculator derives a lower MRL of 0.02 mg/kg for tree nuts, group of, and that there were an insufficient number of residue trials to propose a draft MRL for mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids), subgroup of.
146. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the proposed draft MRLs for tree nuts is recommended based on OECD calculator and expert judgement to cover the possible worse cases, and only parent compound is included in the proposed residue definition for animal commodities because there is no robust analytical standard for other metabolites. The JMPR Secretariat agreed with the EU’s position on the proposed MRL for mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) and will re-evaluate the data at the next meeting. JMPR further clarified that the MRL for tomato paste was extrapolated from data submitted under the fruiting vegetable, other than cucurbits (group)
147. CCPR decided to advance the proposed draft MRL for mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids), subgroup of to step 4, awaiting the outcome of the 2023 JMPR evaluation and to advance all of the other proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.
148. CCPR further agreed to remove the parenthetical qualifier statement “except okra, martynia, and roselle” from peppers (subgroup) and add the footnote as stated in the section on general remarks.

325 BENZPYRIMOXAN

149. CCPR agreed to establish an ADI of 0-0.1 mg/kg bw for benzpyrimoxan, as recommended by JMPR 2022, no estimations for maximum residue levels due to the general consideration of its use in paddy rice.

326 BROFLANILIDE

150. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for cabbages, head; Chinese cabbage (type pack-choi); coffee bean, green; edible offal (mammalian); eggs; cereal grains, group of (except rice); mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; radish, Japanese; poultry, edible offal of; poultry meat; poultry fats; and tuberous and corm vegetables, subgroup of, based on the lack of available toxicological data at EU level.
151. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the JMPR.

327 FLUAZAINDOLIZINE

152. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for fruiting vegetables, cucurbits-cucumbers and summer squashes (subgroup); fruiting vegetables, cucurbits-melons, pumpkins and winter squashes (subgroup); tomatoes (subgroup); eggplants (subgroup); peppers (subgroup) (except martynia, okra, roselle); carrot; tuberous and corm vegetables (subgroup); strawberry; brassica vegetables (except brassica leafy vegetables) (group); leafy vegetables (group); legume feeds with low water (<20%) content (hay) (subgroup); pulses (group); root vegetables (subgroup) (except carrot); stalk and stem vegetables; bulb vegetables (group); cereal grains (group); oilseeds and oilfruits (group); edible offal (mammalian); mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; poultry, edible offal of; poultry fats; and poultry meat, based on the lack of available toxicological data at EU level. EU further noted that for melons, pumpkins, and winter squashes (subgroup), the OECD calculator derives a lower MRL and requested clarification on the approach used for MRLs derived for rotational crops and processed products.
153. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that additional information on rotational crops is included in the JMPR 2022 report and that the MRLs derived for melons, pumpkins, and winter squashes (group) is based on OECD calculator and the highest individual value.
154. An observer noted that the commodity of legumes was missing from the hardcopy version of the MRL database and requested follow up by the Codex Secretariat.
155. CCPR agreed to advance all of the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by JMPR 2022.

328 FLUINDAPYR

156. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed draft MRLs for maize cereals, subgroup of; sorghum grain and millet, subgroup of; sweet corn (corn-on -the cob); tree nuts, group of, and wheat, similar grains, and pseudo cereals without husks, subgroup of, based on missing toxicological data at EU level and pending the outcome of the review by the EU. The EU noted that no MRLs for animal commodities are proposed, although MRLs for feed commodities are proposed.
157. In addition, the EU noted that no suitable analytical method exists to measure this compound in animal commodities therefore no CXLs for these commodities are proposed, although CXLs for feed items are proposed.
158. CCPR agreed to advance all of the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2022 JMPR.

329 INPYRFLUXAM

159. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation to the advancement of all the proposed draft MRLs based on the lack of available toxicological data at EU level.
160. CCPR agreed to advance all of the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by JMPR 2022.

330 ISOFLUCYPRAM

161. CCPR noted that an ADI of 0-2 mg/kg bw had been established and that an ARfD was unnecessary, and the 2022 JMPR was not able to derive a residue definition for dietary risk assessment for plant and animal commodities, and therefore no MRLs were recommended. The data sponsor confirmed that additional data has already been submitted for the 2023 JMPR evaluation.

General Conclusion

162. CCPR:

- (i) agreed to forward to CAC:
 - (a) MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix II).
 - (b) CXLs for revocation by CAC (Appendix III).
 - (c) Consequential amendments to CXLs for peppers groups and subgroups to implement the decision taken by CCPR on okra (Appendix XXX)
 - (d) Noted the reservations from EU, Switzerland and United Arab Emirates for the reasons explained in paragraphs (xxxxxx)
- (ii) noted that:
 - (a) MRLs retained at Steps 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) and to inform CAC accordingly.

