codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH
ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel.: 57971 Telex: 625852-625853 FAO I Cables: Foodagri Rome Facsimile: (6) 57973152-5782610

ALINORM 93/24

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Twentieth Session
Geneva, 28 June - 7 July 1993

REPORT OF THE TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES
The Hague, 6-13 April 1992

Note: This report incorporates Codex Circular Letter CL 1992/12-PR.

codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel.: 57971 Telex: 625852-625853 FAO I Cables: Foodagri Rome Facsimile: (6) 57973152-5782610

CX 4/40.2

CL 1992/12-PR
April 1992

TO: - Codex Contact Points
- Participants at the Twenty-fourth Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues
- Interested International Organizations

FROM: Chief, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy

SUBJECT: Report of the 24th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

The report of the 24th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) (Ref. ALINORM 93/24) will be considered by the 20th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, to be held in Geneva from 28 June - 7 July 1992.

PART A: MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

1. Draft MRLs and Draft Amendments to Codex MRLs at Steps 5 and 8

These are included in document ALINORM 93/24A - Add. 1 distributed separately.

2. Proposed Non-Substantial Changes to Codex Maximum Residue Limits

These are included in document ALINORM 93/24A - Add. 1 distributed separately.

3. Other matters requiring action by the Committee will be included in document ALINORM 93/21 to be distributed prior to the Commission's session.

PART B: COMMENTS AND/OR INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM GOVERNMENTS AND INTERESTED INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. Inclusion of further pesticides in the Codex Priority Lists (para. 237, ALINORM 93/24)

Governments wishing to propose pesticides mentioned in para. 237 for inclusion in the Codex Priority List or other pesticides are requested to forward comments to Dr. J. Taylor, Pesticide Directorate, Agriculture Canada, SBI Building 2323 Riverside Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada, with a copy to this office.

2. Proposed Procedure for the Periodic Review of Pesticides (para. 245)

Countries are requested to forward comments on a proposed procedure for the Periodic Review of Pesticides, attached to the report as Annex II to Appendix V to Dr. J. Taylor, Pesticide Directorate, Agriculture Canada, SBI Building, 2323 Riverside Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada, with a copy to this office.

3. Specific Request for Residues and Toxicological Data

Information on use patterns, good agricultural practice, residue data, national MRR, etc. should be sent to the FAO Joint Secretary, Plant Protection Service, AGP, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.

Toxicological data should be sent to Dr. J.L. Herrman, International Programme on Chemical Safety, World Health Organization, 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland.

i) Pesticides scheduled for evaluation or re-evaluation by the JMPR (Annex I of Appendix V)

ii) Pesticides for which the ADI was established prior to 1976 and or review by the JMPR is based on new data

Data on current GAP are requested for compounds included in paras. 241-242 of the report (ALINORM 93/24): Diquat (031), fenthion (031), trichlorfon (066), thiometon (076), phosmet (103), guazatine (114), trifosine (116). Governments are requested to provide information on carbofenothion (011) and chlorobenzilate (016), both proposed for deletion by the 24th CCPR.

Further information is requested for compounds under review listed in para. 249: Endrin (033), pirimiphos-methyl (086), chlormequat (015), ethoxyquin (035), formothion (042), pyrethrins (063).

iii) National Approaches to requiring animal studies

Governments are requested to submit national approaches to requiring animal studies in order to permit the elaboration of general rules on when transfer studies are necessary (para. 189).

iv) Pesticides for which MRLs are being elaborated

Aldrin and Dieldrin (001)	Scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1992 JMPR. Available monitoring data are requested (paras. 59-60).
Dimethoate (027)	Scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1993 JMPR. Detailed comments on peach are urgently requested (para. 78).
Fentin (040)	The Committee proposed deletion for cacao beans, carrot, celeriac, celery, coffee beans, peanut and peas if no new information became available (para. 88).
Heptachlor (043)	Monitoring data and information are requested on the possible occurrence of residues in carrot, tomato and vegetables in commerce or consumption for the 1993 JMPR (para. 90).
Carbendazim (072)	Information on the commodities carrot, pine-apple, plums (including prunes), pome fruits and sugar beet leaves or tops are requested for the 1992 JMPR (para. 105).
Demeton-S-methyl (073) Demeton-S-methyl-sulphon (164) Oxydemeton-methyl (166)	Are scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1992 JMPR. Available data and information are requested (para. 106).
Amitraz (122)	Governments are requested to report on their national situation concerning the residue definition, with the aim of securing international harmonization (para. 134).
Vinclozolin (159)	Data and information are requested for apricot and lettuce, head (para. 162).

Cyromazine (169)	Information on residue definition are requested for 1992 JMPR (para 184).
Cyhexatin (067) Azocylotin (129)	Different opinions were expressed concerning the proposal of the JMPR to maintain two separate lists for these two compounds. Countries are requested to provide information on current residue definitions (para. 195).
Coumaphos (018)	Information on agricultural uses are requested, considering the recommendation for the deletion of this compound at the next session of the CCPR (para. 206).

4. Use of a Separate List for MRLs concerning Extraneous Maximum Residue Limits (EMRLs)

The proposal of the Codex Secretariat on the use of a separate list for EMRLs was considered and, in view of the remarks presented at the current session, the Committee decided to revise the proposal and request comments (paras. 202-204). The revised proposal is attached as Appendix VII to this report and comments should be sent to Dr. W.H. van Eck, Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs, Foodstuffs Division, P.O. Box 5406, 2280 H.K. Rijswijk, The Netherlands, with a copy to this office, preferably not later than the end of December 1992.

5. Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk and Fish for Control Purposes (at Step 3 of the Procedure)

The Committee discussed the proposed sampling plan for the determination of pesticide residues in milk and dairy products and decided to append the proposed draft as Appendix VI to this report for government comments at Step 3 (paras. 211-214).

Comments should be sent to Ms. R. Hignett, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Pesticide Safety Division, Ogg Building, Rothamstead, Harpenden, Herts. AL5 2QJ, U.K., with a copy to this office, preferably not later than the end of December 1992.

6. Information on pesticides in current use in developing countries (paras. 231-235)

The Committee agreed to the continuation of the Working Group under the same terms of reference, with the understanding that the same questionnaire for information circulated after the 23rd Session of the CCPR (ALINORM 93/24A) should be used. Response to the questionnaire attached to this document as Annex I should be directed according to the appropriate region to:

Regional Chairman for Asia:

Dr. Edhbal Taheri
Head of Toxicology Department and
Deputy Director for Food and Drug
Laboratories
Ministry of Health
No. 31 Emam Khomeini Ave
P.O. Box 9385 Teheran
Iran

Regional Chairman for Latin America and the Caribbean:	Dr. R. Gonzalez Faculty of Agricultural Sciences University of Chile P.O. Box 1004 Santiago Chile
Regional Chairman for Africa:	Ms. Salwa Mohamed Dogheim Central Agricultural Pesticide Laboratory Ministry of Agriculture Dokki Gizah Egypt
Regional Chairman for the South-West Pacific	Mr. G.N. Hooper Director Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Section Department of Primary Industries and Energy Canberra, A.C.T. 2600 Australia

with a copy to this office, preferably not later than the end of December 1992.

7. **Request for Comments on Draft Codex MRLs at Steps 3 and 6 of the Codex Standard**

The 24th Session of the CCPR decided to delay discussion to the 1993 CCPR of individual proposals at Steps 3 and 6 which were proposed or amended by the 1991 JMPR because the residue and toxicological publications were not available at the meeting. Comments on these draft MRLs were requested through CL 1991/29-PR. In accordance with the Codex Procedure, these were sent to members of the Commission and interested international organizations for comments on all aspects, including possible implications of the draft standard, for their economic interest. Further comments on the list of MRLs listed in CL 1991/29-PR should be sent to: Dr. W.H. van Eck, Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs, Foodstuffs Division, P.O. Box 5406, 2280 H.K. Rijswijk, The Netherlands, with a copy to this office, **preferably not later than the end of December 1992**.

8. **Request for Comments on a new procedure for the assessment of the storage stability of residues of pesticides**

The Committee agreed that a new procedure for the assessment of the storage stability of residues of pesticides, based on Annex I to Appendix III of this report should be included in Part VII of the Guide concerning Good Practice in Pesticide Residue Analysis. Comments on this proposal, elaborated by GIFAP and discussed by the Committee, should be sent to Mr. L.G.M. TH. Tuinstra, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, State Institute for Quality Control of Agricultural Prroducts, P.O. Box 230, 6700 AE Wageningen, The Netherlands, with a copy to this office, **preferably not later than the end of December 1992**.

ANNEX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INFORMATION ON PESTICIDES IN CURRENT USE IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

1. What are the most important pesticides used in your country.

2. For each of the above, please provide copies of product labels or details of the following:-

- Manufacturer
- Concentration of active ingredient in the product
- Formulation type
- Crops on which the product is used
- Pests/Diseases controlled
- Application rate
- Number of applications
- Timing of applications
- Method of application
- Pre-harvest intervals
- Special notes/instructions

3. Have MRLs been established for the food commodities on which these pesticides are used? If so, please provide details.

4. Which crops are exported from your country.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Twenty-fourth Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) reached the following conclusions during its deliberations:

Matters for Consideration by the Commission:

Draft MRLs and draft amendments to Codex MRLs at Steps 5 and 8 will be included in document ALINORM 93/24A-Add. 1 which will be distributed prior to the Commission's session.

Other Matters of Interest to the Commission:

- The report of the 1991 Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) was discussed in detail (paras. 23-32). The Committee was informed that owing to severe budgetary constraints at WHO, sufficient funds were not at present available to convene the WHO Expert Group in the 1992 JMPR. The Committee took note of this situation with great concern and requested FAO and WHO to do everything possible to convene a full JMPR in 1992;

- The Committee received a report on replies from governments in response to the Form of Acceptance issued in September 1991 and noted that several countries had submitted their position on acceptance and that all data on acceptances received were included in a computerized programme. The Committee agreed to the importance of all member countries responding to the Form of Acceptance circulated in September 1991 (paras. 33-37);

- The Committee was informed of changes proposed for the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds, in order to facilitate the computerization of Part 4 of the Guide. The Committee supported the proposed amendments to the Codex Classification which will be reproduced in Volume II of the Codex Alimentarius, scheduled to be issued this year (paras. 53-55);

- The Committee received a report from WHO on dietary intake estimates, and the recommendations of the 1990 JMPR concerning the importance of systematically developing and presenting the data on residues in edible portions of commodities to simplify the evaluation of estimated dietary intakes, were emphasized (paras. 38 - 46);

- Reports from GEMS/Food and from national monitoring programmes were received. The Committee expressed its support to the work of GEMS/Food and recommended that data be obtained from countries that are known to use organophosphorus pesticides extensively, since these compounds have at times been found at high levels in cereals, fruits and vegetables (paras. 47-52);

- Draft MRLs were considered in the light of comments received. The Committee decided to postpone discussion of individual proposals at Step 3 and some of the proposals at Step 6 in view of the fact that the 1991 JMPR Evaluations had not yet been published (paras. 56-190);

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (Cont'd)

- The Committee considered the proposal that the EMRLs should be included in a separate list with an appropriate statement concerning their significance and decided to revise the proposal and request comments by circular letter (paras. 202-204);

- The Committee considered the Guideline Levels and decided to postpone their deletion, awaiting evaluation by the JMPR (paras. 205-210);

- The Committee discussed a "Recommended Method for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk and Fish for Control Purposes" prepared by the United Kingdom and decided to append the proposed draft to the report for government comments at Step 3. A harmonization of work with the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods was recommended (paras. 211-214);

- The Committee received a report of the Working Group on Acceptances and adopted its recommendations and the procedure proposed for Step 7B;

- The Committee received a report of the Working Group on Methods of Analysis and agreed to request comments concerning Good Practices in Pesticide Residue Analysis and on a proposed procedure for the assessment of the storage stability of residues of pesticides in samples for analysis;

- The Committee agreed to the continuation of the Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries under the same terms of reference, with the understanding that additional government comments would be solicited on those questions previously circulated;

- Priority lists of pesticides were adopted for the guidance of the JMPR, governments and industry regarding the generation of data and the evaluation of pesticides and their residues. A draft proposed procedure for the periodic review of pesticides was appended to the report for government comments;

- The Committee was informed that an updated list of National Pesticide Residue Limits in Food would be prepared by Canada.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

****

INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues held its 24th Session in The Hague, The Netherlands, from 6-13 April 1992. Dr W.H. van Eck, of the Netherlands Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs served as Chairman. The Session was attended by 42 Codex member countries and 12 international organizations. The list of participants, including officers from FAO and WHO, is attached as Appendix I to this report.

OPENING OF THE SESSION (Agenda Item 1)

2. The Session was opened by Dr. B. Sangster, Director-General of Public Health, Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs. He welcomed the Committee to The Hague on the occasion of its 24th Session. He stressed the importance of the Committee, especially in light of the ongoing GATT negotiations. He mentioned the cooperation of the Committee with the JMPR which had existed since the very onset of CCPR activities. This cooperation should be well maintained. Dr. Sangster frequently made reference to the recommendations of the FAO/WHO Conference on Food Standards, Chemicals in Food and Food Trade and the meeting of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, both held in Rome in 1991. Several of the recommendations of the Food Conference, endorsed by the Commission, will influence the work of the CCPR. He noted the undertaking of the Commission to harmonize methods of risk assessment used by several Codex Committees. Increasingly, dietary intake predictions in relation to the acceptable daily intake would be shown to be an essential factor in the acceptance of proposed residue limits. Dr. Sangster welcomed the participation of developing countries and consumer organizations in Codex activities. Finally, he announced that the Dutch Government had accepted an invitation from the Cuban authorities to hold the 25th Session of the Committee in Havana, Cuba.

3. The Chairman thanked Dr. Sangster for his interesting overview of developments influencing the activities of the Committee, and gratefully acknowledged the continuing government support of the Committee's activities.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 2)

4. The Provisional Agenda as contained in CX/PR 92/1 was adopted by the Committee, with the understanding that working paper CX/PR 92/14 (Agenda Item 10 (a)) had not been prepared and therefore would not be discussed.

APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEURS (Agenda Item 3)

5. Mrs. J.K. Taylor (Canada) and Mr C.W. Cooper (United States of America) were appointed to act as rapporteur and as co-rapporteur to the Committee, respectively.

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES (Agenda Item 4 (a))

6. The Committee noted those items of interest summarized in document CX/PR 92/2. The Codex Secretariat directed the Committee's attention to matters not included in the paper as well as other issues scheduled for discussion elsewhere. The Committee focused its discussions on the following:

Computerized Version of Codex Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides

7. The Committee was informed that the above project was complete and that each Codex Member government would receive a complimentary copy. It is available to other interested bodies for a fee.

8. The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Codex Secretariat for its efforts towards the finalization of this project, and supported the reduced price for developing countries. In response to an IOCU request for the system to be

distributed free of charge to international organizations, the Secretariat indicated that this was being studied on a case-by-case basis but a large distribution was not possible at present in view of the cost to the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme.

Methods of Analysis and Sampling

9. The Committee was reassured that the current review of the terms of reference for the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling would not conflict with those of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Methods of Analysis of the CCPR. The Committee noted that the CCMAS review was only related to the possible elaboration of general methods.

Draft Glossary of Terms and Definitions

10. The Committee noted that the above glossary, as elaborated by the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF), had been forwarded to Step 8 for adoption by the 20th Session of the Commission (Appendix IX, ALINORM 93/31). In taking this decision, the CCRVDF had agreed that other definitions adopted by the Commission or in use by other Codex Committees or the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) would be taken into account.

11. The Committee, while agreeing to the importance of avoiding duplication of efforts or confusion, noted that specific concerns regarding the CCRVDF Glossary should be brought forward to the Codex Secretariat as directed in CL 1991/26-RVDF.

Draft Guidelines for the Establishment of a Regulatory Programme for Control of Veterinary Drugs in Foods

12. The Committee was informed that the above Guidelines (Appendix VIII, ALINORM 93/31), were adopted by the Commission at Step 5 and were currently being circulated for additional government comments at Step 6 (CL 1991/26-RVDF). The Guidelines included sampling plans for the control of veterinary drug residues in animal products.

13. The Committee noted that the CCRVDF had taken the Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues into consideration when elaborating these Guidelines. The Committee agreed that when elaborating the CCPR Sampling Procedures for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk and Fish (Agenda Item 9), duplication of efforts with the CCRVDF should be avoided.

Priority List of Veterinary Drugs Requiring Evaluation

14. The Committee was informed that the CCRVDF had decided to remove lindane from its priority list as the JMPR had recently established MRLs for lindane in eggs, milk, meat of cattle, sheep, pigs, and poultry meat (fat).

Review and Promotion of Acceptances of Codex Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides

15. The Committee welcomed the approach followed by Canada in the use of "free distribution" acceptance, whereby commodities containing residues at levels of less than 0.1 mg/kg can be distributed freely where a Canadian tolerance does not exist.

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

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

16. The representative of FAO informed the Committee of its efforts in implementing the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, especially in regard to the provisions of Prior Informed Consent (PIC). The Committee was reminded that the PIC provisions provided guidance on the import

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE 1991 JOINT FAO/WHO MEETING ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES (Agenda Item 5)

23. The report was briefly introduced by the JMPR Secretariat and the Vice-Chairman of the 1991 JMPR.

24. The report was published by FAO in January 1992 as FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 111. A total of 30 pesticides were on the agenda, of which 17 were evaluated toxicologically. Five of them were evaluated for the first time, while most of the rest were full-scale re-evaluations. Attention was drawn to several errors in Annex 1 to the report, which will be corrected in the residue evaluations currently in print.

25. As outlined in Section 2.12 of the report, difficulties were experienced with procedures for evaluation under the periodic review of old compounds programme. The difficulties mainly arose because the lack of new information (e.g., lack of current GAP) assumed a significance under the periodic review programme which it did not have in normal circumstances. Procedural guidelines for JMPR members were being developed to attempt to address this problem.

26. There was also a complication in knowing the current GAP for a particular pesticide. The complication arose because registrations and authorizations were revised so often. A ready solution was not available, but continual and frequent changes in authorised uses made it very difficult to ensure that current MRLs related to current uses.

27. The observer of the EEC, supported by the Delegation of the United States of America, welcomed the initiative of WHO in calculating on a systematic basis the Theoretical Maximum Daily Intakes (TMDIs) and Estimated Maximum Daily intakes (EMDIs) for pesticides evaluated by the JMPR, as outlined in Annex III of the report. The Guidelines for predicting dietary intake of pesticide residues that had been published by WHO provided an excellent stepwise progression for the estimation of dietary intakes; however, processing information and the necessary details of dietary patterns were frequently unavailable. The EEC requested the development of a procedure to examine Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) in cases where the acceptable daily intake (ADI) might be exceeded by the best estimate of dietary intake, and might represent an unacceptable risk for consumers. The EEC was carrying out two studies on dietary intake in member states, details of which will be provided to IPCS.

28. The observer of the EEC also welcomed the results of the GEMS monitoring data as described in Section 2.3 of the report, and agreed that such information was useful and normally reassuring. However, with the exception of old, persistent and now largely superseded pesticides, the Community would be reluctant to use such information for estimating actual dietary intakes. In order to be of assistance for estimating dietary intakes of pesticides, the quantity and quality of data would need to be exceptionally high. It was not expected that routine monitoring and control data alone would be generated in sufficient quantity and quality to be statistically valid for use in estimating the dietary intake of pesticide residues. The EEC had started a detailed study on monitoring procedures within the Community which should lead to the reinforcement of the Community's monitoring efforts. Progress in this area will be reported to future CCPR sessions.

29. The Delegation of the United Kingdom requested the JMPR to indicate realistic limits of determination for regulatory use (as distinct from limits achievable in residue trials) for pesticides in crops on which their use was not approved. It was these limits which would be adopted by the EEC as MRLs in such crops. The Chairman of the FAO Panel of the JMPR explained that the JMPR always gave this information when possible, but could only do so if appropriate data had been provided.

and export of chemicals which were banned or severely restricted for health or environmental reasons. In this regard, it was indicated that the "Guidance for Governments" document, which explained the operation of the PIC procedure, had been published.