REVISION OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD AND FEED (CXA 4-1989) (Agenda Item 7)**General remarks**

163. The USA, as Chair of the EWG, speaking also on behalf of the co-Chair, The Netherlands, introduced the item, recalled the history to the revision of the Classification, the ToR of the EWG, key points of discussion in the EWG the conclusions and recommendations made as described in the relevant working documents. He further explained that comments submitted in reply to the various CLs had been taken into account to prepare revised proposals for discussion in the virtual pre-meeting (VWG) that took place on 21 June 2023 (CRD03). The recommendations of the pre-meeting as presented in CRD04 would be considered under Agenda Items 7(a) – (d).
164. The EWG Chair further noted that revision of the Tables of examples of representative commodities for commodity groups for the different groups under Classes B and E would not impact on existing CXLs since only subgroups and commodities had been added, and there had been no transfers between groups or subgroups.
165. CCPR considered the recommendations of the VWG as presented in CRD04, made the following decisions, and agreed with or noted the following comments:

Class B – Primary Food Commodities of Animal Origin and Class E - Processed Foods of Animal Origin (All Types) (at Step 4) (Agenda Item 7a)⁶**Tables on examples of representative commodities for commodity groups in different types under Class B and Class E (at Step 4) (for inclusion in the *Principles and Guidance for the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Group (CXG 84- 2012)*) (Agenda Item 7b)⁷**

166. The EWG Chair explained that at previous sessions Classes A, C and D had been completed and that Class B and Class E were the only remaining classes to be finalized to complete work on the revision of the Classification.

Class B – Primary Food Commodities of Animal Origin and Table 9 (examples of selection of representative commodities)

167. The EWG Chair informed CCPR that the revised Class B included 6 types, 18 groups, no reserved groups and 65 subgroups. The additional groups included groups for Amphibians and Reptiles (replacing reserved Group 046) and Invertebrate Animals Group (replacing reserved Group 047). Numerous commodities had been added to the respective groups or subgroups. He further explained the changes made in the VWG.
168. CCPR agreed with the revised Class B as presented in CRD04 with additional changes made by the plenary.
- Table 9 (examples of selection of representative commodities for Class B)**
169. CCPR agreed with the revised Table 9 as presented and further agreed to add:
- Nile Perch in the listing for Group fresh water fish (040), subgroup 040D perches;
 - cattle species in subgroup 030A bovine muscle; and

⁶ CX/PR 23/54/6; CX/PR 23/54/6-Add.1 (Comments in reply to CL 2023/34-PR from Canada, Chile, Egypt, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Norway, Thailand)

⁷ CX/PR 23/54/7

- grass cutter to subgroup 030H various other mammalian muscles

Class E – Processed Foods of Animal Origin (All Types) and Table 10 (examples of selection of representative commodities

170. The EWG Chair informed CCPR that the revised Class E included 10 groups with Group 081 Dried muscle and other avian products (replacing Reserved Group 081). An additional Group 083 Secondary invertebrate food commodities of animal origin had also been added; as were additional subgroups (13) along with numerous commodities.

171. CCPR made no changes to Class E.

Table 10 (examples of selection of representative commodities for Class E)

172. CCPR made no changes to Table 10.

Portion of the commodity to which the MRLs apply, and which is analyzed for Group 006 Assorted Tropical and Sub-tropical fruits - Inedible Peel and Group 023 Oilseeds (Agenda item 7c)⁸

173. The EWG Chair explained that the revised proposals were the result of the comparison between the *Guidelines on Portion of Commodities to which MRLs Apply and Which is Analyzed* (CXG 41-1993) and the revised *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) and that the VWG had agreed with the recommendations of the EWG as presented in CRD04.

Group 006

174. A Member proposed to define edible peel, as mango was included in Group 006 yet mango peel was edible in certain countries.

175. The EWG Chair explained that mango was a member of crop Group 006 (in the current revised Classification previously agreed) and that mango peel varied from region to region.

176. Another Member, supported by an Observer, proposed to retain the example on “banana pulp” from the revised Classification in the definition for the portion of the commodity to which the MRLs apply, and which is analyzed proposed in CRD04 to avoid misalignment between the two definitions. The Observer also noted that in the case of nuts that while these commodities were traded in-shell, the portion to be analysed was after shelling and that the same rationale could possibly apply in the case of bananas.

177. However, it was clarified that the portion of the commodity should apply to the commodity as traded and bananas were traded with peel on. In addition, the international guidance on how to conduct residue trials points to the fact that the whole commodity should be analysed to generate residue data which was the basis for MRLs set by Codex and national authorities. If the portion of the commodity to be analysed were changed to banana pulp it would not align with the residue data that is typically produced and may have subsequently impact on existing CXLs. There were mechanisms to assess the dietary exposure based on the edible portion, i.e. pulp which was distinct from the need to apply the MRL to the whole commodity.

178. CCPR noting the clarification did not agree to the proposal to include the example of “banana pulp” in the revised definition proposed in CRD04.

179. CCPR therefore agreed with the revised Group 006 and Group 023 as presented in CRD04.

Comparison between the *Guidelines on Portion of Commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analyzed* (CXG 41-1993) with a comparison to the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) (Agenda item 7d)⁹

180. CCPR supported the recommendation that the *Classification of Food and Animal Feeds* (CXA 4-1989) should be the single authoritative reference for the classification of food and feed for the establishment of MRLs for pesticides and consequently agreed that the *Guidelines on Portion of Commodities to which MRLs Apply and Which is Analyzed* (CXG 41-1993) should be revoked as these are included in CXA 4-1989.

181. CCPR noted that with these decisions, the EWG had completed its work and thanked the USA and the Netherlands and all members of the EWG for their diligent work on the comprehensive revision of the Classification throughout the years.

Other matters

Proposal to amend the foreword to the CXA 4-1989

182. The European Union, supported by Switzerland, informed CCPR that while revising Class B it was noticed that this Class included some species that are considered endangered and included in Annex I of the CITES Agreement. These delegations had requested that these species be deleted from the list in Class B as Codex’s main aim is to facilitate trade

⁸ CX/PR 23/54/8; CX/PR 23/54/8-Add.1 (Comments in reply to CL 2023/35-PR from Australia, Canada, Chile, Egypt, EU, Iraq, Kenya, Peru, Thailand, ICUMSA)

⁹ CX/PR 23/54/9

and their inclusion could be interpreted as a recommendation supporting trade of endangered species. However, this proposal was not accepted.

183. As an alternative, a proposal was made for an amendment to the foreword to CXA 4-1989 as follows: *“The Classification is not meant to contradict international agreements in other areas; the presence of species internationally recognized as endangered in the Classification is not to be considered as an attempt to facilitate trade of commodities from such species.”*
184. CCPR did not support the proposal noting the following views:
185. the new sentence would not change the applicability of this document in the international system concerning trade and food safety. Without this addition, it was already clear that the Classification would not change international commitments made elsewhere nor the utility of the Classification. This addition could open the door to accept texts addressing many other concerns outside the mandate of CCPR. It was proposed that this matter should be dealt with at a higher level in Codex, possibly through the General Principles of Codex or in the purpose of Codex of the Procedural Manual and not in individual Codex texts.
 - Consideration of endangered species was not within the remit of Codex. It was recalled that this issue had come up before in the Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (CCFFP) where a proposal had been made to reference CITES in a commodity Standard, however, CCFFP did not agree to it since it was not relevant to the safety and quality of the product covered by the Standard. The reference on endangered species in the Classification foreword would permit inclusion of language on factors outside the Codex mandate in future texts, such as sustainability, environmental concerns and consumer preference.
186. As an alternative, the EU proposed a more limited addition as follows: *“The Classification is not meant to contradict international agreements in other areas.”*
187. However, this proposal was also not accepted for the same reasons stated above (paras xxx).
188. The Codex Secretariat further noted that this matter should be considered at a higher level within Codex and that this could be done through discussions on the future of Codex in CCEXEC and CAC as it was not limited to the Classification only. In addition, she reminded CCPR that the *Code of Ethics for International Trade in Food including Concessional and Food Aid Transactions* (CXC 20-1979) through Article 4, and in particular, Article 4.2 already provided high level guidance with respect to this issue.
189. CCPR agreed to retain the foreword to the Classification unchanged.

Consequential amendments to the Classification of Food and Feed

Inclusion of additional commodity codes arising from MRL recommendations by JMPR

190. The Codex Secretariat explained that four commodity codes had been added to Class D – Processed Products of Plant Origin to allow including new MRL recommendations from the 2022 JMPR Meeting into the Database for MRLs for pesticides which would be forwarded to CAC as consequential amendments to the Classification (Agenda Item 6) namely:
 - VR 2952 Pseudoginseng
 - DV 2953 Pseudoginseng, dried
 - DT 0604 Ginseng, dried
 - DV 2950 Pencil yam, dried
191. CCPR agreed with the aforesaid additions.

Proposal to modify Table 2: Subgroup 12C Eggplant and eggplant-like commodities (Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Groups (CXG 84-2012))
192. CCPR considered a proposal to modify subgroup 12C of Table 2 to reflect the extrapolation applied by JMPR for MRLs for eggplants from chilli peppers and/or sweet peppers.
193. The FAO JMPR Secretariat supported this proposal noting that it was in line with JMPR extrapolation procedures. He further noted that additional amendments were needed for consistency in line with JMPR recommendations that MRLs for okra, martynia and roselle could not be extrapolated using sweet pepper or chilli pepper as the representative commodity, referring to Agenda item 5a general considerations. However, CCPR recalled its decision under Agenda items 5a and 6 to continue with the status quo for okra, martynia and roselle pending data generation and further evaluation by JMPR.

194. An Observer noting the amendments to Table 2, proposed that an analysis be done on previous decisions by CCPR on CXLs for tomato and peppers, so that MRLs could be established also for eggplants and offered to prepare a discussion paper in this regard.
195. CCPR agreed to the proposed amendments to Table 2 and further agreed that the Observer GPC would prepare a discussion paper on an analysis of previous decisions by CCPR to establish both tomato and pepper MRLs and to present a proposal to CCPR55 to establish corresponding MRLs in eggplant.

General Conclusion

196. CCPR agreed to:
- (i) Forward to CAC46:
 - (a) the revised Class B and Class E and their respective table of representative commodities for adoption at Step 5/8 and inclusion in the *Classification of Food and Animal Feeds* (CXA 4-1989) and the *Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Groups* (CXG 84-2012) respectively (Appendix xxxx);
 - (b) the amendment to Table 2, Subgroup 12C Eggplant and eggplant-like commodities for adoption as a consequential amendment to the *Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Groups* (CXG 84-2012) (Appendix xxx);
 - (c) the revised definition for the portion of the commodity to which MRLs apply and which is analyzed for Group 006 – Tropical Fruits of Inedible Peel and 023 – Oil fruits as a consequential amendment to the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) (Appendix xxxx);
 - (d) the inclusion of new commodities/commodity codes in Class B - Primary food commodities of plant origin and Class D – Processed commodities of plant origin as consequential amendments to the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) for adoption (Appendix xxxx).
 - (i) Request CAC46 to revoke the *Guidelines on portion of commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analyzed* (CXG 41-1993) noting that the *Classification of Food and Animal Feeds* (CXA 4-1989) should be the single, authoritative reference of food and feed for the establishment of MRLs for pesticides;
 - (ii) Request GPC to prepare a discussion paper as described in para. Xxx for consideration by CCPR55.