17. The representative of FAO also indicated that a Joint FAO/UNEP Database on control actions for the operation of PIC had been developed, and that acutely toxic pesticides which may cause health or environmental problems, especially in developing countries, would be considered for inclusion. FAO and UNEP activities related to training in PIC procedures, especially concerning the strengthening of decision-making and regulatory capabilities in developing countries, were also highlighted.

European Economic Community (EEC)

18. The Observer of the EEC gave a brief outline of Community activities related to Directive 91/414/EEC, which concerned the registration of plant protection products, especially as related to possible implications for the future establishment of MRLs in the Community. It was indicated that this directive was adopted by the European Council of Agricultural Ministers on 15 July 1991.

19. The EEC Observer also highlighted the following Community activities related to pesticide residue legislation:

- the establishment of Community MRLs for 22 major pesticides which may leave residues in food and which have not been previously covered by community legislation;

- the establishment of Community MRLs for several pesticides used either currently or previously in the production of tea;

- the transfer of provisions for 19 pesticides from the previous Directive 76/895/EEC to the recently adopted Directive 90/642/EEC, and;

- the establishment of provisions for birds eggs, as foreseen at the time of the adoption of Directive 86/363/EEC.

International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC)

20. The Observer of the IUPAC outlined the activities of this organization of interest to the CCPR, especially as related to the deliberations of the IUPAC Agrochemicals Commission. The IUPAC representative reminded the Committee that the aim of the IUPAC Commission was to examine critical issues arising from the chemistry and use of agrochemicals as related to the health of mankind and the environment. This included the examination of fundamental aspects of the chemistry of agrochemicals, their fate in plants, animals and the environment, and methods of trace analysis.

21. The Committee was informed that the Eighth IUPAC International Congress on Pesticide Chemistry was scheduled to be held in Washington, D.C. from 4-9 July 1994, and that a IUPAC workshop dealing with the general theme of environmental and worker safety would be held in Bangkok from 9-11 November 1992.

International Toxicology Information Centre (ITIC)

22. The observer of the ITIC informed the Committee of the availability of its "Survey for Establishing an International Database on Pesticides", which separated international safety data on pesticides from those of other chemicals in order to facilitate the identification and location of these reference sources. It was further indicated that the above survey was available by writing directly to the ITIC.

30. The WHO Joint Secretary of JMPR announced that, owing to very severe budgetary constraints at WHO and within the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS), sufficient funds were not at present available to convene the WHO Expert Group (i.e. the WHO component of JMPR) in 1992 unless additional funds were received in the near future.

31. The Codex Secretariat, on behalf of the FAO Chief of the Plant Protection Service, informed the Committee that the FAO Panel was ready to meet on the basis of residue evaluations only. However, it was noted that it would be inappropriate for the FAO Panel to evaluate new compounds in the absence of toxicological evaluations.

32. The Committee took note of this situation with great concern, as the impact of such an eventuality could have a negative influence on the work of the CCPR. Delegations and representatives were requested to do everything possible to make funds available to the WHO for the JMPR. The Directors-General of FAO and WHO should also be requested to do everything possible to convene a full JMPR in 1992.

REPORTS ON ACCEPTANCES BY GOVERNMENTS OF CODEX MRLS (Agenda Item 6)

Summary of acceptances received since the adoption of the new system of acceptance (Agenda Item 6 (a))

33. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 92/3 concerning a summary of Codex MRLs adopted through the 19th Session of the Commission and draft MRLs in discussion at different steps of the Codex Procedure. The document also included a report on acceptances by governments of Codex MRLs in response to the Form of Acceptance sent in September 1991 from the Codex Secretariat to member countries and international organizations. The Committee was informed that the following countries had returned or updated their previous notification of acceptances: Bulgaria; Cuba; Malaysia; Mexico; New Zealand; Rumania; Singapore and the United States of America. Several other countries had reported their position on acceptances at the Codex Coordinating Committee for Asia (i.e. China, Thailand, Indonesia, Republic of Korea, Kuwait and Japan).

34. The Committee was also informed that all data on acceptances received were included in a computerized programme which provided updated information on the position of each member country and the status of acceptance for each Codex MRL.

35. The Delegation of the United States of America pointed out that the information included in the document prepared by the Codex Secretariat referred to the notification transmitted in 1988 and that a complete reply to the Codex Form of Acceptance would be provided in the near future.

36. The observer of the EEC stated that the Community had initiated procedures for acceptance of Codex MRLs. The Codex MRLs were taken into account by the European Commission regularly.

37. The Committee noted that strong support had been given by several notifying countries to the "free distribution" form of acceptance. The Committee agreed to the importance of all member countries responding to the Form of Acceptance circulated in September 1991.

CONSIDERATION OF INTAKE OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES (Agenda Item 7)

Progress Report by WHO on Dietary Intake Estimates (Agenda Item 7 (a))

38. The Committee had before it CX/PR 92/4 (Progress Report by WHO on Prediction of Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues) and Room Document No. 7, which provided details of the calculations and diets used in predicting these intakes. Theoretical Maximum Daily Intake (TMDI) and Estimated Maximum Daily Intake (EMDI) calculations, using the methods described in "Guidelines for Predicting Dietary

Intake of Pesticide Residues" (WHO, 1989) had been performed on all of the pesticides evaluated by the 1991 Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR). In addition, as requested by the Twenty-third Session of the CCPR, TMDI/EMDI calculations had been carried out for endosulfan, inorganic bromide and pirimiphos-methyl. Information on reduction factors to permit the calculation of an EMDI for methacrifos also had been requested at the Twenty-third Session of the CCPR, but no additional information was available on reduction factors.

39. As stated in these Guidelines, the TMDI is a gross overestimate of true pesticide intake because, among other reasons, very few of the crops treated with a pesticide contain the maximum residue level, residues are normally reduced through storage, preparation, commercial processing and cooking, and it is unlikely that each and every food for which an MRL is proposed will have been treated with the pesticide.

40. While the EMDI is a better estimate of intake than the TMDI, it is still an overestimate of the true pesticide residue intake because the proportion of a crop treated with a pesticide is usually far less than 100% and very few of the crops treated contain residue levels as high as the MRL, from which levels in the edible portion, processed and cooked commodities are derived.

41. If the EMDI exceeds the ADI, it is necessary to try to estimate more closely the true intake by calculating the Estimated Daily Intake (EDI). Calculation of the EDI takes into account several reduction factors described in the Guidelines, which are only available at the national level. EDI calculations can only be performed on a national basis by those who have adequate information on food consumption, the use of a given pesticide locally, and the nature and the amount of imported food.

42. The TMDI did not exceed the ADI for the following compounds: amitraz, azinphos-methyl, bentazone, bioresmethrin, bitertanol, buprofezin, cadusafos, carbofuran, carbosulfan, daminozide, fentin, flusilazole, glufosinate-ammonium, hexaconazole, hexythiazox, imazalil, inorganic bromide, methomyl, parathion, permethrin, propiconazole, and propoxur.

43. In carrying out EMDI calculations for those pesticides for which the TMDI exceeded the ADI, information on residue levels in food as consumed was seldom available. Thus, the EMDIs calculated for azocyclotin, chlorpyrifos-methyl, cyhexatin, disulfoton, endosulfan, heptachlor, methacrifos, monocrotophos, phorate, pirimiphos-methyl, and triazophos did not contain all of the correction factors that might be justified and were still substantial overestimates of the true intake.

44. The Delegation of Germany stated that it would be useful to calculate TMDIs using regional diets in addition to the global diet, and recommended that WHO calculate TMDIs using them in the future. The Delegation also stated that the presentation of diets was confusing and recommended that commodities be placed either in alphabetical order or in the order used by Codex. The Delegation of Egypt requested that calculations included residues on fish and nuts, which were important parts of the diet in some countries.

45. Discussion centred on action that should be initiated if EMDIs exceeded the ADI. Some delegations expressed the view that, because estimates based on actual residue levels at the national level invariably resulted in EDIs that were no more than a few percent of the ADI (even though the EMDIs may have been several hundred percent of the ADI) action should not be taken to limit MRLs on this basis. This called for a closer look at intake at the national level. Other delegations stated that a review of GAP should be undertaken when EMDIs exceeded the ADI. With such varying views it was concluded that a policy decision by CCPR may be required in the future. Therefore, it was recommended that this issue be referred to the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Acceptances for consideration. The Delegations of Australia, Finland, Germany, Sweden and the United States of America and the Observer of the EEC volunteered to work together on a document that would be prepared for the Working Group.

46. The Committee expressed its support for the work done by the Joint FAO/WHO/UNEP Programme on predicting intake of pesticide residues and the recommendations of the 1990 JMPR on the importance of systematically developing and presenting the data on residues in the edible portions of commodities to simplify the evaluation of estimated dietary intakes. Submissions to the JMPR should include such information in an appropriate form.

Report on Pesticide Residue Intake Studies through the Joint FAO/WHO/UNEP Food Contamination Monitoring Programme (Agenda Item 7 (b))

47. The Committee had before it Conference Room Document 6 (CX/PR 92/5), Report of the Joint UNEP/FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring and Assessment Programme (GEMS/FOOD), which highlighted progress of GEMS/Food in providing global information on levels and trends of contaminants in foods and their significance with regard to public health. During 1991, GEMS/Food published a summary of data for the period 1986-1988 (WHO/HPP/FOS 91.4), and a report on analytical quality assurance studies carried out in 1989 and 1990 (WHO/HPP/FOS 91.2). In addition, a meeting of the GEMS/Food Programme Management Committee was convened in November 1991 in Geneva. Among various recommendations, the Management Committee agreed to include formally "assessment" in the title of the Programme to reflect current practice. Two assessment documents based on GEMS/Food data will be published during 1992.

48. To improve the reliability of the data received, analytical quality assurance studies for organochlorine compounds and aflatoxins were carried out in 1991. A heavy metals study is being carried out in 1992. In addition, GEMS/Food will hold training courses in analytical quality assurance for participating institutions in Central and Latin America and the Caribbean. In order to obtain valid and comparable data on intakes of contaminants throughout the world, GEMS/Food will promote efforts to undertake total diet studies, especially in countries where monitoring programmes have not yet been established.

49. GEMS/Food will be greatly expanded in Europe to meet the requirements of certain EC directives indirectly related to food contamination monitoring which have relevance for all countries of Europe trading in food. GEMS/Food is also involved in the implementation of a number of European projects related to food safety and the environment. It is hoped that similar initiatives can be undertaken in other regions as well.

50. The Committee expressed its support of the work of GEMS/Food and recommended that data be obtained from countries that were known to use organophosphorus pesticides extensively, since these compounds had at times been found at high levels in cereals, fruits and vegetables.

Reports on pesticide residue intake studies by delegates (Agenda Item 7 (c))

51. The Delegation of Finland presented a paper that was distributed to the Committee as Conference Room Document 9. The paper summarized the results of monitoring studies during 1987-1990 (imported foods) and 1981-1990 (domestic foods) that were used for calculating the average residue levels of the 42 most frequently found pesticides in several agricultural commodities. The estimated maximum intakes were, in all cases, less than 2% of the ADIs established by the JMPR prior to 1991.

52. The Delegation of the United States of America briefly reported the results of the most recent total diet study that had been carried out in that country which covered the year 1990. In this study approximately 200 pesticides in approximately 200 food items, as prepared in the home, were analyzed. A total of 51 pesticides was detected, but all were well below the ADIs estimated by the JMPR. Reports had been made available to participants.

CLASSIFICATION OF FOODS AND ANIMAL FEEDS (Agenda Item 8.1 (a))

53. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 92/6 concerning the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds where changes were proposed in order to facilitate the computerization of Part 4 of the Guide by linking this data base to Parts 2 and 3. The main proposed change was a different numbering system for types and groups of commodities in order to have a system which would permit the addition of new types of commodities without changing the numbering system. Another modification was related to the synonyms for commodities which were not previously numbered in the classification system. Synonyms would now be numbered in a series beginning at 4000.

54. A scan system was used to transfer the text of the Codex Classification into the computerized programme, which permitted all data to be copied from the text. All the information for each commodity concerning the Class, Type, Group, Latin name, portion of the commodity to which the MRL referred and other information would be available in the first updated version of the computerized data base programme on Codex MRLs, to be revised annually.

55. The Committee supported the proposed amendments to the Codex Classification which will be reproduced in Volume II of the Revised Codex Alimentarius, scheduled to be issued this year.

CONSIDERATION OF MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS (Agenda Items 8.1 (b), (c), (d), (e))

56. The Committee had before it the following documents:

- CL 1991/15-PR, 21-PR and 29-PR containing MRLs at Steps 4 and 7;
- CX/PR 2-1992, Part 2 of the "Guide to Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues" in which MRLs are listed;
- CX/PR 92/7, 8 and 9 containing government comments on the MRLs under discussion;
- Japanese comments on MRLs at Steps 3 and 6;
- CX/PR 92/10 containing Codex General Maximum Limits for Fruits and Vegetables.

57. The Committee was informed that the 1991 JMPR Evaluations had not yet been published and therefore were not available to the meeting. In view of this the Committee regretfully decided to delay discussion, to the 1993 CCPR, of individual proposals at Step 3 and some of the proposals at Step 6 which were proposed or amended by the 1991 JMPR.

58. In the interest of economy, the following paragraphs refer only to those MRLs and ERLs on which there was detailed discussion, where delegations expressed reservations, or where relevant information had to be recorded. The Step in the Codex Procedure to which the Committee advanced or returned individual MRLs or ERLs or at which limits were held is indicated for each pesticide as follows:

Step Action

5 The draft MRL is submitted to the CAC for consideration and advancement to Step 6 for comments.

5/8 The draft MRL is submitted to the CAC at Steps 5 and 8 because the CCPR has recommended the omission of Steps 6 and 7.

7A The draft MRL is held at Step 7 only because the ADI is temporary. It is submitted by the Secretariat to the Commission at Step 8 as soon as a full ADI is estimated.

7B The draft MRL is held at Step 7 pending further consideration by the JMPR. Immediately after such consideration it is returned to Step 6 by the Secretariat for comments by Governments.

7C The draft MRL is held at Step 7 to await developments (other than review by the JMPR) on which further action by the CCPR is contingent. After such developments it is returned to Step 6 by the CCPR.

8 The draft MRL is submitted to the CAC for adoption as a Codex MRL (CXL).

(a) The MRL is a proposed amendment to a Codex MRL (CXL).
(following Step number)

ALDRIN AND DIELDRIN (001)

59. The Committee was informed that these compounds were scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1992 JMPR. Delegations were requested to submit available monitoring data. The United States of America had submitted data and the Delegation of Australia confirmed that they would submit data.

Fruits

60. The Committee agreed not to withdraw the general limit for fruits but to await the outcome of the review by the 1992 JMPR.

Cereal grains (except rice); Rice

61. The Committee agreed with the proposal of the Codex Secretariat to delete "rice" and replace "cereal grains except rice" with "cereal grains", (Code No GC 0080) because the MRLs were identical.

AZINPHOS-METHYL (002)

62. The Committee noted that the 1991 JMPR had re-evaluated both toxicological and residue data. The EEC, supported by Germany, indicated that the MRL for apples was too high and would be likely to result in intake problems for consumers in the Community in cases of excessive consumption. The WHO agreed to carry out TMDI calculations for regional diets. The Delegation of Spain indicated a preference for a gradual withdrawal of both specific and general limits. Further discussions on proposals for Step 3 and Step 3a and the deletion of the MRLs for fruits and vegetables were postponed because the 1991 JMPR Evaluations were not available at the meeting. While voluntary cancellations of 22 azinphos-methyl uses in the United States of America had been requested by manufacturers, the Delegation of the United States of America reported that other interested parties had committed to support continued uses for some of these commodities.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: Alfalfa fodder; clover hay or fodder; pecan; sugar cane; walnuts; wheat straw and fodder, dry.

At Step 3(a): Alfalfa forage (green); almonds; apple; blueberries; cherries; cranberry; cucumber; melons, except watermelon; nectarine; peach; pear; peppers, sweet; plums (including prunes); potato; soya bean (dry); tomato; watermelon; wheat.

CAPTAN (007)

63. It was decided to keep captan and folpet on the 1993 JMPR agenda for toxicological evaluation because the TADI for folpet expires in 1993 and they will be considered together. It will be scheduled again in 1994 for both toxicological and residues review, in view of the timing of data submission by the manufacturer.

64. During its 23rd Session the Committee agreed with temporary levels for citrus fruits as proposed by the Delegation of Spain which had already sent information to the JMPR.

CARBARYL (008)

65. The Committee noted that carbaryl was scheduled for toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1996 JMPR. The representative of the manufacturer informed the Committee that a full data package would then be available.

CHLORDANE (012)

Fruits and vegetables 0.02 mg/kg

66. The Committee noted that no action was required and maintained the EMRL at the limit of determination.

DIAZINON (022)

67. The Committee noted that diazinon was scheduled for toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1993 JMPR.

Fruits and Vegetables 0.5 mg/kg

68. The Committee agreed to maintain the general MRL awaiting review by the JMPR.

DICHLORVOS (025)

69. The Committee noted that dichlorvos was scheduled for toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1993 JMPR.

Fruits (0.1 mg/kg) and Vegetables (0.5 mg/kg)

70. The Committee agreed to maintain the MRLs awaiting review by the JMPR.

DICOFOL (026)

71. The Committee noted that dicofol was scheduled for toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1992 JMPR.

Fruits (5 mg/kg) and Vegetables (5 mg/kg)

72. The Committee agreed to maintain the MRL awaiting review by the JMPR.

DIMETHOATE (027)

73. The Committee noted that dimethoate was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1993 JMPR.

Beans, except broad bean and soyabean; broccoli; cauliflower; cucumber; lettuce, leaf

74. The Committee decided that if no new information became available to the 1993 JMPR the proposals would be withdrawn.

Brussels sprouts; cabbages, head; plums

75. The Delegation of the Netherlands would submit detailed comments on these proposals in time for the 1993 JMPR.

Lettuce, head

76. The Delegation of the United Kingdom would provide data on GAP and residues for the 1993 JMPR.

Wheat

77. The Delegation of Germany informed the Committee that they had sent information on GAP and residues to the JMPR in 1991. The Delegation of Italy would do this in time for the 1993 JMPR.

Peach

78. Delegations were urgently requested to send detailed comments on this proposal to the 1993 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Brussels sprouts; cabbages, head; lettuce, head; peach; plums (including prunes); wheat.

At Step 7C: Beans, except broad bean and soya bean; broccoli; cauliflower; cucumber; lettuce, leaf.

DIPHENYL (029)

79. As no new information had become available since the 22nd CCPR, the Committee decided to recommend deletion of the CXL for citrus fruits.

DIQUAT (031)

80. The Committee agreed to maintain the CXL for vegetables (except otherwise listed) at the limit of determination (0.05* mg/kg).

ENDOSULFAN (032)

81. Endosulfan was on the agenda of the 1993 JMPR for residue revaluation. The EEC noted that a risk assessment considering all uses of endosulfan was necessary. Therefore, they reserved their position until further GAP information, to be submitted to the 1993 JMPR, was available.

Broccoli; cabbage, savoy; cabbages, head; cauliflower

82. Several countries supported the proposed MRL of 0.5 mg/kg. The meeting was unable to confirm the availability of new residue data for cabbages from Portugal for the 1993 JMPR. Austria noted that their national limit for cabbage was 0.5 mg/kg and that they would ensure that this information would be made available to the 1993 JMPR. The United States of America indicated that their GAP supported an MRL of 2 mg/kg on cabbage, savoy and head, and cauliflower. The proposed MRLs of 1 for cabbage, head and 0.5 for cauliflower were estimated by the 1989 JMPR without consideration of GAP in the United States.

Chard; chicory, leaves; endive

83. The MRLs were made temporary at the 22nd CCPR when it was determined that they had been based on proposed GAP and not registered uses. There was no

confirmation of national GAP for endosulfan on these commodities, the meeting therefore decided to recommend deletion of these temporary MRLs.

Meat; milks

84. It was noted that the written comments supported the proposed MRL of 0.1 mg/kg in meat measured on a fat basis. The Delegation of the United States of America expressed a reservation as the MRLs, which had been changed by the CCPR from an earlier proposal by the JMPR, were based on monitoring data and method sensitivity rather than GAP. Australia noted that these MRLs must be compatible with those proposed in animal feedstuffs such as alfalfa and cotton seed.