COORDINATION OF WORK BETWEEN CCPR AND CCRVDF: JOINT CCPR/CCRVDF WORKING GROUP ON COMPOUNDS WITH DUAL USE – STATUS OF WORK (Agenda Item 8)¹⁰

197. USA, as Chair of the EWG, presented the item, recalled the background to the work, explained the mandate and work process followed by the EWG as well as conclusions and recommendations for consideration by CCPR. The EWG Chair also recalled the results of the virtual working group held on 21 June 2023 and further noted that the purpose of the joint EWG was to review the work already completed cooperatively between CCRVDF and CCPR to identify and if possible, prioritise, areas of possible further collaboration between both committees and how this could be carried out so as to facilitate the consideration of dual-use compounds by both committees and the consequent harmonization of MRLs with a view to establishing a single MRL for these compounds for food of animal origin.

Discussion

198. CCPR noted general support for Recommendations 1 to 5 as presented in CRD08, which includes the revisions made by CCRVDF26 to Recommendations 4 and 5, and noted the following comments:
- To consider editing Recommendation 2, to include the explicit consent from the data submitter to share data submitted with other joint FAO/WHO scientific committees, in particular JECFA and JMPR. This point was not taken up as the current language provided flexibility for the application of the Recommendation.
 - It was important to evaluate the best ways to share data between JMPR and JECFA in order to be able to carry out harmonised joint evaluations.
 - As regards Recommendation 4, there was no need for Members of the EWG to provide data as discussions would focus on compounds.

¹⁰ CX/PR 23/54/10; CX/PR 23/54/10-Add.1 (Comments in reply to CL 2023/36-PR from Canada, Chile, Egypt, Iraq, Kenya, Uruguay, ICUMSA)

199. As regards Recommendation 2, on the point on data sharing, the WHO JECFA Secretariat, informed CCPR that JECFA was already asking for consent to share data with other joint FAO/WHO scientific committees and for the submitters to explain which data can be shared. He proposed that JMPR include the same in their calls for data. CCPR concurred with this proposal.
200. As regards Recommendation 5, on selecting the highest MRL for the establishment of a single MRL for dual-use compounds, the EWG Chair clarified that the Joint EWG would not establish MRLs but would select a single MRL from the values already recommended by JECFA and JMPR respectively which were considered safe for human consumption for consideration by CCPR and CCRVDF.
201. The Codex Secretariat clarified that the Joint EWG was a new modality being piloted between CCRVDF and CCPR and considering that the Joint EWG had been established by CAC, it was necessary to inform the Commission about the revised ToRs and the progress made in both committees in relation to the discussion on dual-use compounds.

Conclusion

202. CCPR endorsed the recommendations made by the EWG, as modified by CCRVDF26:
1. Recommendation 1: Ask JECFA and JMPR to continue working towards harmonizing their risk assessment methodologies, including ways to establish single, harmonized acceptable daily intake values and MRLs for dual-use compounds. This might include exploring the feasibility of a joint evaluation of dual-use compounds and the formation of Joint JMPR/JECFA EWG.
 2. Recommendation 2: Ask JECFA and JMPR to consider ways in which data can be shared between the two expert committees. This must include JECFA/JMPR asking sponsors to consent to data sharing upon submission of the data packages.
 3. Recommendation 3: Continue to support the current joint EWG to identify and prioritize issues affecting both committees and recommend ways to address the issues and to inform CAC accordingly.
 4. Recommendation 4: Develop a list of compounds with dual-use as a pesticide and veterinary drug for which no or only one Codex MRL has been established and that member countries will provide the information to populate this list.
 5. Recommendation 5: Identify dual-use compounds that have different Codex MRLs for a similar edible commodity of animal origin and recommend on a case-by-case basis, a single, harmonized MRL(s) for the compound(s) and affected commodity(ies). The EWG might recommend that CCRVDF/CCPR consider selecting the higher MRL value.
203. CCPR further agreed that this work would continue through the Joint EWG, chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by Brazil and New Zealand, working in English, to:
- (i) Implement the revised Recommendations 4 and 5;
 - (ii) consider the matter related to harmonized food descriptors to be used by JECFA/JMPR;
204. CCPR noted that the above tasks are in addition to the ToRs agreed¹¹ by CAC44 (2021) when it established the Joint EWG and were in line with the agreements taken by CCRVDF26 in this regard.
205. CCPR agreed to inform CAC of the progress of work of the joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG on dual-use compounds, the revised TORs for this EWG and the addition of Brazil and New Zealand as co-Chairs of the Joint EWG.

MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW (Agenda item 9)¹²

206. Chile, as Chair of the EWG, speaking also on behalf of the co-Chairs Australia, India, and Kenya, introduced the item, recalled the background to the work, the mandate of the EWG, explained the work process in the EWG, key points of discussion, conclusions, and recommendations.
207. The EWG Chair also explained that, in order to facilitate discussion, Chile, together with the co-Chairs, had analysed comments received in reply to CL 2023/37-PR, had prepared a revised proposal (CRD05) which was discussed in the virtual pre-meeting held on 22 June 2023. The EWG Chair informed CCPR of the discussions in the pre-meeting, the conclusions and recommendations as presented in CRD07.

¹¹ REP21/CAC44, para. 64.

¹² CX/PR 23/54/11; CX/PR 23/54/11-Add.1 (Comments in reply to CL 2023/37-PR from Brazil, Canada, Chile, Egypt, EU, Iraq, Peru, Uruguay, USA)

208. The EWG Chair further explained that CRD07 contained the revised approach for the management of unsupported compounds without any public health concern scheduled for periodic review (Appendix I, Section 1) and the revised options for efficient data support that could be addressed by Codex, FAO/WHO, JMPR, governments, industry, and other relevant stakeholders (Appendix I, Section 2) to further assist countries in implementing the proposed management approach.
209. The EWG Chair proposed that CCPR consider these two documents with the view that the approach for the management of unsupported compounds without any public health concern be adopted for internal use by CCPR through a standing EWG; and that the options for efficient data support be published as an information document on the Codex webpage¹³.

Discussion

210. CCPR noted the support for the proposed management approach, the options for efficient data support and the establishment of an EWG to implement the management approach, and noted the following comments:
- It was important to help address the retention of the CXLs of those compounds which are registered in a country for promoting data collection via the national registration database (NRD) as it would provide updated information for the JMPR re-evaluation and simplify the procedure for the periodic review. This approach would help narrow the gap between developing and developed countries; could benefit trade facilitation as well as consumers' health protection; that updated information of GAP was needed to consider the suitability for the retention or adjustment of CXLs instead of removal (revocation) CXLs for compounds without public health concerns.
 - Once established the EW should work in English and Spanish in order to facilitate participation and access to relevant information for the Latin American Member countries.
211. The Codex Secretariat explained that:
- the management approach (Section 1) would not be sent to CAC for adoption or inclusion in the Procedural Manual (PM), but would remain as an internal procedure for CCPR, and would be included as an Appendix to the report for ease of reference, this would provide flexibility for adjustments of the management approach as implemented by the EWG with a view to its possible inclusion in the PM at a later stage; and
 - the options for data support (Section 2) would be published on the Codex website as an information document that could be used for consultations and be reviewed/updated as needed.

Conclusion

212. CCPR agreed to:
- (i) adopt the management approach for internal use by CCPR (Appendix xxx);
 - (ii) publish the options for data support as an information document on the Codex webpage; and
 - (iii) establish an EWG on unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review chaired by Chile, and co-chaired by Ecuador, India, and Kenya, working in English and Spanish, with the following Terms of Reference (ToRs):
 - (a) to implement the management procedure for unsupported compounds without health concerns for periodic review (Appendix xxx);
 - (b) to consider the unsupported compound identified under the priority list in the implementation of the management procedure (see Agenda item xxx);
 - (c) to coordinate with the Chairs of the EWGs on priority lists and national registration database, respectively, on the identification of other possible unsupported compounds in accordance with the management procedure; and
 - (d) based on the above considerations to present the outcomes of the actions made for consideration by CCPR55.

NATIONAL REGISTRATION OF PESTICIDES (Agenda item 10)¹⁴

¹³ <https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/committees/committee/related-information-documents/en/?committee=CCPR>

¹⁴ CX/PR 23/54/12

213. Germany, as Chair of the EWG, speaking also on behalf of the co-Chair Australia, presented the status of work on this item. He recalled the background of and the continued support for the development of the national registration of pesticides database (NRD) by CCPR53.
214. The EWG Chair also recalled that the compounds to be considered by the EWG were divided in three groups as described in the working document. A CL 2023/25-PR (Rev.) was distributed to all Codex Members to request comments on a revised list of compounds under Group 1 and Group 2 on which the status of national registration is being requested. He solicited Members to send their comments in reply to this CL within the set deadline (i.e. 31 August 2023) so that the EWG could have sufficient time to examine the responses.
215. The EWG Chair explained the work process that the EWG would follow after completion of work on the compounds listed under Group 1 and Group 2. He indicated that another CL would be issued to request comments on compounds listed under Group 3 and that the responses submitted in reply to this CL would be considered by the EWG in order to provide a comprehensive analysis of the status of national registration of compounds listed under the three groups for consideration at its next Session. The second CL would be issued in the second half of 2023 in order to start work by the end of 2023 or early 2024. This way forward would leave sufficient room for examination and discussion of the responses in the EWG and for preparation for CCPR55.

Conclusion

216. CCPR:

- (i) supported the approach and timelines to review of the NRD as explained in paragraphs 13-14 of CX/PR 23/54/12;
- (ii) encouraged Codex Members to provide replies to CL 2023/25-PR (Rev.) in order to progress on this exercise i.e. fill the NRD in order to support the periodic review of unsupported compounds with no public health concern which are no longer be supported by the manufacturer;
- (iii) provided any further suggestion to help filling the NRD as requested in CL 2023/25-PR (Rev.); and
- (iv) agreed the EWG, chaired by Germany and co-chaired by Australia would continue its work based on the replies to the CLs and provide a report for consideration by CCPR55.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR (Agenda Item 11)¹⁵

217. Australia, as Chair of the EWG on Priorities, introduced the item and presented the revised Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation or re-evaluation by JMPR.