Common bean

85. An MRL of 2 mg/kg would be required to reflect GAP in the United States of America as they had reason to believe that not all relevant data had been provided to the JMPR, but were unable to clarify the situation at the meeting due to changes in data ownership.

Fruits; vegetables (except ...)

86. The Committee agreed to await the review of the 1993 JMPR prior to recommending deletion of these general MRLs.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Broccoli; cabbages, savoy; cabbages, head; cauliflower.

At Step 8: Common bean (podsand/or immature seeds);meat; milks.

Deletion: Chard, chicory leaves, endive.

ENDRIN (033)

87. Monitoring data, especially on poultry meat, were requested for the 1992 JMPR. The delegations of the United States, The Netherlands and Australia had already sent data or would be sending it in the near future. The Delegation of The Netherlands expressed the view that the level for eggs was not consistent with levels for other animal products. They would send detailed comments on this aspect for the 1992 JMPR review.

FENTIN (040)

88. The 1991 JMPR was unable to make recommendations for cacao beans, carrot, celeriac, celery, coffee beans, peanut and pecan, either because GAP information was inadequate or because available residue data from supervised trials were not suitable in terms of current GAP. The Committee decided that if no new information became available, the current CXLs should be recommended for deletion.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: Hops, dry.

FOLPET (041)

89. Folpet was scheduled for toxicological review by the 1993 JMPR because of the temporary ADI. The manufacturer's representative informed the Committee that field studies on citrus fruits, lettuce, head and melons, as well as on potatoes, were currently being conducted and that residue data would be available for the 1994 JMPR. The manufacturer would also be providing residue data for citrus fruit, as well as for melons; lettuce, head and potato. The Committee decided to maintain the CXLs as temporary for all commodities.

HEPTACHLOR (043)

90. The Committee agreed with the recommendation of the 1991 JMPR that the current ERLs for carrot, tomato and vegetables should be converted to temporary ERLs pending the receipt of additional information. Delegations were requested to supply monitoring data and information on the possible occurrence of residues in food in commerce or at consumption for the 1993 JMPR (see 1990 JMPR report, Section 2.7. for details of type of information required).

INORGANIC BROMIDE (047)

91. The Delegation of Israel informed the Committee that a full residue data package had been submitted for the 1992 JMPR review of residue data.

92. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that in light of its ozone depleting potential and in order to meet the requirements of legislations and the Montreal Accord, the use of methyl bromide might have to be phased out by the year 2000. The representative of the EEC stated that the use of methyl bromide needed to be carefully examined in view of its possible effects on the ozone layer.

Fruits 20 mg/kg

93. The Committee decided to postpone a decision on the recommendation of the deletion of the CXL while awaiting the 1992 JMPR evaluation.

MONOCROTOPHOS (054)

94. The Delegation of Finland, supported by other delegations, was of the opinion that the 1991 JMPR recommendation to lower the ADI created a need to reconsider the existing CXLs and GAP. Special concerns were expressed with regard to the CXLs for apple, pear and tomato.

95. Attention was drawn to the study from Finland where intake, based on monitoring data, was calculated to be 1 percent of the previous ADI.

96. The manufacturers representative informed the Committee that the compound was re-scheduled for toxicological evaluation at the 1993 JMPR, during which the ADI would again be discussed.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: Egg plant; peanut; peppers, chili; sugar cane; tea, green, black; watermelon; wheat.

OMETHOATE (055)

97. During its 23rd Session the Committee agreed that an update for omethoate would be considered separately from dimethoate and formothion. Proposed MRLs and CXLs, all based on old GAP and residue data, were considered obsolete. The representative of the manufacturer stated that a full data package would be available for the 1993 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: Banana.

At Step 3(a): Cabbage, head; onion, bulb; tomato.

At Step 6: Apple; apricot; cherries; grapes; peach; pear; plums (including prunes); sugar beet leaves or tops; witloof chicory (sprouts).

PARAQUAT (057)

Vegetables 0.05 mg/kg

98. The Committee noted that MRL was at the limit of determination and decided that no action was required.

PARATHION (058)

99. The Committee noted that parathion had been evaluated for residues by the 1991 JMPR and was scheduled for toxicological evaluation by the 1994 JMPR.

100. Discussion of the 1991 JMPR recommendation to withdraw the CXL for citrus fruit and the general CXLs for fruits and vegetables was postponed.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: Cotton seed; maize; olive oil, crude; sorghum; sunflower seed.

At Step 3(a): Apple; leek; lemon; mandarin; olives; oranges, sweet, sour; potato; soya bean (dry).

PARATHION-METHYL (059)

101. The 1991 JMPR delayed re-evaluation to await additional residue data being developed by the manufacturer for re-registration in the United States of America. Residue review was scheduled for the 1992 JMPR; re-evaluation of toxicology for 1994. Deletion of the general CXL for fruits was postponed.

CYHEXATIN (067)

102. The 1991 JMPR re-evaluated cyhexatin in conjunction with azocyclotin (129). The ADI was lowered and the residue definition simplified by deleting the metabolite dicyclohexyltin oxide. The MRLs for cyhexatin were now the same as those for azocyclotin. The source of each MRL is indicated in the report of the 1991 JMPR.

103. Cyhexatin was scheduled for toxicological review by the 1994 JMPR and residue review by the 1992 JMPR. It was uncertain whether additional information would be available for the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: Nectarine.

At Step 6: Common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); egg plant; grapes; kiwifruit; peach; plums (including prunes); strawberry.

At Step 6(a): Apple.

BROMOPROPYLATE (070)

104. The Committee noted that bromopropylate was on the agenda of the 1993 JMPR for residue and toxicological evaluation. Consideration of the withdrawal of the MRL for vegetables will be postponed pending the outcome of the 1993 JMPR. The representative of the manufacturer was requested to provide additional data for the 1993 JMPR.

CARBENDAZIM (072)

105. This compound, together with benomyl (069) and thiophanate-methyl (077) was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation. At the suggestion of the Delegation of Austria, the Committee decided to request the WHO to calculate the TMDI and EMDI for carbendazim, benomyl and thiophanate-methyl. The Delegation of the Netherlands was requested to provide information for apricot; bean fodder; cherries; citrus fruits; lettuce, head; mushrooms; nectarine; peach and peppers for the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of Hungary agreed to provide monitoring data in 1993 for berries and other small fruits; lettuce, head and tomato. The observer of the EEC was requested to provide information for cereal grains. No specific delegation agreed to provide information on the commodities carrot; pineapple; plums (including prunes); pome fruits and sugar beet leaves or tops for the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Apricot; bean fodder; berries and other small fruits; carrot; cereal grains; cherries; citrus fruits; lettuce, head; mushrooms; nectarine; peach; peppers; pineapple; plums (including prunes); pome fruits; sugar beet leaves or tops; tomato.

DEMETON-S-METHYL (073), DEMETON-S-METHYLSULPHON (164), OXYDEMETON-METHYL (166)

106. These compounds were on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for re-evaluation of residues. Discussions on proposals at Step 6 were postponed to the 25th Session of the CCPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: All proposals.

DISULFOTON (074)

107. Discussion on proposals at Step 3 or Step 3A and the withdrawal of the MRL for vegetables as recommended by the 1991 JMPR were postponed. The Committee was informed that the CXLs for clover hay or fodder and rice were not temporary and that the footnote 4/ for coffee beans should be deleted.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3(a): Alfalfa fodder; asparagus; barley; broccoli; cabbages, head; cauliflower; coffee beans; common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); garden pea (young pods); garden pea, shelled; lettuce, head; lettuce, leaf; maize; maize forage; oat forage (green); oat straw and fodder, dry; oats; pecan; radish, Japanese; sorghum; sorghum forage (green); sugar beet; sugar beet leaves or tops; sweet corn (corn-on-the-cob); sweet corn (kernels); tomato; wheat; wheat forage (green).

At Step 3: Barley straw and fodder, dry; beans (dry); chicken eggs; cotton seed; maize fodder; milk of cattle, goats and sheep; poultry meat; wheat straw and fodder, dry.

PROPOXUR (075)

108. Discussions on proposals at Step 3A and the withdrawal of the MRL for vegetables as recommended by the 1991 JMPR were postponed because the 1991 JMPR Residue Evaluations were not available at the meeting.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3(a): Broad bean (green pods/immature seeds); cabbage, savoy; carrot; common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); cucumber; garden pea (young pods); kohlrabi; leek; lettuce, head; onion, bulb; potato; spinach; tomato.

VAMIDOTHION (078)

109. The Delegation of France, on behalf of the manufacturer, indicated that residue data and GAP information on apples and pears would be available for the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Pome fruits.

CHLOROTHALONIL (081)

110. This compound was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation. However, the manufacturer asked for a one year delay to allow for providing residue data for grapes. The Delegation of the EEC was requested to send comments on the toxicological evaluations within the next two months. The Delegations of Germany and the United States of America had already submitted comments.

111. In view of the fact that the manufacturer was carrying out a review of all of the residue data not yet submitted to the JMPR, it was agreed that the 1992 residue evaluation could be rescheduled to 1993. In addition, the manufacturer would be providing residue data on grapes.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Grapes.

PIRIMIPHOS-METHYL (086)

112. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for toxicological re-evaluation based on data originally developed by the manufacturer some years ago and a literature search. No new data will be provided.

Peanut oil, edible

113. The Committee was informed that information had still not been received from African countries on post-harvest uses for peanuts. Because no new data had become available, the Committee decided to move the proposal to Step 7C, awaiting further review by the JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7C: Peanut oil, edible.

DINOCAP (087)

114. The Committee noted that the product was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation. The Delegation of Germany had supplied GAP, The Netherlands would supply written comments and the manufacturer informed the Committee that residue data would be made available to the JMPR as requested.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: All proposals.

CHLORPYRIFOS-METHYL (090)

115. This product was on the agenda of the 1991 JMPR for toxicological and residue evaluation. Because some information on toxicology was not received in time for the 1991 JMPR meeting, the compound was placed on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR. The Committee decided to postpone further discussion until the JMPR evaluation was available.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: Barley; date; grapes; mushrooms; oats; oranges, sweet, sour; rape seed.

At Step 3(a): Peppers.

BIORESMETHRIN (093)

116. This product was on the agenda of the 1991 JMPR for toxicological and residue evaluation. An ADI was estimated. Discussions on proposals at Step 3 were postponed because the 1991 JMPR Evaluations were not available at the meeting.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: All proposals.

ACEPHATE (095)

117. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation. Although several Delegations had expressed reservations on the proposed MRLs in the past, no new information on GAP or residues had become available. The representatives of GIFAP would contact the manufacturer about the availability of information.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Broccoli; Brussels sprouts; cabbages, head; cauliflower; citrus fruits; tomato.

CARBOFURAN (096)

118. The Committee noted the relationship of carbofuran residues to carbosulfan (145). The Committee decided therefore to consider temporary the MRL of citrus fruits for carbofuran as was done for carbosulfan. The Delegation of Germany indicated that the proposed MRL was not supported by adequate data. The Delegation of Spain indicated that the data from Italy reflected GAP in Spain. Both Delegations were invited to supply their comments in writing to the JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Citrus fruits.

METHAMIDOPHOS (100)

119. The Committee noted that methamidophos was a metabolite of acephate (095) for which separate MRLs had been recommended. The compound was on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation. The Delegation of The Netherlands was invited to forward their GAP and written comments on broccoli; cabbages, head; cauliflower; egg plant; potato and tomato to the JMPR. The Delegation of Germany had sent their comments and GAP to the JMPR, while the observer of the EEC indicated that they would send comments soon. The Delegations of Australia, Spain and Italy would provide residue data on peaches. The representative of the manufacturer would send GAP and residue data to the JMPR.

Celery

120. The Delegation of The Netherlands and Germany indicated that the data base was inconsistent and did not support the proposed MRL. Both Delegations were requested to send their written comments to the JMPR.

Cotton seed

121. The Delegation of the United States of America questioned whether the 0.1 mg/kg proposal for cotton seed was high enough to accommodate acephate uses.

Melons, except Watermelon

122. The Delegation of Germany, supported by the Delegations of France and The Netherlands, considered the data base as insufficient for establishing an MRL and would provide written comments to the JMPR. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the proposed MRL based on data already submitted. The Committee decided to move the proposal to Step 8.

Peppers, Chili; Peppers, Sweet; Watermelon

123. A few delegations indicated that the proposed MRLs were too high. The Committee decided to move the proposals to Step 8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Broccoli; cabbages, head; cauliflower; citrus fruits; cotton seed; egg plant; peach; potato; tomato.

At Step 8: Celery; melons, except watermelon; peppers, Chili; peppers, sweet; watermelon.

PHORATE (112)

124. The Committee noted that the compound had been considered at the 1991 JMPR for residue evaluation.

Carrot

125. The Delegation of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that in view of the low ADI they had changed their GAP. The pre-harvest interval had been changed significantly. Details of revised GAP and residue data would be submitted to the 1992 JMPR.

126. The Delegation of France indicated that in view of the low ADI the manufacturer should be encouraged to provide a method of analysis with a lower limit of determination.

Peanut oil, crude and edible

127. Several delegations agreed with the proposed MRL at the limit of determination. The Delegation of The Netherlands indicated that the MRL for peanut was twice as high as for peanut oil. The Delegation of France indicated that it was unlikely that phorate residues would be found in fatty products.

Potato

128. Several delegations expressed reservations regarding the proposed MRL for potato. More information was desired on the fate of residues in processed potatoes in view of the low ADI. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that they had a MRL of 0.5 mg/kg and that data reviewed by the JMPR supported that level. Calculations of intake in the United States of America,

using more refined data than that used by WHO for calculating TMDIs, indicated no intake problems from currently registered uses in the United States of America.

129. The representative of the manufacturer informed the Committee that data on processing and cooking would be provided to the 1992 JMPR. The Committee decided to maintain the proposal at Step 7B pending evaluation by the JMPR.

Status of MRLS

At Step 3: Maize; sweet corn (corn-on-the-cob).

At Step 6: Maize forage; peanut.

At Step 7B: Carrot; potato.

At Step 8: Peanut oil, crude; peanut oil, edible.

TECNAZENE (115)

Potato

130. The Committee noted that tecnazene was on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for toxicological and residue re-evaluation. The Delegations of Norway, Spain and Sweden reserved their positions for toxicological reasons. The Delegation of Finland expressed a reservation on the definition of the residue and mentioned difficulties in assessing GAP data in the JMPR evaluations. The Delegation of France indicated that additional processing information was necessary. The Delegation of the United States of America noted that the compound was still registered in the U.S., but was not largely used. It emphasized that the JMPR should make a decision based on the data it received. The data evaluated support at least of the 10 mg/kg estimated by the JMPR. The representative of the AOAC indicated that washing to remove adhering soil was essential. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Methods of Analysis would clearly define the washing treatment used for potato before analysis for any residue (see Appendix III). The Delegation of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that their GAP on potatoes was currently under review and new toxicological data would be available for the 1994 evaluation. The JMPR was asked to consider including the metabolites within the residue definition.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7C: Potato.

ALDICARB (117)

131. The Committee noted that aldicarb was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for toxicological evaluation and on the agenda of the 1993 JMPR for residue evaluation.

132. The representative of the manufacturer informed the Committee that information on residues in Brussels sprouts from trials outside The Netherlands would be sent in time for the 1993 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Brussels sprouts.

PERMETHRIN (120)

133. This compound was on the agenda of the 1991 JMPR for residue evaluation. There were also no requirements for further data.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: Wheat germ.

At Step 6: Wheat bran, unprocessed; wheat flour; wheat wholemeal.

AMITRAZ (122)

134. The 1991 JMPR recommended that the definition of the residue should not be changed at present, but suggested that the CCPR should ascertain the definition used in national legislations with the aim of securing international harmonization. By means of a circular letter, delegations would be requested to report on their national situation concerning the residue definition.

ETRIMFOS (123)

135. The compound was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation. The Delegation of Germany indicated that the registration in Germany had been cancelled, so no additional data would be provided. Also, the manufacturer's representative could not confirm data availability for the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Lettuce, head.

METHACRIFOS (125)

136. This compound was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation.

Cereal grains; Wheat bran, unprocessed; Wheat flour; Wheat wholemeal

137. The Delegation of Australia said that milling/processing studies were completed and that data would be available for evaluation by the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of the United Kingdom also indicated that they would submit their information on reduction factors relevant to EMDI calculations. In answer to a request for clarification by the Delegation of France regarding the exclusive listing for poultry meat, the Vice-Chairman of the 1991 JMPR noted that transfer studies were needed for other meats.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: All proposals.

AZOCYCLOTIN (129)

138. This compound had already been discussed in conjunction with cyhexatin (067) (see paragraphs 102-104).

TRIADIMEFON (133)

139. The Committee noted that because this compound was closely related to triadimenol (168) a complete residue review of both compounds was needed by the JMPR in order to derive separate MRLs. The Delegation of Germany, on behalf of the manufacturer, stated that new residue data and data on GAP were submitted to the 1991 JMPR. However, the data could not be evaluated by the 1991 JMPR owing to lack of time. The review would take place at the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Barley; barley straw and fodder, dry; grapes; oat straw and fodder, dry; oats; raspberries, red, black; rye; rye straw and fodder, dry; wheat; wheat straw and fodder, dry.

DELTAMETHRIN (135)

Meat

140. At the last meeting, the Delegation of Egypt suggested an MRL of 0.05 mg/kg instead of 0.5 mg/kg in meat. The Delegation of The Netherlands, supported by the Delegation of Germany, recommended a longer waiting period before slaughter in order to attain the lowest possible residue. The Delegation of Australia noted that in some circumstances involving quarantine requirements it was necessary to have a short waiting period.

141. The Committee decided to advance the MRL of 0.5 mg/kg for meat to Step 8.

Wheat bran, unprocessed; Wheat flour; Wheat wholemeal

142. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation. The manufacturer and the Delegation of Australia informed the Committee that data were supplied to the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Wheat bran unprocessed; wheat flour; wheat wholemeal.

At Step 8: Meat.

PROCYMIDONE (136)

143. The Committee noted that procymidone was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation. Several delegations underlined their concern regarding the proposed MRLs as they were based on GAP data from 10 years ago although the ADI was estimated in 1989. Sharing this concern, the Delegation of the United States of America pointed out that this compound was a good example of what the Working Group on Priorities had been struggling with, the ADI should not be the sole basis for re-evaluations. The Representative of the manufacturer indicated that recent GAP is, from countries where it is currently registered, would be submitted in time for the 1992 JMPR. Residue data for common bean; cucumber; grapes; lettuce, head; onion, bulb, and tomato will also be submitted in time for the 1992 JMPR. The Delegations of Sweden and Finland indicated that they had supplied monitoring data covering several commodities. Residues exceeded 1 mg/kg in only a few cases. The Delegation of Japan preferred an MRL of 0.2 mg/kg for potato and agreed to send residue data and data on GAP to the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: All proposals.

METALAXYL (138)

144. This pesticide was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue review. The manufacturer would provide additional GAP to the 1992 JMPR for spinach and lettuce. The Delegation of the Netherlands would provide written comments on broccoli; cabbages, head and cauliflower in time for the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of Canada reported that the manufacturer had already sent data for strawberry to the 1992 JMPR.

Pome fruits

145. The Delegations of France and Germany expressed their reservations regarding inconsistencies in the data base for post-harvest use. The Delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States of America supported by the Vice-Chairman of the 1991 JMPR indicated that sufficient trials had been carried out and that they could accept the proposed MRL.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Broccoli; cabbages, head; cauliflower; lettuce, head; onion, bulb; spinach; strawberry.

At Step 8(a): Pome fruits.

PROCHLORAZ (142)

Cattle fat; Cattle meat; Cattle, Edible offal of; Milks

146. Last year several delegations requested further clarification of the residue levels reported in the feeding study data evaluated by the JMPR. There were concerns about the dose level fed to animals in transfer studies and about a different limit of determination used in residue studies. The delegation of The Netherlands would provide written comments to the 1992 JMPR detailing these concerns. The Delegation of The Netherlands further noted that no real limit of determination could be found. This matter will be brought to the attention of the Working Group on Methods of Analysis for consideration next year.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Cattle fat; cattle meat; cattle, edible offal of; milks.

TRIAZOPHOS (143)

147. This pesticide was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation and scheduled for the 1993 JMPR for toxicological evaluation. The Representative of GIFAP indicated that 0.05 mg/kg had to be considered as a practical limit of determination.

Banana; Citrus fruit

148. Concern was expressed about the interpretation of the residue data available to the JMPR. The Delegations of France, The Netherlands and Germany would provide written comments of these concerns to the JMPR for re-evaluation of the data.

Common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); Brussels sprouts; Cabbages, head

149. The Delegation of The Netherlands would provide written comments to the JMPR.

Carrot

150. The Delegation of the United Kingdom confirmed that they had sent data on residue and GAP to the 1992 JMPR.

Cauliflower

151. The Delegation of France expressed its reservation on the high level of the proposed MRL and would provide written comments to the JMPR.

Coffee beans

152. The Committee corrected the indicated Step 7B to 7A in view of the TADI.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7A: Broad bean, shelled, (succulent); cattle meat; cattle milk; cauliflower; coffee beans; common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); cotton seed; peas; pome fruits.

At Step 7B: Banana; Brussels sprouts; cabbages, head; carrot; cereal grains; citrus fruits; onion, bulb; potato; sugar beet.

BITERTANOL (144)

153. The Committee noted that the 1991 JMPR had re-evaluated the data on residues in stone fruits and estimated separate MRLs for apricots, peaches and nectarines. The Committee decided to advance all proposals to Step 8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: Apricot; nectarine; peach.

CARBOSULFAN (145)

154. The Delegation of Germany noted that because of the change in residue definition, the residue data had to be reconsidered. The residue level for carbosulfan alone would be very low. The conjugates had to be taken into account in the risk assessment. The Delegation of the United States noted that conjugates were included in the data due to the analytical methods used although it was not included in the residue expression. The Delegation of France indicated that carbosulfan was not stable and very low residues could be expected. The Representative of the JMPR, supported by the Delegation of the United States of America indicated that new data were received too late for consideration by the 1991 JMPR. The JMPR would further re-evaluate in 1993.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Citrus fruits.

FLUCYTHRINATE (152)

155. The Committee noted that flucythrinate was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of the Netherlands and France had sent their written comments to the JMPR regarding residues in animal products and animal transfer studies. The manufacturer's representative confirmed the availability of a report. The Committee decided to maintain all proposals at Step 7B awaiting JMPR evaluation.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Cattle meat; cattle milk; goat meat; maize fodder; maize forage.

CLOFENTEZINE (156)

Citrus fruits

156. The Committee decided in 1991 to lower the proposed MRL from 0.5 to 0.2 mg/kg. The manufacturer disagreed with an MRL of 0.2 mg/kg and would submit residue data supporting an MRL of 0.5 mg/kg to the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of the United States of America supported the manufacturer's view and noted that the TMDI was only 3% of the ADI. The Committee decided to maintain the proposal at Step 7B awaiting reconsideration by the JMPR.

157. The manufacturer and the Delegation of Chile noted that the present residue definition which included the 2-chlorobenzoyl metabolite should apply only to commodities of animal origin. For commodities of plant origin the residue should be expressed as clofentezine. This would agree with all current national MRLs. It was decided to refer this matter to the JMPR for re-consideration.

Currants, black, red, white

158. The Committee decided to advance the proposal to Step 8 noting that the MRL was at the limit of determination.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Citrus fruits.

At Step 8: Currants, black, red, white.

CYFLUTHRIN (157)

159. The Committee decided to retain all temporary MRLs at Step 7B pending the residue evaluation by the 1992 JMPR.

Apple

160. The Delegation of Japan preferred a higher MRL of 1.0 mg/kg in consideration of national GAP. The residue data would be submitted to the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Apple; cattle milk; cotton seed; maize; maize forage; peppers, sweet; plums (including prunes); rape seed; tomato.

GLYPHOSATE (158)

Wheat bran, unprocessed

161. The Delegations of Germany and France expressed reservations concerning the level of 40 mg/kg and the use of 8 as the conversion factor from wheat to wheat bran. The Vice-Chairman of the 1991 JMPR indicated that the data base for glyphosate use on wheat was very extensive but that evaluation of the results was complicated by the variable recovery of the analytical methods.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: Wheat bran, unprocessed.

VINCLOZOLIN (159)

162. This compound was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation and the 1995 JMPR for toxicological evaluation. Several Delegations opposed the proposed MRLs for apricot and lettuce, head. The Committee decided to retain the proposals at Step 7B pending JMPR review.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Apricot; lettuce, head.

PROPICONAZOLE (160)

163. At the request of the 23rd CCPR, the 1991 JMPR reconsidered the data available to the 1987 JMPR with the aim of replacing the general limit for cereal grains with individual MRLs.

Barley

164. The 1991 JMPR required the submission of GAP and residue data (measured as parent compound) by 1993 to support the proposed MRL of 0.2 mg/kg. The Delegation of Germany noted that their residue data included metabolites.

Wheat

165. Japan stated that they had GAP and residue data which would support an MRL of 0.1 ppm on wheat. These data would be submitted in time for the JMPR review in 1993.

166. The Committee decided to advance the proposal to Step 8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Barley.

At Step 8: Oats; rye; wheat.

Deletion: Cereal grains.

ANILAZINE (163)

167. The Committee was informed that this compound was scheduled for a 1992 JMPR residue evaluation. The United States of America noted that the manufacturer had requested voluntary cancellation of U.S. registrations, not for safety but for economic reasons.

Barley

168. The concern regarding the apparent variability of the data available to the 1989 JMPR, expressed at the 23rd CCPR, was reiterated. No additional residue data had been provided in response to the request of the 23rd CCPR.

Barley Straw and fodder, dry; Wheat straw and fodder, dry

169. The MRLs for these commodities were temporary as an adequate analytical method for enforcement had not been provided. An enforcement method would be made available to the 1992 JMPR by the manufacturer.

170. The meeting requested that, in view of the high residues in straw and fodder, MRLs be proposed for animal commodities. The manufacturer noted that animal transfer studies had been available to the 1989 JMPR.

Celery

171. The manufacturer stated that it had GAP data for Italy, Canada and the Dominican Republic for celery. Residue data from trials in Italy would be available to the 1992 JMPR.

Tomato

172. The Delegations of France and Spain expressed reservations concerning the proposed MRL of 10 mg/kg. Spain stated that their GAP supported an MRL of 1 mg/kg. Limited residue data on tomatoes from trials in Morocco and Spain, conducted according to Italian GAP, would be available to the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: Barley; wheat.

At Step 7B: Barley straw and fodder, dry; celery; tomato; wheat straw and fodder, dry.

FLUSILAZOLE (165)

173. The Committee was informed that this compound was scheduled for a 1993 JMPR residue evaluation. In the absence of the evaluations from the 1991 JMPR, discussion of a number of commodities was postponed until next year.

Rape seed

174. The Delegation of Germany expressed a reservation to the proposed MRL of 0.05 mg/kg, citing the absence of information on residues of flusilazole and its metabolites in rape seed oil. The Vice-Chairman of the JMPR pointed out that carry-over of residues into oil was not expected.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: Banana; chicken eggs; chicken meat; chicken, edible offal of; dried grapes; grapes; pome fruits; rape seed; sugar beets.

At Step 6: Barley; barley straw and fodder, dry; cattle fat; cattle meat; cattle milk; cattle, edible offal of, rye; rye straw and fodder, dry; wheat; wheat straw and fodder, dry.

At Step 3: Nectarine, peach.

TERBUFOS (167)

175. It was noted that paragraph 213 of the report of the 23rd CCPR referred to terbufos and not flusilazole. This paragraph requested the development of residue data which reflected a limit of determination of 0.01 mg/kg as opposed to that available based on 0.05 mg/kg.

176. The representative of GIFAP stated that information was presently available for maize and sugar beet with a limit of determination of 0.01 mg/kg. However, an analytical method with a limit of determination of 0.01 mg/kg was not likely. The TMDI, EMDI and EDI dietary intake estimated for the United States of America were all less then the ADI. Furthermore, the U.S. requested that countries wanting lower MRLs provide their TMDI calculations.

177. Several Delegations expressed a reservation because new data based on a limit of determination of 0.01 mg/kg would not be available.

Cotton seed

178. The additional supporting data requested by the 23rd CCPR were not provided. The Committee agreed to withdraw the proposed MRL.

Sweet corn (corn on the cob)

179. The Delegation of the United Kingdom noted that, in view of the nature of the residue, the proposed MRL at the limit of determination of 0.01 mg/kg would be analytically difficult to enforce. Theoretical intake, calculated assuming residues at the 0.05 mg/kg limit of determination, would be well below the ADI.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: Broccoli; cabbages, head; cattle meat; cattle, edible offal of; chicken meat; chicken, edible offal of; coffee beans; mustard seed; onion, bulb; peanut; peanut fodder; peanut forage (green); rape seed; rape seed oil, crude; soya bean (dry); straw and fodder (dry) of cereal grains; sugar beet; sweet corn (corn on the cob).

Deleted: Cotton seed.

TRIADIMENOL (168)

180. The 23rd CCPR noted that because this compound was closely related to triadimefon (133) an evaluation of residue data was needed in order to derive separate MRLs. The manufacturer's representative informed the Committee that data had already been sent to the JMPR.

Cattle meat; cattle milk; eggs; poultry meat

181. Because of the temporary nature of the proposals the Committee decided to maintain them at Step 7B.

Grapes

182. The Delegation of France, supported by the Delegation of Italy, expressed its reservation regarding the proposal because it was only based on a trial in South Africa at a rate of 125 g/ha. The representative of the manufacturer informed the Committee that new information on grapes from Germany and Israel was sent to the 1991 JMPR. The Committee decided to maintain the proposal at Step 7B.

Rye straw and fodder, dry

183. The Committee noted that the MRL entry in the Guide was an error and changed it to 5 mg/kg.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Cattle meat; cattle milk; eggs; grapes; poultry meat.

At Step 8: Apple; barley; barley straw and fodder, dry; coffee beans; cucumber; rye; rye straw and fodder, dry; wheat; wheat straw and fodder, dry.

CYROMAZINE (169)

184. The Delegation of the United States of America expressed its reservation regarding the definition of the residue. While Codex proposals were for cyromazine only, the U.S. supported inclusion of the melamine metabolite in MRLs. Written comments had already been provided by the U.S. Melamine residues could equal or significantly exceed those of cyromazine in both plants and animals and the percentage of melamine compared to total residues of cyromazine and melamine was highly variable. The Delegation of the Netherlands made the same observation, but suggested that this should be taken into account when evaluating the risk from a toxicological point of view, and agreed to present their comments to the 1992 JMPR. The Committee was informed that there was at least one other compound which gave melamine as a metabolite. The representative of the manufacturer stated that no new data would be produced because until now all countries used the residue defined as cyromazine. The Committee decided to advance all proposals at the limit of determination to Step 8, and to maintain all others at Step 7B awaiting the evaluation of the residue definition by the JMPR.

Mushrooms and Tomato

185. The Delegation of France expressed its reservations concerning GAP.

Peppers

186. The Delegation of Spain informed the Committee that their GAP would require an MRL of 2 mg/kg. Supporting residue data would be sent to the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: Celery; cucumber; eggs; lettuce, head, melons, except watermelon; mushrooms; peppers, tomato.

At Step 8: Milks; poultry meat; sheep meat.

HEXACONAZOLE (170)

Apple juice

187. The Committee decided to delete the MRL for apple juice referring to the discussion on Codex maximum limits for pesticides in processed foods (ALINORM 91/24A, paras. 328-338).

Banana

188. Discussion on this proposal at step 6 was postponed because the 1991 JMPR Evaluations were not available at the meeting.

Wheat; wheat straw and fodder, dry

189. The Committee noted that these draft MRLs were temporary pending the availability of data on processing studies and on transfer into animal products. Several Delegations were of the opinion that, in view of the low MRLs, data on transfer into animal products were not required. The representative of the manufacturer informed the Committee that no animal transfer studies would become available. The Committee decided to request countries to submit national approaches to requiring animal studies through a circular letter, and then to ask the JMPR to elaborate general rules on when transfer studies were necessary. The Delegations of France and Spain expressed their reservation on the proposal for wheat as they were of the opinion that an MRL of 0.05 mg/kg was sufficient. The Committee decided that the limits were no longer temporary and advanced the proposals to Step 8. The Delegation of Germany was of the opinion that a method of analysis for regulatory purposes for this compound was necessary. It was not possible to get any confirmation from the manufacturer on the existence of such a method.

Status of MRLs

At Step 6: Banana.

At Step 8: All other proposals.

Deletion: Apple juice.

PROFENOFOS (171)

190. The Committee noted that all limits were temporary until information on relevant GAP was provided. The compound was scheduled for review of residue data by the 1992 JMPR. The representative of the manufacturer confirmed the availability of data. The Committee decided to maintain all proposals at Step 7B awaiting the re-evaluation by the 1992 JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: All proposals.

BENTAZONE (172), BUPROFEZIN (173), CADUSAFOS (174), GLUFOSINATE-AMMONIUM (175), HEXYTHIAZOX (176)

191. Discussions on proposals at Step 3 were postponed because the 1991 JMPR Evaluations were not available at the meeting.

GLUFOSINATE-AMMONIUM (175)

Soya bean (dry); sunflower seed

192. The Committee was informed that these proposals should read as 2 mg/kg as a consequence of the corrections of Annex I of the 1991 JMPR report.

CONSIDERATION OF COMBINED LISTS OF COMPOUNDS (Agenda Item 8.1 (f))

193. The Committee had before it a review of all Codex cases of related compounds and relevant CCPR recommendations for combining limits as summarized by the Codex Secretariat in CX/PR 92/11.

1. Cyhexatin (067)/Azocyclotin (129)

194. Different opinions were expressed concerning the proposal of the JMPR to maintain two separate lists for these two compounds. The Delegations of Chile, France, Germany and Italy indicated their preference for a combined list, while the Delegation of the United States of America agreed with the JMPR proposal.

195. The Vice-Chairman of the 1991 JMPR indicated that this was a complicated issue which had been fully discussed in the 1991 JMPR report. The Committee decided to request, by circular letter, information on current residue definitions and other comments from member countries.

2. Triadimefon (113)/Triadimenol (168)

196. The Committee decided that a decision should be postponed until the 1992 JMPR evaluation.

3. Dimethoate (027)/Formothion (042)/Omethoate (055)

197. The Committee decided that a decision should be postponed until the 1993 JMPR evaluation.

4. Benomyl (069)/Carbendazim (072)/Thiophanate methyl (077)

198. The Committee agreed that no action was needed. CXLs for carbendazim covered residues resulting from the use of benomyl, thiophanate methyl and carbendazim. MRLs for thiophanate methyl would be recommended for deletion when the MRLs for carbendazim reached Step 8.

5. Acephate (095)/Methamidophos (100)

199. The Committee decided that a decision should be postponed while awaiting the 1994 JMPR evaluation.

6. Carbofuran (096)/Carbosulfan (145)

200. The Committee agreed with the harmonized residue definition and the establishment of two separate lists.

7. Methomyl (094)/Thiodicarb (154)

201. The Committee agreed with a combined list and the addition of "fresh weight" to maize fodder.

USE OF A SEPARATE LIST FOR MRLS CONCERNING EXTRANEOUS RESIDUE LIMITS (Agenda Item 8.1 (g))

202. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 92/12, which was prepared and introduced by the Codex Secretariat. It was stressed that the EMRLs (Extraneous Maximum Residue Limits) were based on monitoring data and as such were quite different from MRLs, which were based on GAP. The establishment of EMRLs was very similar to the approach used for contaminants. It was pointed out that, for example, the existing Codex MRLs for chlorinated pesticides could create problems in international food trade because several countries had no standards established for several of these compounds. A list was given of seven pesticides related to established Codex MRLs which were converted into EMRLs or were undergoing a conversion process. It was proposed that the EMRLs should be included in a separate list with an appropriate statement concerning their significance.

203. Several delegations supported the proposal. The Delegation of Australia, however, requested that the list should clearly indicate by title and explanation that the EMRLs were to be maintained under their current status as the responsibility of the CCPR. Several delegations raised concerns about the inclusion of fenitrothion (037) and lindane (048) in the list because these pesticides were still used and carried over through feed to animals. The observer of Greenpeace welcomed the conversion of MRLs into EMRLs of seven pesticides, which would support the developing countries in the establishment of better agricultural practice while encouraging developed countries to identify alternative compounds. The Delegation of Spain asked to include hexachloro-benzene. The Delegation of China noted that monitoring data from all parts of the world should be used for the establishment of EMRLs.

204. The Committee decided, in view of the remarks presented at the current session, to revise the proposal and request comments by circular letter.

RECONSIDERATIONS OF GUIDELINE LEVELS (Agenda Item 8.2)

205. The Committee had before it the Guide to Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues - Part 3 (CX/PR 3-1992).

COUMAPHOS (018)

206. The compound was scheduled for both toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1995 JMPR. Several Delegations informed the Committee that, to their knowledge, the compound was registered only for veterinary uses. The Delegation of The Netherlands mentioned use of the chemical in beehives. The Vice-Chairman of the JMPR confirmed that, in the 1990 Residue Evaluations, only veterinary uses were recorded. The Committee decided to request information on agricultural uses by a circular letter to governments and international organizations and to delete the compound at the next session if no such uses are reported. The GLs were maintained.

METHYL BROMIDE (052)

207. The Committee noted that the compound, together with inorganic bromide, was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of Israel confirmed that data had been provided. The GLs were maintained.

ETHEPHON (106)

208. The compound was scheduled for both toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1993 JMPR. Data availability was confirmed by the manufacturer's representative. The GLs were maintained.

PROPYLENETHIOUREA (PTU) (150)

209. The Committee was informed by the manufacturer's representative that data would be available for both toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1993 JMPR. The GLs were maintained.

PYRAZOPHOS (153)

210. The compound was scheduled for both toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1992 JMPR. Data availability was confirmed. The GLs were maintained.

SAMPLING FOR THE DETERMINATION OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN MILK AND FISH FOR CONTROL PURPOSES **(Agenda Item 9)**

211. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 92/13 prepared by the Delegation of the United Kingdom.

212. The Committee was reminded that at its previous session it was decided (para. 287, ALINORM 91/24A) that sampling guidelines for milk and fish would be elaborated under the direction of the United Kingdom, with a view towards their eventual inclusion in the general "Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues" (CAC/PR 5-1984). The Committee noted that the current draft was restricted to milk, dairy products and eggs.

213. The Codex Secretariat noted that the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF) had requested comments (Step 6) on Draft Guidelines for the Establishment of a Regulatory Programme for Control of Veterinary Drug Residues in Foods (Appendix VIII, ALINORM 93/31). The Guidelines included a section on Sampling for the Control of Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (Part I) which applied to meat, poultry, fish, honey, milk and egg products.

214. Several delegations welcomed the initiative of the United Kingdom for the elaboration of this document. It was acknowledged that further detailed study of the proposal was necessary, with a view also to the desirability of a harmonized approach in relation to existing sampling guidelines for milk of the International Dairy Federation and the International Standardization Organization. The Committee decided to append the proposed draft Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk and Dairy Products (see Appendix VI) to this report for government comments at Step 3. Governments were also requested to provide information on sampling practices relevant to fish in order that the draft plan might be expanded in the future. The Committee agreed that the draft plan should be forwarded to the CCRVDF through its *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Methods of Analysis and Sampling for discussion. The Delegation of the United States of America agreed to coordinate harmonization efforts between the two Committees with a view to avoiding possible duplication of work.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP ON ACCEPTANCES **(Agenda Item 10)**

215. The report, which was introduced by the Chairman of the Working Group Mr. B. Murray (Canada), is attached to this report as Appendix II.

216. The Chairman informed the Committee that two discussion papers, based on the responses received to two circular letters, were considered by the Working Group. One paper investigated the role of efficacy data in determining good agricultural practice (GAP) and the further development of the case studies on efficacy assessment proposed at the 23rd CCPR. The second paper summarized information on enforcement practices in different countries and proposed a mechanism to improve communication between the CCPR and the JMPR, specifically Step 7B MRLs.