2024 Schedule for JMPR evaluations

218. The EWG Chair referred to CRD02 containing the Schedules and Priority Lists for 2024 and beyond, noting that the task for CCPR was to agree on the 2024 lists. The EWG Chair noted the list of 6 compounds proposed for the 2024 Schedule of new compounds and that national registrations had been confirmed for all the compounds. JMPR agreed that acynonapryr, an outstanding compound that had previously been agreed by CCPR on the new compound priorities list that was approved by CAC, would be in the next JMPR data call.
219. In respect to the 2024 Schedule of new uses and other evaluations, the EWG Chair noted that there were three outstanding compounds from previous years: phosphonic acid (301), fosetyl-Al (302) and Methoprene (147). Listed in the 2024 schedule of new uses and other evaluations were 17 nominations, with evidence of national registrations provided for all 17 compounds. JMPR advised that the alternative GAP for chlormequat (15) on barley should be retained in this list. An observer advised that thiamethoxam (245) was currently under review and that the reviewer had agreed to consider the spices monitoring data in this review. JMPR recommended that thiamethoxam for cumin remain on the 2024 schedule of new uses and other evaluations, to be approved by CCPR. It was noted that the 2025 Schedule of new uses and other evaluations was very large and many requests for evaluation were for compounds with only one commodity. Members and observers were asked to consider inclusion of additional commodities to assist with efficiency of JMPR evaluations.
220. For the 2024 periodic review evaluations, the EWG Chair noted that there were three outstanding compounds from previous years: aldicarb (117), dithiocarbamates (105) and fenthion (39). The EWG Chair requested advice from the next meeting of JMPR on the timing and strategy for evaluation of dithiocarbamates. An Observer noted that these compounds had first been scheduled for evaluation in 2020 and that toxicology and residue data packs were available. The JMPR Secretariat advised that dithiocarbamates would not be scheduled for evaluation in 2024, but perhaps in 2025

¹⁵ CX/PR 23/54/13

or 2026 and would likely be the only periodic review conducted for that meeting. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that aldicarb would be listed on the next JMPR data call. As fenthion was unsupported and noting that there was an issue with alternative GAP, CCPR agreed to refer this compound to the EWG on Unsupported compounds without public health concerns for its consideration (Agenda Item 9).

221. The EWG Chair advised CCPR that AgroCare had withdrawn support for chlorpyrifos (17) and asked India if there was support for chlorpyrifos, given the intervention at CAC45 (2022). India advised that in November 2022, their industry association had been in contact with the JMPR Secretariat to support this compound. Further confirmation of support for chlorpyrifos-methyl (90) was pending. It was agreed that chlorpyrifos and chlorpyrifos-methyl remain on this list. For parathion-methyl (59), the manufacturer had earlier indicated that they did not support this compound and CCPR agreed to remove this compound from this list and forward it to the EWG on Unsupported compounds without public health concerns (Agenda item 9).
222. CCPR was advised of manufacturer support for terbufos (167), fenbutatin oxide (109), carbaryl (008) and 2-phenyl phenol (52). Manufacturers had requested 4-year rule extensions for ethoxyquin (35), fenbutatin oxide, 2-phenyl phenol, tebufenozide (196) and quinozone (64). For permethrin (120) and carbosulfan (145)/carbofuran (96), JMPR evaluations were underway. Spain advised that support for 2-phenylphenol was through the manufacturer, rather than their agency.
223. The EU advised of suggestions in CRD11 regarding operations of CCPR and JMPR, including a recommendation to significantly increase the list of periodic review substances for 2025 and onwards, to ensure that a minimum of five substances could be reviewed each year. The EU expressed the view that more efforts were needed to ensure complete dossiers were provided in time for scheduled periodic reviews, to avoid substances not being evaluated due to incomplete dossiers. Further, a pre-screening of data packages by JMPR was recommended. The FAO JMPR Secretariat agreed with the need for complete dossiers but advised that pre-screening of dossiers was difficult. The EWG Chair recommended that these suggestions be raised in the EWG for Enhancing operational procedures of JMPR and CCPR.

Public health concerns

224. CCPR was advised that public health concern forms had been submitted for phosmet (103) and indoxacarb (216). The JMPR Secretariat advised CCPR that initial JMPR technical advice based on information available indicated an acute intake exceedance. JMPR requested that the EU supply detailed intake data in time for the September 2023 JMPR meeting to establish if an exceedance could be confirmed by the meeting. The EU committed to submit relevant intake data within this timeframe. If intake estimates were confirmed, these would identify an intake concern against the existing JMPR ARfD (300% exceedance) and would indicate a periodic review should be initiated. On that basis, the JMPR Secretariat requested that phosmet be prioritised on the 2024 periodic review list. CCPR agreed to this proposal.
225. The public health concern form for indoxacarb would be considered by JMPR and a response provided at CCPR55.