Discussion of the Working Group Report

217. The Chairman noted that two sets of comments had been received on the Working Group Report. They were principally editorial (deletion of paragraphs 11 and 16) and did not alter the content of the document.

Development of Case Studies on Efficacy

paragraph 8

218. The establishment of a deadline of 30 June 1992 for the submission of efficacy data for the two case studies, tolylfluanid on apples and permethrin on lettuce was highlighted.

paragraph 9

219. The recent submission of guidelines on efficacy assessment by the Delegation of the United Kingdom was noted.

Mechanism for Step 7B MRLs

paragraph 15

220. GIFAP expressed concern over the proposal that MRLs would remain at Step 7B for a maximum of two years. It was stated that it may not be possible to develop data within this time and suggested that where there was a commitment to produce data, a three-year maximum was preferred.

221. It was noted that governments had at least two opportunities for comment on the recommendations of the JMPR and that where a proposal was deleted it might re-enter the system with a recommendation for the elimination of Steps. The importance of maintaining the proposed two-year period in order to coincide with meetings of the Codex Alimentarius Commission was also indicated. Germany, supported by the United States, noted that under the proposed system it was increasingly important for governments to provide documented concerns and data at Step 3.

222. It was recognized that certain situations were likely to arise that would require special consideration and that the proposal should be amended (last line of paragraph 15) to indicate that the maximum should be two years unless adequate and early justification was provided for a maximum extension of one year.

223. The Committee adopted the Report of the Working Group and the procedure proposed for Step 7B MRLs.

Appointment of a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group

224. The Committee expressed its appreciation to Mr. Murray for his work on the Committee. Mr. Murray will not be in a position to continue as Chairman. It was decided to establish a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group which would function until the end of the next session under the Chairmanship of Mr. Hinsley of the United Kingdom.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS (Agenda Item 11)

225. The report, which was introduced by the Chairman of the Working Group, Mr. L. Tuinstra (The Netherlands) is attached to this Report as Appendix III.

226. Mr. Tuinstra informed the Committee that a revised list of "Recommendations for Methods of Analysis" had been finalized and would be updated, based on references to the first 169 pesticides and an Annex of screening methods. A request for the submission of reference methods for new compounds was referred to

governments and manufacturers. The Working Group also commenced a revision of "Good Practice in Pesticide Residue Analysis" and a revision of Part VII of the Guide was proposed. The Working Group expressed the opinion that a combined list of MRLs for pesticides with common metabolites was preferable. In this regard, it referred to problems related to the analysis of dithiocarbamates in commodities of the *cruciferae* family which produced CS_2 under the conditions used for dithiocarbamates analysis. The Working Group pointed out that in the future more attention would be given to a process of harmonization in the area of residue analysis with the EEC and the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF).

Discussion of the Working Group Report by the Committee

227. The Committee noted that several limits of determination, as requested at the previous session, were not yet established. The Committee agreed with the Working Group suggestion to request comments from the participants concerning Good Practices in Pesticide Residues Analysis. It was also indicated that a document on fat-soluble pesticides would be drafted by The Netherlands for consideration at the next CCPR session.

228. The Delegation of Germany pointed out that the ADI should be taken into consideration when combining pesticides with common metabolites into a single list, as recommended by the Working Group. With reference to the preparation of samples for analysis, the Committee agreed that a new procedure for the assessment of the storage stability of residues of pesticides, based on Annex I to the Working Group report, should be included in Part VII of the Guide of the soliciting government comments.

229. The Committee also agreed that the Working Group should harmonize the recommended methods of analysis for residues in food with other organizations (eg., CEN and CCRVDF).

Appointment of an Ad Hoc Working Group on Methods of Analysis

230. The Committee thanked the Working Group and its Chairman and Vice-Chairman and decided to set up a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group under the Chairmanship of Mr. L. Tuinstra and Vice-Chairmanship of Mr. P. van Zoonen.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PESTICIDE RESIDUE PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (Agenda Item 12)

231. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries (see Appendix IV) was presented to the Committee by its Chairman, Ms. Salwa Dogheim (Egypt).

232. The Committee was informed that the Working Group re-emphasized its support for those decisions made at the 23rd CCPR Session concerning the identification of specific needs for developing countries in regard to pesticides. This included the establishment of infrastructures and means of coordination between different ministries, easing information transfer, the identification of inexpensive and reliable methods of analysis and general information on pesticide use in developing countries and regions.

233. The Working Group also agreed to support the routine publication of information concerning residue detections and detentions on imported commodities in order to assist developing countries in modifying their pesticide uses accordingly. The Working Group also recognized the importance of identifying alternative use compounds for those pesticides scheduled for removal from the priority list owing to the absence of available data.

234. The Committee agreed to the continuation of the Working Group under the same terms of reference, with the understanding that additional government comments

would be solicited on those questions previously circulated. In addition, it was agreed that Ms. Salwa Dogheim would continue to act as Chairman.

235. The Committee agreed with the strong support and appreciation expressed by the Group towards the Government of Cuba for offering to host the 25th session of the CCPR. It was noted that holding the meeting in Cuba would provide strong incentive for developing countries to participate more positively and effectively in CCPR deliberations.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITIES (Agenda Item 13)

236. The report of the Working Group on Priorities (see Appendix V) was introduced to the Committee by its Chairman Ms J. Taylor (Canada).

237. Four new proposals were presented and scheduled for evaluation: fenpropimorph (1994), fenpyroximate (1995), tolclofos-methyl (1994) and haloxyfop (1995). In addition, there were two other proposals, for which data submission had not yet been confirmed. They are chlozolinate and tetradifon. The Delegation of France suggested that the chlozolinate be evaluated, if possible, together with vinclozolin as they had the same metabolite.

238. An updated schedule of the pesticides for periodic review is provided in Annex I - Appendix V (Pesticides Tentatively Scheduled for Evaluation or Re-evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues).

239. The manufacturer requested a delay in the review of amitrole (currently scheduled for 1993) to 1995, as a new long-term study would not be available before that time. The WHO Joint Secretary pointed out that the ADI for amitrole is conditional and that in 1993 a number of other thyroid toxicants would be considered. For these reasons, amitrole would be maintained on the 1993 agenda.

240. The Delegation of Germany requested that carbofuran be included in the schedule of the JMPR for the review of a new dog study which may lower the ADI for that product. The request would also be made in writing to the JMPR. In the meantime, it had been tentatively scheduled for toxicology review by the 1994 JMPR.

241. Of the twelve pesticides in the group for which ADIs were evaluated between 1976 and 1980, seven had been tentatively scheduled for periodic review on the basis of indications from basic manufacturers that substantial data could be made available to the JMPR. These were: diquat (031), fenthion (039), trichlorfon (066), thiometon (076), phosmet (103), guazatine (114), triforine (116).

242. Two of these pesticides may no longer be manufactured: carbofenothion (011) and chlorobenzilate (016). Comments would be requested by circular letter on a proposal to withdraw CXLs.

243. Separate CXLs for thiophanate-methyl (077) would be recommended for deletion as soon as the proposals for carbendazim reached Step 8. Carbendazim, benomyl and thiophanate-methyl would be considered together by the JMPR in 1992 for residues and in 1995 for toxicology.

244. For cartap (097) and dicloran (083), further information would be sought from the manufacturers regarding the data base. In the meantime, they had been tentatively scheduled for re-evaluation in 1994 (dicloran) and 1995 (cartap) for a review of both older data and the limited updated data.

245. The draft "Proposed Procedure for the Periodic Review of Pesticides" is appended to the report (Annex II - Appendix V). Comments on the Procedure would be requested by circular letter.

246. The representative of GIFAP reminded the Committee that several national governments were currently requiring the generation of additional data on

pesticides to support their continued registration. The Committee was requested to consider the synchrony of evaluations between the JMPR and national governments.

247. The Delegation of Canada pointed out the difficulty that the JMPR might experience in trying to coordinate evaluations with several governments and suggested that the countries undertaking reviews should try to coordinate with the JMPR. The representative of the EEC indicated that the Community endorsed the work of the JMPR and would do everything possible to coordinate the timing of EEC evaluations with the JMPR reviews.

248. The Committee recommended that all member countries and groups of countries tried to coordinate the timing of their evaluations, as far as possible, with those of the JMPR.

249. During discussion of the Procedure, several of the pesticides presented as examples of the way the steps would work were also discussed. Some further discussion on these pesticides is presented below:

- endrin (033) - converting MRLs to EMRLs is in process.

- pirimiphos-methyl (086) - Currently under review by the WHO for discussion at the 1992 JMPR. At that time there will be some indication of whether a review of an older data base has merit in terms of confirming ADIs.

- chlormequat (015) - On the 3rd priority list for residues with the EEC (September 1993). To be reconsidered at the 25th CCPR on the basis of any new information which may become available.

- ethoxyquin (035) - For the 25th CCPR, determine the availability of new studies, especially whether carcinogenicity studies will be available. The Delegation of Germany indicated that deletion of CXLs should be recommended by the 25th CCPR if such studies are not going to be available.

- formothion ((42) - There is one CXL for citrus fruits. Formothion is related to omethoate and dimethoate. All three are to be considered for residues by the EEC (Oct 1993). They will be reconsidered at the 25th CCPR on the basis of any new information which may become available.

- pyrethrins (063) - Further information regarding data development by the U.S. Task Force will be provided to next CCPR. Pyrethrins are scheduled for review by the 1994 JMPR.

250. The Vice-Chairman of the JMPR described briefly some of the difficulties faced by the JMPR as a result of the periodic review of the older pesticides (see Annex III - Appendix V). Four recommendations were put forward to the address the problems and were agreed to by the Committee.

Appointment of a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group

251. It was decided to establish a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group which would function until the end of the next session under the Chairmanship of Ms. J. Taylor (Canada).

NATIONAL PESTICIDE RESIDUE LIMITS IN FOOD (Agenda Item 14)

252. The Committee had before it CX/PR 92/15 which was presented by Mr. B. Murray of the Delegation of Canada.

253. The list of National Pesticide Residue Limits in Food was first prepared by Canada almost 20 years ago. The data in the document are transcribed from a

translation of the original legislation or published lists provided and is considered an unofficial compilation. It has proved to be a valuable reference source.

254. Since 1988 the list has been available on computer disk in a Wordperfect format (4.2). In the interest of making the data more accessible, an interactive database is under development using DBase IV.

255. The difficulties encountered in developing the database have centred on data entry and verification and inconsistencies in the terminology used to identify individual food commodities. A consistent system of commodity identification is necessary in order to keep the database to a manageable size and permit effective comparisons. The Codex Classification system has been adopted. The difficulty in interpreting national MRLs in terms of the Codex Classification was emphasized.

256. The capabilities of the system were briefly described and some examples of the types of reports that might be produced highlighted. Prior to the circulation of the total database, individual countries will be provided with copies of their national lists along with an outline of how the Codex Classification was interpreted and a request for verification of these data. This will include consideration of the assigned Codex Commodity Classification as well as the MRLs themselves.

257. Delegations in a position to provide comment on the operation of the database, eg., operation of the software or others interested in obtaining further technical information on the operation of the database were requested to write to the address given below.

258. In view of the time required to finalize the database, a new version of the list in Wordperfect format (probably 5.1) is under preparation. This will include updates received from countries since the distribution of the 1990 version.

National Pesticide Residue Limits in Food
Chemical Evaluation Division
Bureau of Chemical Safety
Food Directorate
Health and Welfare Canada
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1A 0L2

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 15)

259. The Committee did not have other business scheduled or suggested for discussion.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 16)

260. The Committee was informed that its Twenty-fifth session would be held from 19-26 April 1993 in Havana at the kind invitation of the Government of Cuba.

SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK

Recommendation	Step	For Action By:	Document Reference
Notification of Acceptances using the new form	--	Governments International Organizations to which competence has been transferred by member states Codex Secretariat	paras. 36-37, ALINORM 93/24
Policy decision if EMDI exceed the ADI	--	Working Group on Acceptances Australia, Finland, Germany, Sweden and U.S.A.	paras. 45-46, ALINORM 93/24
Notification of intake data from countries using organochlorine and organophosphorus pesticides	--	Governments WHO	para. 50, ALINORM 93/24
Amendments to the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds	--	Codex Secretariat	paras. 53-55, ALINORM 93/24
Draft MRLs	8	CAC	ALINORM 93/24A - Add. 1
Proposed Draft MRLs	3 & 6	Governments	CL 1991/29-PR
Draft MRLs and matters arising from the 24th CCPR Session	7	Governments JMPR	CX/PR JMPR 1992
Use of a separate list of MRLs concerning Extraneous Residue Limits	--	Codex Secretariat Governments CAC	paras. 202-204 and Appendix VII, ALINORM 93/24
Guideline Levels	--	Governments	paras. 205-210, ALINORM 93/24
Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk and Fish for Control Purposes	3	Codex Secretariat U.K./U.S.A. Governments CCRVDF	paras. 211-214, ALINORM 93/24
Recommendation for Methods of Residue Analysis	--	Governments Codex Secretariat	paras. 225-230 and Appendix III, ALINORM 93/24

SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK (Cont.d)

Recommendation	Step	For Action By:	Document Reference
Circulation of a questionnaire on pesticides in current use in developing countries	--	Regional Chairmen Governments of developing countries Codex Secretariat	paras. 231-235, ALINORM 93/24 CL 1992/12-PR
Consideration of the 1992 Proposals for the Priority List	--	Governments Industry CCPR	para. 237, ALINORM 93/24
Proposed Procedure for the Periodic Review of Pesticides	--	Governments Codex Secretariat	para. 245, ALINORM 93/24
Review of Pesticides for which the ADI was established prior to 1976	--	Governments Industry CCPR	paras. 241-242, ALINORM 93/24
Mechanism for Step 7B MRLs	--	JMPR Codex Secretariat Governments CCPR	paras. 220-223 and Appendix II, ALINORM 93/24
National Pesticide Residue Limits in Food	--	Canada Governments	paras. 252-258, ALINORM 93/24

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

Chairman of the Session:
Président de la Session:
Presidente de la Reunión:

Dr. W.H. VAN ECK
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Postbox 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
Netherlands

MEMBER COUNTRIES
PAYS MEMBRES
PAISES MIEMBROS

ARGENTINA
ARGENTINE
ARGENTINA

Dr. Rodolfo C. ACERBI
Ministerio de Economía y Obras
y Servicios Públicos
Secretaría de Agricultura,
Gañadería y Pesca (Senasa)
Av. Fleming 1653 Martínez
CP.1640 BS, AS Argentina

Lic. Eduardo A. CANALE
Embassy of Argentina
Catsheuvel 85
2517 KA Den Haag
The Netherlands

Mrs. Ing. Agr Alba MUSTACCIOLO
Instituto Argentino de
Sanidad y Calidad Vegetal (IASCAV)
Registro de Insumos Químicos y
Biológicos de Uso Agricola
República Argentina
Ing. Huergo 1001 1er Piso
1107 Buenos Aires
Argentina

Oscar D. RAMPINI
Ministerio de Economía y
Obras y Servicios Públicos
Secretaría de Agricultura,
Ganadería y Pesca (Senasa)
Av. Fleming 1653 Martínez
CP.1640 BS, AS Argentina

Dr. Guillermo H. RENOM
Minister Counsellor
Embassy of Argentina
Catsheuvel 85
2517 KA The Hague
The Netherlands

AUSTRALIA
AUSTRALIE
AUSTRALIA

G.N. HOOPER
Director, Agricultural and
Veterinary Chemicals Branch
Department of Primary
Industries and Energy
Canberra, A.C.T. 2600, Australia

D.J. HAMILTON
Agricultural Chemistry Branch
Department of Primary Industries
Meiers Road
Indooroopilly
Brisbane Qld, Australia 4068

A. MORLEY
Agricultural and Veterinary
Chemicals Association of Australia
P.O. Box 961
Lane Cove 2066, Australia

F. STENHOUSE
National Food Authority
55 Blackhall St. Barten 2600
Australia

Dr. D.J. WEBLEY
Australian Wheat Board
P.O. Box 4562
Melbourne, Australia 3001

D.E. WEEDMAN
Department of Community
Services and Health
P.O. Box 9848
Canberra 2601, Australia

AUSTRIA
AUSTRICHE
AUSTRIA

Edmund PLATTNER
Head of Division III/2
Federal Ministry of Health,
Sports and Consumer Protection
Radetzkystrasse 2
A-1030 Vienna, Austria

Robert WOMASTEK
Federal Institute for
Plant Protection
Trunnerstrasse 5
1201 Vienna, Austria

BELGIUM
BELGIQUE
BELGICA

M. CORNELIS
Inspecteur-expert au Service
central de l'Institut d'expertise
vétérinaire du Ministère de la
Santé publique Belge
Rue de la Loie 56 5e et.
1040 Brussels, Belgium

Hubert GHEYSENS
Ministère de la Santé Publique
Inspection des Denrées Alimentaires
RAC Vesalius 412
Pachécolaan 19 bus 5
1010 Brussels, Belgium

Nathalia GOCHA
UCB S.A., Organics Division
Avenue Louise, 326 Bte. 7
B-1050 Brussels, Belgium

M. DE JONCKHEERE
Laboratorium voor Fytofarmacie
Faculteit Landbouwwetenschappen
Rijksuniversiteit Gent
Coupure Links 653
9000 Gent, Belgium

M. MOHIMONT
Inspection des Matières Premières
Ministerie van Landbouw
Bolwerklaan 21
1210 Brussels, Belgium

Me Liliane ROLAND
B.E.A.Gx - Centre Phytopharmacie
Faculté des Sciences Agronomiques
B - 5030 Gembloux, Belgium

CANADA

Daniel CHAPUT
Laboratory Services Division
Food Production and Inspection
Branch
Agriculture Canada
C.E.F. Bldg. No. 22
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A OC6, Canada

Bill MURRAY
Bureau of Chemical Safety,
Health Protection Branch
Health and Welfare Canada
Banting Bldg., 3rd Floor Center
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario,
K1A OL2 Canada

Janet K. TAYLOR
Pesticide Directorate
Food Production and
Inspection Branch
Agriculture Canada
Ottawa, Ontario Canada K1A OC6

CAPE VERDE
CAP-VERT
CABO VERDE

Victor TEIXEIRA
Ingénieur Technicien
Chimiste de l'EMPA
C. Postal Nr 107 - EMPA
Praia, Cape Verde

CHILE
CHILI

Roberto GONZALEZ
Faculty of Agricultural
Sciences
University of Chile
P.O. Box 1004
Santiago, Chile

CHINA, PEOPLE'S REP.OF
CHINE, REP.POPULAIRE DE
CINA, REP. POPULAR DE

Zhao HONG GEN
Deputy Director, Senior Engineer
Tianjin Import and Export
Commodity Inspection
Bureau of China
6. Pu Kon Dao, Hexi District
Tianjin 300042, China

Zhuang WU JI
Associate Professor
Head of Department of
Research Chemicals
China Import and Export
Commodity Inspection Institute
Gao Bei Dian North Road
Chao Yang District
Beijing 100025, China

CUBA

Rolando ALVAREZ
Embassy of the Republic
of Cuba
Prins Mauritslaan 6
2582 LR Den Haag
The Netherlands

Ing. Alberto MARRERO
Chief, Department of
International Relations
CEN State Committee for
Standardization
Egido 610 entre Gloria y Apodaca
Havana, Cuba

CZECHOSLOVAKIA
TCHECOSLOVAQUIE
CHECOSLOVAQUIA

Václav BENES
Head NRC for Pesticides
National Institute of Public Health
Srobárova 42, 100 48 Praha 10
Czechoslovakia

DENMARK
DANEMARK
DINAMARCA

Knud VOLDUM-CLAUSEN,
Food Law Administration
National Food Agency
Mørkhoj Bygade 19
DK - 2860 Soborg
Denmark

EGYPT
EGYPTE
EGIPTO

Salwa Mohamed DOGHEIM
Central Agricultural Pesticide
Laboratory
Ministry of Agriculture
Dokki-Giza
Egypt

FINLAND
FINLANDE
FINLANDIA

Vesa TUOMAALA
General Secretary
Advisory Committe on Foodstuffs
Ministry of Trade and Industrfy
Box 230, 00171 Helsinki
Finland

Pirjo-Liisa PENTTILÄ
Senior Scientific Officer
National Food Administration
Box 5, 00531 Helsinki
Finland

Kalevi SIIVINEN
Head of Pesticides Section
Customs Laboratory
Tekniikantie 13
02150 Espoo, Finland

FRANCE
FRANCIA

M. BUYS
U.I.P.P
Union des Industries de la
Protection des Plantes
2 rue Denfert-Rochereau
92100 Boulogne, France

M. DE CACQUERAY
U.I.P.P.
Union des Industries de la
Protection des Plantes
2 Rue Denfert-Rochereau
92100 Boulogne, France

M. DE CORMIS
INRA - CDR d'Avignon
Station de phytopharmacie
Domaine Saint-Paul
B.P. 91
84140 Montfavet
France

M.B. DECLERCQ
Chef de délégation,
Ministère de l'Economie,
des Finances et du Budget
Laboratoire Inter-regional
de la D.G.C.C.R.F.
25 Avenue de la République
91305 Massy, France

M. L'HOTELLIER
U.I.P.P.
Union des Industries de la
Protection des Plantes
2 Rue Denfert-Rochereau
92100 Boulogne, France

J.C. TOURNAYRE
U.I.P.P.
Union des Industries de la
Protection des Plantes
2 Rue Denfert-Rochereau
92100 Boulogne, France

GABON

Jean Pierre NGOUA
Secrétaire Principal chargé
du Comité National du Codex
Alimentarius
Commission Nationale de la FAO
B.P. 551 Libreville, Gabon

GERMANY
ALLEMAGNE
ALEMANIA

B. FETTERROLL
Oberchemierat
Chemische Landesuntersuchungs-
anstalt Karlsruhe
Hoffstrasse 3
D-7500 Karlsruhe
Germany

S. GANSER
Oberregierungsrat
Bundsministerium für Ernährung
Landwirtshcaft und Forsten
Postfach 14 02 70
D-5300 Bonn 1, Germany

Renate HANS
Direktor und Professor
Bundesgesundheitsamt
Postfach 33 00 13
D-1000 Berlin 33
Germany

K. HOHGARDT
Wiss. Angestellter
Biologische Bundesanstalt für
Land-und Forstwirtschaft
Messeweg 11-12
D-3300 Braunschweig
Germany

Dr. W. LINGK
Direktor und Professor
Bundesgesundheitsamt
Postfach 330013
D-1000 Berlin 33
Germany

J.-R. LUNDEHN
Direktor und Professor
Biologische Bundesanstalt für
Land-und Forstwirtschaft
Messeweg 11-12
D-3300 Braunschweig
Germany

E.D. PICK
Industrieverband Agrar e.V.
Karlstrasse 21
D-6000 Frankfurt 1
Germany

Henning REGENSTEIN
BASF AG
Landw. Versuchsstation
Postfach 220
D-6703 Limburgerhof
Germany

Dr. Gabrielle TIMME
Bayer AG
Zentr. landwirtschaft Monheim
Geb. 6100
D-5090 Leverkusen, Bayerwerk
Germany

GREECE
GRECE
GRECIA

Despina TSIPISTEFANITSI
Chemist Ph.D.
Ministry of Finance
State General Chemical Lab.
Greece

HUNGARY
HONGRIE
HUNGRIA

Dr László GYÖRFI
Plant Health and Soil
Conservation Station in
Budapest
Hungary 1118, Higany str. 2

Katalin SOÓS, M.D.
Consultant
National Institute of Food,
Hygiene and Nutricion
Gyáli ut 3/a
H-1097 Budapest
Hungary

INDONESIA
INDONESIE

A. Mukmin SIREGAR
Indonesian Embassy
Tobias Asserlaan 8
2571 KC Den Haag
The Netherlands

Wahyudi SUGIYANTO
Agricultural Attaché
Indonesian Mission to the
European Communities
Av. Tedesco 7, Box 3
1160 Brussels, Belgium

IRAN (ISLAMIC REP. OF)
IRAN (REP. ISLAMIQUE D')
IRAN (REP. ISLAMICA DEL)

Mr. H. GHORAYSHIZADEH
Director-General of Plan and
Budget of the Ministry of
Agriculture

Mrs. Sakineh HASHEMI-JAVADI
Food Technologist
Food and Drug Control Lab.
Ministry of Health and Medical
Education
No 31, Emam Khomeini Ave, 1436
P.O. Box 9385
Teheran, Iran

Mr. Kooroush SEPEHER
Chief of the Pesticide
Control of the Plant
Protection Organization
Tabnak Ave. Evin, Teheran, Iran

Mrs. Dr. Eghbal TAHERI
Head of Toxicology Dept.
and Dept. Director of Food
and Drug Laboratories.
Ministry of Health
No 31 Emam Khomeini Ave
P.O. Box 9385
Teheran, Iran

IRELAND
IRLANDE
IRLANDA

D. O'SULLIVAN
Department of Agriculture
and Food
Pesticide Control Service
Abbotstown, Dublin 15
Ireland

James QUIBLEY
State Laboratory
Abbotstown
Dublin 15, Ireland

ISRAEL

Miriam FREUND
Head of Pesticide Registration
Department of Plant Protection
and Inspection
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box 78
Bet Dagan 50 250, Israel

Sylvain Yair ROTH
Makhteshim Agan
International Coordination Center
283 Ave Louise Box 7
1050 Brussels, Belgium

ITALY
ITALIE
ITALIA

Sandra BELLISAI
Ministero della Sanità
DGIAN
Piazza Marconi 25
Roma, Italy

Riccardo FABBRINI
Agrofarma
Via Accademia 33
20131 Milano, Italy

Enrica QUATTRUCCI
Istituto Nazionale
della Nutrizione
Via Ardeatina, 546
00179 Roma, Italy

JAPAN
JAPON

Toshihito IKEDA
Deputy Director
Food Chemistry Division
Environmental Health Bureau
Ministry of Health and Welfare
1-2-2 Kasumigaseki
Ciyodaku, Tokyo 100, Japan

Shunichi MIYAKAWA
Society of Agricultural
Chemicals Industry
1-5-8 Muromachi
Nihonbashi Chuoku
Tokyo 103, Japan

Tsuyoshi SAKAMOTO
Assistant Director
Plant Protection Division
Agricultural Production Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture,
Forestry & Fisheries
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, ChiyodaKu
Tokyo 100, Japan

Toshio SHIMOMURA
Society of Agricultural
Chemicals Industry
1-5-8 Muromachi
Nihonbashi Chuoku
Tokyo 103, Japan

Atsushi YAMAUCHI
Chief of Toxicology Section
Agricultural Chemicals
Inspection Station
Ministry of Agriculture,
Forestry & Fisheries
2-772 Suzuki-Cho, Kodaira-Shi
Tokyo 187, Japan

KOREA, DEM. PEOPLE'S REP.OF
COREE, REP. DEM.POP. DE
COREA, REP. POP.DEM. DE

Chom Jae GWAN
Head Department of
Foodstuffs Institute
P.O. Box 901
Pyongyang, DPR of Korea

Kim Jong SU
Head Department of Foodstuffs
Institute
P.O. Box 901
Pyongyang, DPR of Korea

LESOTHO

Miss T.F. ADORO
First Secretary
Embassy of the
Kingdom of Lesotho
Rome, Italy

MALAYSIA
MALAISIE
MALASIA

Ainie KUNTOM
P.O.R.I.M.
6 Pesiaran Institusi
Bandar Baru Bangi, 43000 Kajang
Selangor, Malaysia

Chee ONG KOH
Chemistry Department of Malaysia
Jalan Sultan
46661 Petaling Jaya
Selangor, Malaysia

Cheah UAN BOH
Mardi
P.O. Box 12301
50774 Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia

MEXICO
MEXIQUE

Marco A. MARTINEZ
Deputy Agricultural Counsellor
Embassy of Mexico
1911 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington DC 20006, USA

Mrs. Amada VELEZ
Dirección General de
Sanidad Vegetal
Secretaría de Agricultura
y Lecussor Hidraulico
Guillermo Perez Valenzuela # 127
Doyoacán Mexico DlF, Mexico

MOROCCO
MAROC
MARRUECOS

Ahmed LAABERKI
Tarhy Mostafa
Laboratoire Officiel (LOARC)
25 Rue de Tours
Casablanca, Morocco

Mr Amneskane MOHAMED
Ingénieur d'Etat des Industries
Agro-alimentaires
BP 328, Settat, Morocco

NETHERLANDS
PAYS-BAS
PAISES BAJOS

P.H. ARENTZEN
National Institute of Public Health
and Environmental Protection
P.O.Box 1
3720 BA Bilthoven
The Netherlands

F.G. DE BOER
Nefyto/Duphar
P.O. Box 54
1243 ZH 's-Graveland
The Netherlands

G. COSTER
Duphar Ned. B.V.
Crop Protection Division
P.O. Box 7133
1077 JC Amsterdam
The Netherlands

M.J. GERRITSEN-WIELARD
Central Buro of Fruit and
Vegetables Auxions in
The Netherlands
P.O. Box 216
2700 AE Zoetermeer
The Netherlands

H. DE HEER
Head of the Delegation
Ministry of Agriculture,
Nature Management and Fisheries
Plant Protection Service
P.O. Box 9102
6700 HC Wageningen
The Netherlands

A.W.M. HUIJBREGTS
Commission for the Dutch
Food and Agricultural Industry
Sugarbeet Research Institute
P.O. Box 32
4600 AA Bergen op Zoom
The Netherlands

G. KLETER
Ministry of Welfare, Health and
Cultural Affairs
General Inspectorate for
Health Protection
P.O. Box 5406
2280 HK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

D.G. KLOET
Ministry of Agriculture,
Nature Management and Fisheries
Department for the Environment,
Quality and Nutrition
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK Den Haag
The Netherlands

I.M.F. RENTENAAR
Commodity Board for Arable
Products
P.O. Box 29739
2502 LS The Hague
The Netherlands

E.M. DEN TONKELAAR
National Institute of Public
Health and Environmental
Protection
P.O. Box 1
3720 BA Bilthoven
The Netherlands

L.G.M.Th. TUINSTRA
Ministry of Agriculture,
Natural Management and Fisheries
State Institute for Quality
Control of Agricultural
Products
P.O. Box 230
6700 AE Wageningen
The Netherlands

H.J. DE VRIES
Ministry of Agriculture,
Nature Management and
Fisheries
Plant Protection Service
P.O. Box 9102
6700 HC Wageningen
The Netherlands

P. VAN ZOONEN
National Institute of
Public Health and
Environmental Protection
P.O. Box 1
3720 BA Bilthoven
The Netherlands

NEW ZEALAND
NOUVELLE-ZELANDE
NUEVA ZELANDIA

D.W. LUNN
Resistrar
Pesticides Board
Agricultural Compounds Unit
Ministry of Agriculture
and Fisheries
P.O. Box 40063
Upper Hutt, New Zealand

NORWAY
NORVEGE
NORUEGA

Hanne-Grete Nilsen
Norwegian Food Control Authority
P.O. Box 8187 Dep.
N-0034 Oslo, Norway

Børge HOLEN
Pesticides Laboratory
Oslovn 1
N-1430 AAS, Norway

PHILLIPPINES
FILIPINAS

Dr. Napoleon DOMINGO
Embassy of the Phillippines
Laan Copes van Cattenburg 125
The Hague, The Netherlands

POLAND
POLOGNE
POLONIA

Jan LUDWICKI
Chief of Toxicology Section
National Institue of Hygiene
24, Chocimska Str.
00-791 Warsaw, Poland

Wojciech MARTINEK
Chief of Laboratory Quality
Inspection Office
Ministry of Foreign Economic
Relations
11/13, Reymonta str.
60-791 Poznań, Poland

REPUBLIC OF KOREA
REPUBLIQUE DE COREE
REPUBLICA DE COREA

In-Shik HONG
Director Plant Protection
Division
Ministry of Agriculture,
Forestry and Fisheries
1 Jung angDong
KwacheunSi KyunggiDo, Korea

Moo-Gi HONG
Health Researcher
National Institute of Health
5, Nokbundong
EunpyungKu
Seoul, Korea

Noh-Won JUNG
Director
Kyung Nong Corporation
1337-4 Seo Cho Dong,
Seocho-Gu
Seoul, Korea

Il-Kyu LEE
Manager Business Dept.
Agricultural Chemicals
Industrial Association
1358-9 Seo cho-Dong
Seo cho-Ku
Seoul, Korea

Yi-Ki MIN
Manager
Hannong Corporation
237-10 Non Hyon-Dong
Kng Nam-Ku
Seoul, Korea

Byung-Hun SONG
Agricultural Researcher
Agricultural Chemicals Research
Institue RDA
249 Seo dun-Dong
Kwonsun-Ku Su won-Si
Kyunggi-Do, Korea

Sung-Bum YANG
Oriental Chemical Industries
50, Sokong-Dong, Chung-Gu
Seoul, Korea

SPAIN
ESPAGNE
ESPANA

Angel YAGUE
Jefe de Sección de Homologación
de Productos Fitosanitarios,
Ministerio de Agricultura,
Pesca y Alimentación
Juan Bravo 3B
28006 Madrid, Spain

Dolores GARCIA RIVAS
Ministerio de Agricultura,
Pesca y Alimentación
Juan Bravo 3B
28006 Madrid, Spain

Josefina LOMBARDERO
Laboratorio Arbitral
Ministerio de Agricultura,
Pesca y Alimentación
Carretera Coruna km 10, 700
28023 Madrid, Spain

Enrique CELMA
AEPLA, Ici-zeltia
Costa Brava 13a
Madrid 28034, Spain

SWAZILAND
SWAZILANDIA

A.F.G. SMITH
c/o Farnham House
Farnham Royal
Slough SL2 3RQ
United Kingdom

SWEDEN
SUEDE
SUECIA

Arne ANDERSSON
Chief Government Inspector
National Food Administration
P.O.Box 622
S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

Ingegärd BERGMAN
Principal Administrative Officer
National Food Administration
P.O. Box 622
S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

Bengt-Göran ERICSSON
Toxicologist
National Food Administration
P.O. Box 622
S-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

Dicken JOHANSSON
Agronomist
Swedish Farmer's Cooperation
Chemical Department
P.O.Box 30192
S-104 25 Stockholm, Sweden

SWITZERLAND
SUISSE
SUIZA

Hulda BARBEN
Swiss Federal Research Station
CH-8820 Wädenswill
Switzerland

I. -C. CIUREA
Jacobs-Suchard SA
Rue des Usines 90
CH-2003 Neuchâtel
Switzerland

W. KOBEL
PP 2.56
Ciba-Geigy Ltd.
P.O. Box
CH-4002 Basel
Switzerland

T. LAANIO
Swiss Society of Chemical Industry
c/o Ciba-Geigy Ltd.
CH-4002 Basel
Switzerland

Danièle MAGNOLATO
Nestec SA
CH-1800 Vevey
Switzerland

T. STIJVE
Nestec SA
CH-1800 Vevey
Switzerland

Cl. WÜTHRICH
Federal Office of Public Health
Food Control and Toxic Substances
Haslerstrasse 16
Postfach, CH-3000 Berne 14
Switzerland

SYRIA
SYRIE
SIRIA

Dr. Khalil ALSHEIKH
Deputy Plant Protection
Director Syria Damascus
Ministry of Agriculture
and Agrarian Reform, Syria

Taysir Sheikh OMAR
Head of Central Pesticide Laboratory
Syria, Damascus
Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform
Syria

THAILAND
THAILANDE
TAILANDIA

Mr. Surasak CHUASUKONTHIP
First Secretary
Royal Thai Embassy
The Hague, The Netherlands

Miss Suwimol LERDWERASIRIKUL
Scientist 6
Department of Agricultural Toxic Substances
Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900
Thailand

Mr. Sak MONKONGKUNTIWONG
Officer 5
Commodity Standards Technical
Department of foreign trade
Ministry of Commerce
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

Mrs. Oratai SILAPANAPAPORN
Standards Officer 6
Thai Industrial Standards Institute
Ministry of Industry,
Rama VI Rd. Bangkok 10400
Thailand

Mr. Bunlert SIRICHAI
Scientist 7
Department of Foreign Trade
Ministry of Commerce
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

UNITED KINGDOM
ROYAUME-UNI
REINO UNIDO

J.R. COX
Overseas Development Administration
National Resources Institute
Central Avenue
Chatham Maritime
Kent ME4 4TB, UK

I.C. DEWHURST
Department of Health HEF(M)
2 Division, Hannibal House
Elephant and Castle
London SE1 6TE, UK

R.R. HIGNETT
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Pesticides Safety Division
Ogg Building, Rothamstead
Harpenden, Herts AL5 2QJ, UK

A.R.C. HILL
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Central Science Laboratory
Hatching Green, Harpenden
Herts AL5 2BD, UK

C.F. HINSLEY
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Pesticides Safety Division
Ergon House, c/o Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR, UK

R. ROWE
Department of Regulatory, Toxicology & Environmental Affairs
Dow Elanco Europe
Letcombe Laboratory
Letcombe
Regis, Wantage
Oxen OX12 9JT, UK

G. TELLING
Food and Drink Federation
6 Catherine Street
London WC2B 5JJ, UK

M. WATSON
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
Pesticides Safety Division
Ogg Building, Rothamstead
Harpenden, Herts AL5 2QJ, UK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ETATS-UNIS D AMERIQUE
ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA

Glen CARMAN
President
California Citrus Quality Council
953 West Foothill Blvd
Claremont, California 91711, USA

William J. COOK JR.
Box 690
Mt. Gretna,
Pennsylvania 17064, USA

Charles W. COOPER
Assistant Director
Center for Food Safety and
Applied Nutrition, FDA
200 C Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20204, USA

Paul B. ENGLER
Executive Secretary
California Citrus Quality Council
953 West Foothill Blvd.
Claremont,
California 91711, USA

Stanford N. FERTIG
Application Technology Research
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Agricultural Research Service
Building 1070, BARC-East
10300 Baltimore Avenue
Beltsville, Maryland 20705-2350
USA

John P. FRAWLEY
President
Health & Environmental International
400 W. 9th Street, Suite 401
Wilmington, Delaware 19809, USA

George B. FULLER
Director, Product Registration
and Regulatory Affairs
Monsanto Agricultural Company
800 N. Lindbergh Boulevard C2SB
St. Louis, Missouri 63167, USA

M.A. ISMAIL
Florida Department of Citrus
700 Experiment Station Road
Lake Alfred, Florida 33850, USA

Fred IVES
Chemist
Office of Pesticide Programs
Health Effects Division (H7509C)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20460, USA

Bruce JAEGER
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Health Effects Division (H7509C)
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20460, USA

Anne LINDSAY
Director, Registration Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Pesticide Programs
401 M Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20460, USA

Richard M. PARRY, Jr
Agricultural Research Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Bldg. 005 BARC
Beltsville, MD 20705, USA

John R. WESSEL
Director, Contaminants Policy Staff
Office of Regulatory Affairs
Food and Drug Administration
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, Maryland 20857
USA

ZIMBABWE

L. TOET
Senior Analytical Chemist
Tobacco Research Board
Kutsaga Research Station
Airport Ring Road
Harare, Zimbabwe

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES

ASSOCIATION OF OFFICIAL ANALYTICAL CHEMISTS INTERNATIONAL (A.O.A.C.)

Derek C. ABBOTT
United Kingdom and Ireland
Representative
AOAC International
33 Agates Lane
Ashtead
Surrey KT21 2ND, UK

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Peter BAUM
Partial Agreement in the Social
and Public Health Field

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY (EEC)

Michael MURPHY
Expert, Directorate General
for Agriculture

Michael WALSH
Principal Administrator
Directorate General for
Agriculture

GREENPEACE

William BARCLAY
Research Coordinator
Pesticides Campaign
Greenpeace
1436 U St., N.W.
Washington DC 20009, USA

INTERNATIONAL DAIRY FEDERATION (I.D.F.)