Unsupported compounds

226. CCPR was advised that there were several compounds from previous schedules of periodic reviews which were not evaluated by JMPR and appear to be unsupported: amitraz (122), dinocap (87), methamidophos (100), bitertanol (144) and fenthion (39) and parathion-methyl (59).
227. A Member advised that amitraz had dual uses and should be considered by the EWG on Coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF.
228. The EWG Chair recommended that this list of unsupported compounds be forwarded to the EWG on Unsupported Compounds without public health concerns as a future work program (Agenda item 9).
229. The EWG Chair informed CCPR that JMPR advice on methamidophos (100) and dinocap (87) cautioned of potential problems for trade and implementation of CXLs for acephate (95) and meptyldinocap (244) if CXLs for methamidophos and dinocap were removed. The EWG on Unsupported compounds without public health concerns should consider these impacts and make recommendations to CCPR. CCPR agreed to these proposals (Agenda Item 9).

Conclusion

230. CCPR agreed to:
 - (i) endorse the proposed Schedule of Pesticides for evaluation by the 2024 JMPR for submission to CAC46 for adoption; and
 - (ii) re-convene the EWG on Schedules and Priorities, chaired by Australia and working in English. The EWG will be tasked with providing a report on the Schedules and Priority lists for consideration at the next meeting of CCPR.

Other matters

CCPR Discussion on-Ethylene Oxide (EtO)

231. The EWG Chair on Priorities reminded CCPR that under Agenda Item 3 the Codex Secretariat had advised deferral of discussion on EtO to this agenda item.
232. The Codex Secretariat recalled that CCCF16 had agreed to request clarification from CCPR on whether EtO meets the Codex definition of pesticide and whether coordination of risk assessment between JECFA and JMPR would be required to evaluate EtO as a contaminant.
233. The importance of developing limits for EtO was highlighted by a number of Member countries as there were significant trade impacts from lack of a Codex standard.
234. CCPR noted that in order to understand whether EtO fell within the Codex definition of a pesticide, it was necessary to understand how EtO was used in practice. It was clarified that EtO was regulated for different purposes in different countries, i.e. registered for use as a pesticide in agriculture and/or as a sterilant and could also be present in food due to carry-over from food additives.
235. An Observer expressed the view that EtO met the Codex definition of a pesticide and supported setting of a Codex MRL for EtO. If to be evaluated as a pesticide by JMPR, it would need to be prioritised as a new compound and this would require support from a manufacturer. The FAO JMPR Secretariat further confirmed that the complete data set, including GAP, toxicology and residue data should be submitted for possible independent JMPR or joint JMPR/JECFA evaluation.
236. Noting the lack of a sponsor to support inclusion of EtO in the priority list for evaluation by JMPR and the already huge workload of JMPR, CCPR agreed that EtO would not be included in the priority list for evaluation by JMPR.

Conclusion

237. CCPR agreed to advise CCCF that EtO is used in some countries as a pesticide (fumigant) and/or as a sterilant. In view of no support to include EtO in the priority list for evaluation by JMPR, and due to the need to establish a limit for this compound to avoid/minimize negative trade impacts, CCPR agreed that JECFA should take the lead on the evaluation of EtO, with possible support from JMPR. This approach would expedite the establishment of a maximum level for EtO as a contaminant by CCCF due to uses other than a pesticide.

GUIDANCE FOR MONITORING THE PURITY AND STABILITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS OF MULTICLASS PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (Agenda Item 12)¹⁶

238. India, as Chair of the EWG and the in-session WG established under Agenda item 1, speaking also on behalf of the co-Chairs Argentina and Iran, introduced the item, recalled the background to the work, the mandate of the EWG, explained the work process in the EWG, key points of discussion, conclusions, and recommendations.
239. The EWG Chair further explained that, in order to facilitate discussion, an in-session WG had met to discuss all comments received and to further refine the proposal for new work in the project document. She explained that major revisions had been made to the scope to clarify that the new work would be the development of guidance for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials (RMs) and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage. Such guidance would allow the extended use of the RMs which are stable with acceptable purity beyond their expiry dates specified by Reference Material Producers (RMPs) for robust residue analysis. Further consequential amendments had been made throughout the project document to reflect these decisions.
240. The EWG Chair proposed that CCPR consider starting new work on this guidance as presented in the revised project document and to establish an EWG to develop the procedures if new work is agreed by CCPR and approved by CAC.

Discussion

241. CCPR made some additional editorial amendments for purposes of consistency with the scope and to improve clarity of the project document and noted that the general support for this new work.

Conclusion

242. CCPR agreed to:
 - (i) forward the project document (Appendix xxx) to CAC46 for approval as new work;
 - (ii) establish an EWG, chaired by India, and co-chaired by Singapore and Argentina, working in English only to:

¹⁶ CX/PR 23/54/14; CX/PR 23/54/14 Add.1 (Comments in reply to CL 2023/38-PR from Brazil, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Kenya, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Uruguay, USA, ICUMSA)

- (a) develop the guidance procedures for monitoring the stability and purity of multiclass pesticide reference materials and their stock solutions during prolonged storage based on the outline provided in CX/PR 23/54/14, Appendix III) and taking into account comments submitted in reply to CL 2023/38-PR, pending approval of the new work by CAC46; and
- (b) submit the report of the EWG and the proposed guidance procedures to the Codex Secretariat for circulation for comments at Step 3 and consideration by CCPR55 (2024).