Dr A. BLÜTHGEN
Institut für Hygiene der
Bundesanstalt für Milchforschung
Hermann Weigmannstr. 3/11
Postfach 6069
D-2300 Kiel 14, Germany

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF CONSUMERS UNIONS (I.O.C.U.)

R. VAN WELIE
Consumentenbond
Leeghwaterplein 26
2521 CV The Hague, Netherlands

INTERNATIONAL TOXICOLOGY INFORMATION CENTRE (ITIC)

G. VETTORAZZI
Director ITIC
Paseo Miraconcha nr 10
E-20007 San Sebastian, Spain

OFFICE INTERNATIONAL DE LA VIGNE ET DU VIN (O.I.V.)

Dr Dominique TUSSEAU
CIVC, BP 135
5, rue H. Martin
51204 Epernay Cedex
France

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF PESTICIDE MANUFACTURERS (GIFAP)

S. BEHRENDT
BASF A.G.
Postfach 220
D-6703 Limburgerhof
Germany

M. BLISS
ISK Biotech Corporation
5966 Heisley Road
P.O. Box 8000
Mentor, OH 44061-8000, USA

Eric BRUNNER
Sandoz Agro Ltd.
4002 Brussels, Belgium

R.D. COSTLOW
Rohm & Haas Company
Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19105, USA

I. FRIEDMAN
Makhteshim Chemical Works Israel
P.O. Box 60
84100 Beer Sheva, Israel

G.R. GARDINER
79A Avenue Albert Lancaster
1180 Brussels, Belgium

A. GARNIER
Janssen Pharmaceutica N.V.
Plant Protection Division
2340-Beerse, Belgium

Z. GOLLOP
Dead Sea Bromine Co
P.O. Box 180
Beer Sheba, Israel

W. GRAHAM
Marsanto Europe S.A.
270-272 Av. de Terower
1150 Brussels, Belgium

B. Jurien DE LA GRAVIERE
Makhteshim-Agan France
118, Avenue Paul Doumer
F-92563 Rueil-Malmaison
France

A. HADJIYIANNI
FMC Corp.
1735 Market str.
Philadelphia, PA, 190103 USA

H. HOSODA
Nihon Nohyaku Co, Ltd.
2-5, Nihonbashi 1-chome
Chuo-Ku, Tokyo 103
Japan

B.G. JULIN
DuPont de Nemours
Mercure Centre
100 rue de la Fusée
B-1130 Brussels, Belgium

Gerhard KEUCK
Hoechst AG
P.O.Box 80 03 20
6230 Frankfurt 80
Germany

G. KÜLPS
Bayer A.G.
Pflanzenschutzzentrum Monheim
D-5090 Leverkusen Bayerwerk
Germany

S. MARUYAMA
Sumitomo Chemical Co
5-33 Kitahama, 40-Chome
Chuo-Ku, Osaka 541, Japan

J. MCCARTHY
NACA
1155 15th Street, N.W.
Suite 990
Washington, DC 20005, USA

R. NIELSSON
American Cyanamid
P.O. Box 400
Princeton, NJ 08543-0400

M. NOKATA
Nihon Nohyaku Co, Ltd
2-5, Nihonbashi 1-chome
Chuo-Ku, Tokyo 103, Japan

J.P.R. ORME
Schering Agrochemicals
Chesterford Park
Saffron Walden
Essex CB10 XL, UK

Zim PUNJA
ICI Agrochemicals
Fernhurst, Surrey, UK

F.J. RAVENEY
Agrilex
1 Place de la Gare
1260 Nyon, France

S. RICKAR
Merck & Co
Hillsborough Road
Three Bridges, NJ 08887, USA

Sylvain Yair ROTH
Marhteshim
283 Ave Louise Box 7
1050 Brussels, Belgium

Y. SHIMONAO
Hokko Chemical Industry Co.
Mitsui Building No. 2
4-4-2 Nihonbashi Hongoku-cho
Chuo-ku, Tokyo 103, Japan

S. SUGIMOTO
Nippon Soda Co. Dept.
Product Development Dept.
Agro-Pharm Division
2-2-1 Ohtemachi
Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 100, Japan

Y. TAKIMOTO
Sumitomo Chemical Co
5-33 Kitahama, 40-Chome
Chuo-Ku, Osaka 541, Japan

S. TAMAGAWA
Mitsui Toatsu Chemicals Inc.
2-5, Kasumigaseki, 3-chome
Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo 100, Japan

J.S. THORNTON
Miles Inc.
P.O. Box 4913
Kansas City, Missouri 64120, USA

M. TSUKUI
Takeda Chemical Industry Ltd.
Japan

N. YATES-PARKER
Monsanto
800 N. LindberghBlvd
St. Louis, Missouri 63167, USA

Brian A. YOUNG
Programme Manager Battelle
505 King Avenue Columbus
Ohio 43201-2693, USA

Ken WHITAKER
Shell International Chemical
Company Ltd.
Shell Centre
London SE1 7PG, UK

FAO REPRESENTATIVES
REPRESENTANTS DE LA FAO
REPRESENTANTES DE LA FAO

Tony MACHIN
FAO Consultant
2 Ullathorne Road
London SW16 1SN, UK

WHO REPRESENTATIVES
REPRESENTANTS DE L'OMS
REPRESENTANTES DE LA OMS

John L. HERRMAN
International Programme on
Chemical Safety
World Health Organization
1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland

FAO/WHO SECRETARIAT
SECRETARIAT FAO/OMS
SECRETARIA FAO/OMS

Enrico CASADEI
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards
Programme
FAO, 00100 Rome, Italy

David H. BYRON
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards
Programme
FAO, 00100 Rome, Italy

NETHERLANDS SECRETARIAT
SECRETARIAT PAYS-BAS
SECRETARIA PAISES-BAJOS

J.W. DORNSEIFFEN
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Directorate for Food and
Product Safety
P.O. Box 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

Mrs. R. HITTENHAUSEN-GELDERBLOM
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Inspectorate for Health
Protection
Hoogte Kadijk 401
1018 BK Amsterdam
The Netherlands

H. ROELFZEMA
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Directorate for Food and
Product Safety
P.O. Box 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

P. OLTHOF
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Directorate for Food and
Product Safety
P.O. Box 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

Mrs. M. BUTER-GEERTSMA
Ministry of Welfare, Health
and Cultural Affairs
Directorate for Food and
Product Safety
P.O. Box 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

Mrs. K. SCHENKEVELD
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Directorate for Food and
Product Safety
P.O. Box 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

Mrs. M.B.J. STOK-LAARMAN
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Directorate for Food and
Product Safety
P.O. Box 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

Mrs. J.Ph.A. PIGMANS
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Directorate for Food and
Product Safety
P.O. Box 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

Mrs. A.C.M. V.D. NOUWELAND
-V.D. PLOEG
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
Directorate for Food and
Product Safety
P.O. Box 3008
2280 MK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

W. BUITENWEG
Ministry of Welfare,
Health and Cultural Affairs
P.O. Box 5406
2280 HK Rijswijk
The Netherlands

REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP ON ACCEPTANCES

1. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Acceptances met to further discuss issues raised at the Meeting of 13 April 1991. The discussion paper tabled at the meeting in 1991 highlighted several issues that warranted further investigation/ discussion with respect to their potential impact on the acceptance of Codex maximum residue limits (MRLs) by national governments. This original discussion paper was used as a workplan for the present meeting.

2. The meeting had before it two discussion papers based on responses received to two circular letters. The first, (distributed in August 1991) investigated the role of efficacy data in determining good agricultural practice (GAP) at the national level and considered the further development of the proposed case studies. The second (distributed October 30, 1991) investigated enforcement practices and a mechanism to improve communication between the CCPR and the JMPR, specifically a proposal for the handling of Step 7B MRLs.

3. The responses to the questions on efficacy assessment indicated that in most countries there was some consideration of efficacy data in developing MRLs.

4. It was the general consensus of the respondents that there was a shared responsibility on the part of a country with challenged GAP and that raising the objection to support their positions with scientific rationales. That is, to document the need for the GAP through the presentation of full details of the use pattern, identification of the pests controlled, and a summary of the efficacy evaluation.

5. It was recognized that there is a need for the Chairman of the CCPR to clearly identify the reason for an intervention. If it reflects concern for the ADI, or the interpretation of the residue data in establishing the MRL, then a mechanism exists for the consideration of such concerns by the JMPR. An intervention on the basis of GAP must be identified as such and may be considered for referral to an expert group on efficacy for resolution.

6. The was general support for the further development of the case studies as part of a pilot project to investigate the feasibility of an expert group on efficacy. It was suggested that the deliberations of an expert group on GAP would be a mechanism for the development of a better understanding of questions related to GAP and might be useful in the case of conflict.

7. There was limited response to the call for GAP information and supporting efficacy data for the pesticide-commodity combinations proposed for the case studies. It was suggested that the GAP guidelines developed by the European Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO) might be a basis from which to proceed to develop these case studies. In view of this it was recommended that tolylfluanid on apples and permethrin on lettuce be the focus of further development.

8. In order for the case studies to be effective a commitment to provide a range of efficacy data must be obtained. In the interest of having the draft case studies ready for the consideration of the 1992 JMPR a deadline of 30 June 1992 for the submission of this information to the Chair of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Acceptances was established. If this information is not provided, it will be considered to reflect a lack of support for the continued development of these case studies, and for further consideration of an expert group on efficacy.

9. Apart from the United Kingdom and Germany, no delegation provided copies of the relevant directives or Guidelines for the development of efficacy data. It was hoped that a comparison of national Guidelines might lead to a better understanding of the differences between countries and facilitate the definition of a set of general principles. The request for the submission of this information, as well as, names of experts who might participate in the development of this pilot project were reiterated.

10. The responses to the question on national enforcement practices were summarized. The responses clearly indicate that in some countries MRLs are strictly enforced as absolute levels, while in others, a margin of error is applied to MRLs in determining action levels above which enforcement or regulatory action might be initiated.

11. A proposal to improve communication between the CCPR and the JMPR and a mechanism for the follow-up of referrals to the JMPR, specifically MRLs at Step 7B, was tabled.

12. A letter was sent by the Chairman of the CCPR to delegations mentioned in the Report of the 23rd session of the CCPR requesting that information (either in the form of additional data or a scientific rationale) in support of their interventions be made available in time for the 24th Session. There has been limited response to this request. It was proposed that in the future the responses to such a letter be tabled as a Room Document at the CCPR which would clearly indicate the current status of the interventions i.e. whether supporting information is to be forthcoming, whether promised information has been provided, and the proposed fate of the MRL.

13. It was proposed to develop a list of existing MRLs at Step 7B with the reason for its referral and the responsible party identified. This list will be circulated to CCPR participants for comments and to determine what, if any, information might be expected to be provided. On the basis of these responses the CCPR must then consider the following:

    i) if it is determined by the JMPR that the MRL lacks critical information with respect to GAP or residues and no commitment to provide supporting data is received, it will then be proposed for deletion;

    ii) if the basis for holding an MRL at Step 7B are country interventions, which have not been substantiated, the MRL will be proposed for advancement to Step 8. This would include such general statements as "the ADI is too low" or "all MRLs greater than 5 are too high": and for which neither additional data or a scientific rationale are to be made available for the consideration of the JMPR.

14. A proposal for a mechanism to follow-up MRLs referred to the JMPR (Step 7B) was tabled. It was noted that in order for this proposed procedure to be effective it will require a certain amount of discipline and increased work/effort on the part of the JMPR Joint Secretaries, the Chairman of the CCPR and most importantly CCPR participants. It was suggested that this procedure might be implemented at the present Session of the CCPR.

15. There was some concern that a three year maximum for an MRL to remain at Step 7B would not provide countries with adequate time to develop residue data where it was required. It was noted however that the Commission met only every two years thus a two year maximum was to be preferred. In addition, in view of the fact that the MRL would have already been in the Codex system for 3 or more years since the initial review of the data base and entry into the step process, a maximum two year time limit at Step 7B was adequate.

16. The amended proposal as accepted by the Working Group is attached. It was to be recommended to the plenary session of the CCPR for adoption.

17. It was noted that the FAO Guide on the evaluation of pesticide residue data and the estimation of maximum residue levels in food and feed was not yet available. It was expected that the information presented on enforcement practices might be useful information to include in this document. It was expected that a draft of the Guide would be available in time for discussion at the next meeting of the ad Hoc Working Group at the 25th Session of the CCPR in 1993.

ANNEX I

PROPOSAL FOR CCPR PROCEDURE FOR FUTURE STEP 7B MRLs

1. Only when there is a reasonable chance that information will be provided will an MRL be placed at Step 7B. A specific country or other party must verbally commit to providing or attempting to have provided additional information for the consideration of the JMPR.

   The reason for the intervention and the delegation to provide the supporting information must be recorded in the Report of the Meeting.

   The "additional information" may include a country's scientific rationale supporting its intervention, along with the appropriate documentation, but does not necessarily require submission of new data, unless the rationale is based on data not previously available to the JMPR.

2. For JMPR consideration of scheduling that year, the additional information must be available to the Joint Secretary of the JMPR within one month of the CCPR (e.g. May 31).

   The Codex Secretariat and CCPR chairman will be copied with the transmittal letter but not with the detailed submission.

3. In the absence of written confirmation of the availability of the additional information to the JMPR by May 31, the CCPR Chairman will send a letter to the committing party requesting submission of the additional information (JMPR Secretariat(s) copied). This letter will reference the Report of the Meeting and specify the additional information for which a commitment was made.

4. Within three months of the CCPR (e.g. July 31) a written response must be provided to the CCPR chairman (JMPR Secretariat(s) copied) on the intended response to the commitment, the information to be provided and the time-frame of the intended submission.

5. If the committed information or a commitment to provide it are not available by January 31 of the following year, the presumption will be made at the next session of the CCPR that it is not to be provided. The MRL proposal will be advanced or deleted as deemed appropriate by the Committee. This action may only be changed with the actual submission and JMPR review of the additional information needed to support the intervention.

   A brief status report of the MRLs at Step 7B will be prepared by the Secretariat of the CCPR and be available at the CCPR meeting in the form of a room document.

6. If the additional information is not provided in accordance with the committed timeframe, the CCPR will consider its options as circumstances warrant. Normally, a written explanation to the CCPR chairman for any delay will be expected from the committing party to hold a proposal at Step 7B beyond its initial specified time.

   No MRL may be held at Step 7B for more than two years.

Proposed CCPR procedure for Step 7B MRLs

CCPR proposal of MRLs to Step 7B - in absence of written commitment, letter from CCPR Chairman

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2
* April	May 31	July 31	January 31	April
1 month	2 months	6 months		
- verbal commitment to provide information to the JMPR	- information to be submitted for possible consideration by next JMPR	- written response on information to be provided and timeframe for submission	- deadline for submission of information or timeframe for its submission	CCPR - status report of MRLs at step 7B tabled - no information provided, MRL advanced or deleted as appropriate - information schedule for JMPR evaluation

* It should be noted that countries have adequate opportunity to determine the availability of additional information and to develop data (if necessary) for consideration by the JMPR, or in response to the recommendations of the JMPR.

- Schedule of the JMPR review is published 1 to 3 years in advance.
- There are at least two rounds of government comment on the recommendation of the JMPR prior to the proposals reaching Step 7B.

REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* GROUP ON METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The Working Group met under the Chairmanship of Mr L.G.M.Th. Tuinstra and Mr P. van Zoonen (Netherlands). The following countries and organisations attended: Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, People's Republic of, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States of America, Zimbabwe, AOAC, O.I.V.

REVISION OF THE LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR METHODS OF ANALYSIS

1. As decided during last meeting, participants received and commented on a revised list of the Recommendations for Methods of Analysis. The finalized version was made available to the Codex Secretariat in October 1991. As the printing is foreseen in the autumn of 1992, comments received during this meeting will also be incorporated. This means that the Recommendations will include references to literature for the first 169 pesticides. Last year's request for a method for compound 156 (clofentezine) resulted in the inclusion of a recent reference. However, until now no literature references have been received for the new compounds: bentazone (172), buprofezin (173), cadusafos (174), glufosinate-ammonium (175) and hexythiazox (176). Information for compound 170 (hexaconazole) is also lacking. GIFAP is again asked to encourage members to submit their methods for publication in the open literature.

GOOD PRACTICE IN PESTICIDE RESIDUE ANALYSIS

2. Participants of last year's meeting received a revised draft in October 1991. Comments were received from 11 participants up to two weeks before this year's meeting. During the discussion of the revised draft it became clear that the paragraphs concerning the use of mass spectrometry needed to be rewritten. It was noted that there was also a need for detailed information on the appropriate way to report the analytical result. It is now planned that the final draft will be sent out to the participants of the Working Group at the end of Summer 1992 for approval at the 25th CCPR.

FAT SOLUBLE PESTICIDES

3. It was noted that, from an analyst's point of view, MRLs should be based on the whole product. However, for the assessments of MRLs on a whole product basis appropriate data should be submitted to the JMPR. The Working Group noted and accepted the findings of the 1991 JMPR and awaits further information to be provided in the future. The basic approach of the JMPR using the octanol water partition coefficient as the prime indicator of fat solubility, supplemented by residue-data, could also form a basis for other Codex groups such as the CCFAC.

SCREENING METHODS

4. In relation to ALINORM 91/24A para 295, the Working Group discussed the need for screening methods for go/no-go decisions and decided to make available, as an annex to the Recommendations for Methods of Analysis, a reference guide to immunoassays and other methods based on e.g. fungal growth or cholinesterase inhibition.

PROBLEMS ARISING FROM MRLS FOR PESTICIDES WITH COMMON METABOLITES

5. The Working Group endorsed the views expressed last year that, for enforcement purposes, as few compounds as possible should be included in the definition of the residue. The Working Group has a strong preference for combining the MRLs for pesticides with common metabolites into a single list, or at least an appropriate system of cross references, wherever there is an overlap in use patterns.

STORAGE STABILITY OF ANALYTICAL SAMPLES

6. The representative of GIFAP reported on their guidelines on stability of residues during storage (see Annex 1 to this document). The Working Group briefly discussed the subject and expressed appreciation for the work.

PORTION OF COMMODITY TO BE ANALYZED

7. The Group was informed on problems with the preparation of samples for analysis. It concerned, in particular, samples of potatoes, carrots, parsnips and other root vegetables. The following procedure is recommended: wash the potato tubers in cold running water, brushing gently with a soft brush to remove loose soil and debris, if necessary, and then dab lightly with a clean tissue paper to dry. The same procedure holds for the carrots but after drying, the tops are carefully cut off with a knife by cutting through the bottom of the stem at the lowest point of attachment of the outer petioles. If an annulus of root tissue is thereby severed from hollow-crown roots, this material should be re-combined with the roots.

It is recommended that Part VI of the Guide is revised accordingly. The existing footnotes i.e. "wash before analysis" for tecnazene (115), carbendazim (72), thiabendazole (65) and imazalil (110) would then be superfluous.

PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN DITHIOCARBAMATE ANALYSIS

8. Plants belonging to the family *Cruciferae* (or **Brassicaceae**) contain certain naturally-occurring sulphur compounds which degrade to produce CS_2 under the conditions used for dithiocarbamates analysis. Plants known to present this problem include cabbages, Brussels sprouts, calabrese, mooli, radishes, turnips, swedes and watercress. However, at present there are no Codex MRLs set for dithiocarbamates on this group of commodities, but these effects should be borne in mind. The amount of CS_2 generated by the plant material may be found to increase with time after harvest. The CS_2 generated by dithiocarbamate residues cannot be distinguished from that produced by the other sulphur compounds in these commodities.

In addition, onions and leeks etc. do not appear to generate CS_2 from naturally-occurring compounds under the conditions of analysis but they do produce other volatile sulphur compounds (e.g. dimethyl disulphide) which may be difficult to separate chromatographically from CS_2. These particular contaminants can produce spurious results when using a sulphur-specific flame-photometric detector but they are easily distinguished from CS_2 by coupled gaschromatography-mass spectrometry.

HARMONISATION

9. The Working Group is aware of the installation of technical committees in the European Committee for Standardization (CEN TC 275 WG 3 and 4) for the elaboration of reference methods for pesticides in fatty and non-

fatty foods. It is strongly suggested that the CCPR submit its list of methods to these groups.