ENHANCEMENT OF THE OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF CCPR AND JMPR: Opportunities, Challenges, and Recommendations on Next Steps (Agenda Item 13)¹⁷

243. The United States of America, as Chair of the EWG and of the in-session WG, speaking also on behalf of the Co-Chairs Costa Rica, France, Germany, and Uganda, introduced the item, recalled the background to the work, the mandate of the EWG, explained the work process in the EWG, key points of discussion, conclusions, and recommendations. The EWG Chair further explained that, in order to facilitate discussion, an in-session WG had met to discuss all comments received in reply to CL 2023/39-PR and further refined the next steps and timelines for the progression of work in the EWG.
244. CCPR noted general support for the continuation of work in the EWG. An Observer referred to its CRD17 and highlighted key outcomes of a series of webinars organized by CropLife International to support the work of the EWG and expressed its support for continuing discussing this matter in the EWG under the new ToRs.

Conclusion

245. CCPR agreed to:
- (i) request JMPR, through the JMPR Secretariat, to:
 - (a) consider the discussion paper prepared by the EWG (Appendix xxx) at its regular meeting in September 2023. The discussion paper should be accompanied with the summary of the discussion that took place in plenary as contained in the CCPR54 report as well as comments received in reply to CL 2023/39-PR, and
 - (b) to provide guidance on the following:
 - (1) General feedback on discussion paper (and particularly Table 1 comments on opportunities for enhancement).
 - (2) Recommendations on initial priorities.
 - (3) Additional considerations that require guidance from CCPR.
 - (ii) re-establish the EWG chaired by USA and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Uganda, working in English and Spanish, with the following ToRs:
 - (a) Taking into account the feedback of JMPR (point (i) (b)), explore potential approaches, which could include recommending the commissioning of an independent third-party organization to conduct an assessment or working through an existing Codex advisory body or committee, to:
 - (1) identify priorities for CCPR and JMPR enhancement; and
 - (2) develop an implementation roadmap.
 - (b) Based on points (i) and (ii), prepare a summary of recommendations for consideration by CCPR55.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 14)

246. CCPR noted that no other business had been proposed for its consideration.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 15)

247. CCPR was informed that its 55th Session was tentatively scheduled to be held in China, in 2024, the final arrangements being subject to confirmation by the Host Country and the Codex Secretariats.

¹⁷ CX/PR 23/54/15; CX/PR 23/54/15-Add.1 (Comments in reply to CL 2023/39-PR from Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Costa Rica, Egypt, EU, Iraq, Kenya)

LIST OF CRDs

CRD No.	Agenda item	Submitted by
01	/	EU Division of competence and voting right between EU and its Member States
02	Establishment of Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR	Australia as Chair of the EWG on Priorities & Schedules Establishment of schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR
03	Report of the EWG Chairs on the revision of the Classification of Food and Feed (Agenda Items 7a/b)	USA and Netherlands as Chair and Co-Chair of the EWG on the revision of the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (pre-meeting CRD)
04	Report of the EWG Chairs on the revision of the Classification of Food and Feed	USA and Netherlands as Chair and Co-Chair of the EWG on the revision of the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (pre-meeting CRD)
05	Report of the EWG Chair on Management of Unsupported Compounds	Chile As Chair of the EWG on discussion paper on the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review
06	Report of the EWG Chairs on the revision of the Classification of Food and Feed	USA and Netherlands as Chair and Co-Chair of the EWG on the revision of the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (post-meeting CRD)
07	Report of the EWG Chair on Management of Unsupported Compounds	Chile As Chair of the EWG on discussion paper on the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review (pre-meeting CRD)
08	Report of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF VWG	USA As Chair of the Joint CCPR-CCRVDF EWG. (post-meeting CRD)
09	1, 7(a, b, c, d), 10, 12	United Republic of Tanzania
10	7 (a, b, c, d), 8, 9, 12, 13	Philippines
11 Rev.	3, 4(a), 5(a), 7(a, b), 8, 10, 11, 12	European Union
12	8, 10	Senegal
13	7 (a, b, c, d), 8, 9, 10, 13	Nigeria
14	6, 7(c), 7(d), 9, 12	Ecuador
15	4(a), 6, 8	Brazil

CRD No.	Agenda item	Submitted by
16	6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Thailand
17	5(a), 6, 8	CropLife International
18	3, 4(a), 4(b), 5(b), 6, 7(a), 7(b), 7(c), 7 (d), , 8, 9, 10, 12, 13	Ghana
19	6, 8, 12	Egypt
20	7 (a, b, c, d), 8, 9, 10, 12	Uruguay
21	6, 7(c), 7(d), 8, 9, 12, 13	Peru
22	7 (c, d), 8, 12	Republic of Korea
23	3, 4(a), 7(a), 7(b), 7(c), 7 (d), 8, 9, 13	Indonesia
24	1, 14	India
25	6, 7, 9, 11, 13	Morocco
26	6, 7, 12	China
27	Reconsideration of the Classification of Okra in the Classification of Food and Animal Feeds	USA and Netherlands as Chair and Co-Chair of the EWG on the revision of the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (post-meeting CRD)
28	3, 7(c), 9	IFU
29	7a, 7d, 9, 12	Guatemala
30	7a, 7d, 9, 10, 12	AGROCARE LATINOAMERICA
31	6	United Arab Emirates
32	Proposal for new work on guidance for monitoring the purity and stability of reference material of multi-class pesticides during prolonged storage	India as Chair of the Electronic Working Group
33	7a, 7c, 7d, 9, 10	Guyana
34	3, 4a, 4b, 5a, 5b, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c, 7d, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13	Uganda