The Working Group briefly discussed the recent foundation of community reference laboratories in the EC. A document concerning the goals and tasks of such reference laboratories will be made available for information to the Working Group.

The Working Group noted that the report of the Sixth session of the CCRVDF ALINORM 93/31 contained several items of a more general nature which might be applicable to the work in our group. In the next meeting more attention will be given to those elements which are of mutual interest.

The meeting expressed concern at the growing number of MRLs being recommended by other organisations at unnecessarily and impractically low levels for which relevant data or rationale were not always available. Attention was also drawn to the greatly increased cost of analysis at such low levels.

SAMPLING PROBLEMS

10. It was noted that problems can occur in sampling lots in which the distribution of residues, although regular within a lot, is uneven within packages. This is not covered by the existing CCPR sampling guidelines (Section V).

STABILITY OF RESIDUE DURING STORAGE
(Prepared by GIFAP - Residue Working Group)

Samples should be analyzed as quickly as possible after collection, before physical and chemical changes take place. If samples cannot be prepared and analyzed on receipt at the laboratory, the stability of residues during storage conditions must be studied.

Studies on the stability of residues in samples, over the time and at the temperature of storage, should be carried out with representative pesticides and substrates. The intervals for sampling plus analysis depend on the available information on the potential stability of the residue. A minimum of five sampling intervals including zero time should be considered whatever the total duration of the study might be. If relatively rapid degradation is likely, intervals such as 0, 14, 28, 56, 112 days can be chosen; if available information shows reasonable stability of residues, longer intervals e.g. 0, 1, 3, 6 and 12 month can be selected. The stability study should be conducted with sample material subjected to the identical sample preparation procedures and storage conditions as those for residue samples of a corresponding magnitude of residue study. Data may be required for a representative range of crops (Codex) eg water-, oil-, protein-, and starch-containing crop materials to support residue trials, for animal tissues, milk, eggs to support animal transfer studies.

Experiments may be conducted on prepared samples with incurred residues. Alternatively, aliquots of prepared control samples should be spiked with a known amount of chemical storage under normal storage conditions. The storage stability studies are to be carried out at sufficient high levels in the starting material to monitor a potential dissipation with significant precision. The residue values should be within the range of the expected residues, but they should be at least ten times the limit of determination of the analytical method in order to demonstrate a possible breakdown with certainty.

Storage conditions should be those which allow the best stability of residue; generally, samples are stored in a deep freeze, preferably at -20°C.

The analytical method must be able to determine the parent compound and its relevant metabolites. For each sampling date at least two samples along with procedural recoveries should be analyzed.

The results of storage stability are presented in tables including mean and individual values. Procedural recoveries should be reported. In case of a significant decline, a dissipation curve is established based on the mean or individual values. This is achieved by plotting the time of storage (x-axis) versus percentage residues on the y-axis. From this curve the percentage dissipation can be read at any time point within the curve.

REPORT OF THE AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PESTICIDE RESIDUE PROBLEMS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The Working Group met under the Chairmanship of M. Salwa Dogheim (Egypt). The following countries and organizations participated in the deliberations: Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Gabon, Germany, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Zimbabwe, Greenpeace and the ITIC.

The Secretariat reminded the group of its decisions and agreements supported by the 23rd CCPR session, as outlined in paragraphs 304-310 and Appendix V of ALINORM 91/24A. This included the following revised terms of reference:

- to identify major pesticides used in developing countries and the food crops on which they are used;
- to provide information that would allow for the elaboration of MRLs for pesticides used in individual countries;
- to identify pesticide residue issues of concern to developing countries for referral and consideration by the CCPR;
- to promote the exchange of information on pesticides between countries, and;
- to liaise with the Codex Regional Coordinating Committees where appropriate.

The initial working group discussions centred on those government comments submitted to the Regional Working Group Chairmen in response to CL 1991/15-PR, Part B.5. The questionnaire was circulated with a view towards obtaining information on pesticides currently used in developing countries and the food crops on which they are used, as well as information concerning the establishment of MRLs.

The Regional Working Group Chairman for Latin America and the Caribbean (Dr. R. Gonzalez, Chile) provided the group with an excellent summary of problems highlighted by countries in the region related to pesticide residues. This included problems related to regulatory control (e.g., communication between various government agencies and Codex bodies, registration schemes, pre-harvest intervals, acceptance procedures), analytical facilities and capabilities and residue detection and detention in importing countries (publication of detentions and rejections, unregistered pesticide uses).

The Regional Working Group Chairman for Asia (Dr. Edhbal Taheri, Iran) indicated that a response to the questionnaire was received from Thailand, which highlighted major pesticide uses in that country. The Group was also informed that Iran had identified major pesticides used, established a National Committee on Pesticide Residues, organized seminars and training courses to promote good agricultural practices, established guidelines in Farsi on the use of pesticides and continued to participate in GEMS/FOOD.

Mr. G.N. Hooper of Australia (Regional Chairman for the South-West Pacific) also presented the Group with an update of activities in the region regarding the collection and dissemination of information concerning pesticides.

Other delegations present at the Session also provided verbal reports concerning problems associated with the use of pesticides in their countries. Several countries indicated that they are adversely affected by legislation in developed countries in regard to those pesticides used on a limited basis. The delegation of Argentina also indicated that it had established several MRLs for pesticides in vegetables and had several laboratories for the evaluation of residues in vegetables and animal products. The Delegation of Cuba also indicated that it would update information submitted previously.

The Delegation of Canada clarified its position concerning the acceptance of Codex MRLs, whereby products with residues at levels of less than 0.1 ppm were accepted for compounds not registered in Canada. The meeting was informed that Canada has recently begun establishing MRLs below o.1 mg/kg, where appropriate, in the interest of harmonizing with Codex MRLs or MRLs of trading partners. The regulatory policy regarding MRLs of less than 0.1 mg/kg has been scheduled for review in the coming year.

The Delegation of Canada also cautioned the group that several compounds identified by the Working Group on Priorities would be removed from the priority list in the absence of available data. The identification of alternate use compounds was encouraged. It was indicated that carbophenothion, chlorobenzilate, dicloran and cartap would most likely be deleted. In addition the fate of MRLs for chlormequat, diphenyl, endrin, ethoxyquin, formothion, pyrethrins and pirimiphos-methyl was also uncertain.

The Working Group concluded its deliberations by re-emphasizing the needs of developing countries outlined above in regard to the establishment of infrastructures and means of coordination between different ministries, easing information transfer, the identification of inexpensive and reliable methods of analysis and general information on pesticide use in developing countries and regions. The Working Group also concluded that importing countries should endeavour to publish on a routine basis information concerning residue detections on imported commodities to help assist developing countries in modifying pesticide uses accordingly.

The Working Group decided to recommend its continuation under the same terms of reference and to solicit government comments through the Regional Chairmen/Codex Contact Points to those questions previously circulated. In addition, it was decided that the Regional Chairmen would remain as established at the previous meeting, except that Ms. Salwa Dogheim of Egypt was appointed as Chairman for the African region.

Chairman:	Ms. Salwa Dogheim (Egypt)
Regional Chairman for Asia:	Dr. Eghbal Taheri (Iran)
Regional Chairman for Latin America and the Caribbean:	Dr. R. Gonzalez (Chile)
Regional Chairman for Africa:	Ms. Salwa Dogheim (Egypt)
Regional Chairman for the South-West Pacific:	Mr. G.N. Hooper (Australia)

As a final matter, the Working Group also expressed its strong support and appreciation to the government of Cuba for offering to host the 25th meeting of the CCPR. It was agreed that holding the meeting in Cuba would provide a strong motive for developing countries to participate more positively and effectively in CCPR deliberations.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITIES

JMPR Schedule

The tentative JMPR schedule for the years 1992 and 1993 was presented by the Joint Secretaries. A number of changes to the last schedule, published in ALINORM 91/24A, were noted. A new schedule will be included in the Report of the 1992 meeting.

Consideration of the 1992 Proposals for the Priority List

New proposals were scheduled as presented in the table below:

PESTICIDE	COUNTRY	MANUFACTURER	JMPR*
Fenpropimorph	Switzerland	Ciba Geigy	JMPR 1994
Fenpyroximate	Japan	Nihon Nohyaku	JMPR 1995
Haloxyfop	Ireland	Dow/Elanco	JMPR 1995
Tolclofos-methyl	Sweden	Sumitomo	JMPR 1994

Further Proposals

The following proposals cannot be scheduled until further information is provided as listed below:

COMMON NAME	COUNTRY	MANUFACTURER	JMPR
Chlozolinate (fungicide)	Proposed by Sweden as a result of finding residues on fruits and/or vegetables in monitoring programs.	No company has been contacted regarding availability of data to the JMPR.	
Tetradifon (acaracide)	Proposed by Sweden as a result of finding residues on fruits and/or vegetables in monitoring programs.	No company has been contacted regarding the availability of data to the JMPR.	

Follow-up on Previous Proposals

Sethoxydim - At the 1991 meeting it was suggested that clethodim and sethoxydim should be reviewed at the same time by the JMPR as the majority of the metabolites are identical for the two compounds. The manufacturer of sethoxydim (Nippon Soda) has indicated that data will not be made available to the JMPR.

Quinalphos - The manufacturer (Sandoz) has generated new data to support EPA import tolerances but indicated that they would be unable to simultaneously support Codex activities. The Delegation of the USA indicated that they would discuss the matter further with the manufacturer.

Fenarimol - The manufacturer Dow/Elanco indicated that information could be supplied on this proposal.

Update on Re-evaluation

Some updates for scheduling of the re-evaluation of pesticides (ADI established prior to 1976) were provided by manufacturers and will be reflected in the JMPR schedule.

Of the 12 pesticides (ADIs established 1976 to 1980) the following information was received.

Carbofenothion (011) - No information forthcoming from a manufacturer. Indications are that the original manufacturer, Stauffer, discontinued the product in 1987 (ref Farm Chemicals Handbook) and also that all products have been cancelled in the USA.

Chlorobenzilate (016) - Ciba Geigy, formerly the major manufacturer of chlorobenzilate, indicated they would not be supplying further data. All products have been cancelled in the USA.

Diquat (031) - The manufacturer (ICI) has additional toxicological data in preparation for diquat. These will be submitted in time for the 1993 JMPR. There will be no additional residue data supplied.

Fenthion (039) - The manufacturer (Bayer) has indicated that fenthion is still used in many countries on a variety of crops and that an updated data package could be submitted, at the earliest, in time for the 1995 JMPR.

Trichlorfon (066) - The manufacturer (Bayer) has indicated that trichlorfon is still used in many countries on a variety of crops and that an updated data package could be submitted, at the earliest, in time for the 1995 JMPR.

Thiometon (076) - The manufacturer (Sandoz) indicated that a number of new studies are planned for thiometon including some which are long term. They could be submitted in time to be reviewed by the 1995 JMPR.

Thiophanate-methyl (077) - The manufacturer has only a limited amount of new data available, i.e. several mutagenicity studies. The data could be submitted at any time to the JMPR. Scheduling of review of this pesticide will be considered by the JMPR in relation to the status of reviews for benomyl and carbendazim. All three are tentatively scheduled for 1995.

Dichloran (083) - The manufacturer (Schering) has indicated that, due to declining market shares and costs of maintaining registrations, the registration will no longer be supported by Schering AG and therefore no data will be supplied to the JMPR. The product registration has been withdrawn in the USA for these commercial reasons.

Cartap (097) - The manufacturer of cartap has a limited amount of new data available for cartap which could be submitted at any time.

Phosmet (103) - The manufacturer (ICI) has additional toxicological data in preparation which can be submitted in time for the 1993 JMPR. Phosmet is scheduled for the 1994 JMPR.

Guazatine (114) - The Manufacturer (Rhone-Poulenc) has provided a list of all available data (toxicology, residues, methods of analysis, environmental) and also indicated that new chronic studies with rats, mice and dog and a 3-generation rat study were started in 1991. It will be tentatively scheduled for 1995 or 1996 depending on the availability of data.

Triforine (116) - The manufacturer (Shell) indicated that it would be possible to provide data to the JMPR whenever it can be scheduled. It is tentatively on the schedule for the 1994 JMPR.

Proposed Procedure for the Periodic Review of Pesticides

In view of comments received, the draft Procedure was significantly amended from that discussed last year, necessitating a full review of the new draft by the Priorities Working Group. In addition to the Procedure, an indication was provided of the individual pesticides which might be found at be at each step of the Procedure.

Discussion centred on those pesticides for which it appears quite certain that there will be no substantial updating of the basic toxicology data base. In these cases the generation of supporting residue and GAP information would not ensure the continued use of the product. GAP information may be useful in providing an indication of the importance of the pesticide to certain countries and the time needed to adjust national uses e.g. find alternatives. There was considerable interest in establishing specific time frames at the end of which, if the required data are not submitted, there would be a recommendation made to the Commission to withdraw CXLs. The Working Group realized that a complete re-evaluation requires all data and not just toxicology.

As the new draft was not available in sufficient time to give members of the Working Group time to fully consider it, it was agreed that further comments could be provided in writing to the Chairman or the Secretary of the Working Group during the course of the meeting and that there might be time to further discuss it during plenary.

JMPR Evaluations, Procedural Matters

The attached paper describes some difficulties encountered by the 1991 JMPR in the course of carrying out the periodic review of some of the older compounds, together with some recommendations for actions which could resolve them.

PESTICIDES TENTATIVELY SCHEDULED FOR EVALUATION OR RE-EVALUATION BY THE JOINT FAO/WHO MEETING ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

The following is the tentative list of compounds to be considered by the JMPR from 1992 to 1996. Compounds recommended for priority attention by the 24th or earlier sessions of the CCPR, which have not been evaluated, are marked with an asterisk (*). All other compounds are for re-evaluation.

1992 Joint Meeting:

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
*Abamectin (177)	*Abamectin (177)
Aldicarb (117)	Aldrin/dieldrin (001)
*Bifenthrin (178)	Anilazine (163)
Chlorpyrifos-methyl (90)	Benalaxyl (155)
*Cycloxydim (179)	Benomyl/carbendazim/
Dicofol (26)	thiophanate-methyl (069/072/077)
*Dithianon (180)	*Bifenthrin (178)
Fenbutatin oxide (109)	Bromide ion (inorganic bromide)
Iprodione (111)	Bromomethane (methyl bromide)
Methidathion (51)	(052)
*Myclobutanil (181)	Clofentezine (156)
*Penconazole (182)	*Cycloxydim (179)
Piperonyl butoxide (62)	Cyfluthrin (157)
Pirimiphos-methyl (86)	Cyhexatin (067)
*Propham (183)	Cyromazine (169)
Pyrazophos (153)	Deltamethrin (135)
Thiram	Demeton compounds
	Dicofol (026)
	Dinocap (087)
	*Dithianon (180)
	Endrin (033)
	Etrimfos (123)
	Fenbutatin oxide (109)
	Flucythrinate (152)
	Iprodione (111)
	Metalaxyl (138)
	Methacrifos (125)
	Methidathion (051)
	*Myclobutanil (181)
	Parathion-methyl (059)
	Phorate (112)
	*Penconazole (182)
	Piperonyl butoxide (062)
	Prochloraz (142)
	Procymidone (136)
	Profenofos (171)
	*Propham (183)
	Pyrazophos (153)
	Triazophos (143)
	Triadimefon (133)
	Triadimenol (168)
	Vamidothion (078)
	Vinclozolin (159)

1993 Joint Meeting:

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
Amitrole (79) Bromopropylate (70) Captan (7) *Chlorpropham Diazinon (22) Dichlorvos (25) Diquat (31) Ethephon (106) Ethylenethiourea (ETU) (108) *Etofenprox (185) *Fenpropathrin (186) Folpet (41) Mancozeb (50) Maneb *Metiram Monocrotophos (54) Phosalone (60) Propineb Propylenethiourea (PTU) (150) Triazophos (143) Zineb	Aldicarb (117) Amitrole (079) Azinphos-methyl (002) Bendiocarb (137) Bromopropylate (070) Carbofuran (96) Carbosulfan (145) Chlorothalonil (081) *Chlorpropham (184) Chlorpyrifos-methyl (090) Cyfluthrin (157) DDT (021) Diazinon (022) Dichlorvos (025) Dimethoate (027) Endosulfan (032) Ethephon (106) Ethion (034) Ethylenethiourea (ETU) (108) *Etofenprox (185) *Fenpropathrin (186) Ferbam (105) Flusilazole (165) Formothion (042) Heptachlor (043) Hexaconazole (170) Mancozeb (050) Maneb (105) *Metiram Omethoate (055) Phosalone (060) Propineb Propiconazole (160) Propylenethiourea (PTU) (150) Quintozene (064) Thiram (105) Zineb (105) Ziram (105)

1994 Joint Meeting:

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
Azocylotin (129) Carbofuran (96) Chlorfenvinphos (14) Chlormequat (15) *Clethodim Cyhexatin (67) 2,4-D (20) Dicloran (83) Ethoxyquin (35) *Fenpropimorph Parathion (58) Parathion-methyl (59) Phosmet (103) Pyrethrins (63) *Tebuconazole Tecnazene (115) *Teflubenzuron *Tolclofos-methyl Triforine (116)	Acephate (095) Captan (007) Chlorfenvinphos (014) *Clethodim Dicloran (083) Ethoxyquin (035) *Fenpropimorph Folpet (041) Methamidophos (100) Phosmet (103) Pyrethrins (063) *Tebuconazole Tecnazene (115) *Teflubenzuron *Tolclofos-methyl Triforine (116)

1995 Joint Meeting:

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
Benomyl (69) Carbendazim (72) Cartap (97) Coumaphos (18) *Fenarimol *Fenpyroximate Fenthion (39) *Haloxyfop-methyl Malathion (49) Quintozene (64) Thiometon (76) Thiophanate-methyl (77) Trichlorfon (66) Vinclozolin (159)	Cartap (097) Coumaphos (018) *Fenarimol *Fenpyroximate Fenthion (039) *Haloxyfop-methyl Malathion (049) Thiometon (076) Trichlorfon (066)

1996 Joint Meeting:

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
Carbaryl (8) Dodine (84) Guazatine (114) Mevinphos (53) Thiabendazole (65)	Carbaryl (008) Dodine (084) Guazatine (114) Mevinphos (053) Thiabendazole (065)

PROPOSED PROCEDURE FOR THE PERIODIC REVIEW OF PESTICIDES AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITIES, 1992

1. In recent years, within the CCPR and also within the JMPR, there has been concern with respect to maintaining CXLs that may no longer reflect current information.

2. This applies to CXLs where:

- the GAP could have changed and the CXL may no longer reflect current GAP;
- the residue data on which the original proposals were based may no longer be adequate due to changes in GAP, analytical methodology etc.;
- the toxicological data base supporting the ADI may no longer be valid, either because, by modern standards, it is incomplete or because the studies themselves are no longer considered adequate to determine No Observable Adverse Effect Levels.

3. A more formal method for the periodic review of pesticides is needed to determine if CXLs require amendment or deletion.

4. This method should provide:

- a clear definition of conditions for undertaking the periodic review;
- a step system which provides adequate opportunity for countries and manufacturers to:

  i) indicate interest in the question
  ii) schedule and complete data development
  iii) search for alternatives;

- a clear endpoint by which time, if no data or information are supplied or if the information supplied is inadequate, there is a recommendation made to cancel the CXLs.

CONDITIONS FOR UNDERTAKING PERIODIC REVIEW OF CXLs

5. The following will be scheduled for review:

Any individual CXLs based on GAP which is older than 10 years or CXLs which have been established more than 10 years ago. (These are probably the same.)

All CXLs for pesticides for which the ADI was established more than 10 years ago.

STEP SYSTEM

In the proposed procedure a CXL remains in place during the review process but with a footnote (in Part 2) to indicate that it is under review. Once the review is completed by the JMPR the footnote will be removed if the CXL

is confirmed. If an MRL at a different level is recommended by the JMPR, the new recommendation will appear at step 3 and when it completes the step procedure it will replace the existing CXL. If the data provided are not adequate or if no data are provided, the CXL will will be recommended for withdrawal.

STEPS IN THE PERIODIC REVIEW PROCESS
PERIODIC REVIEW, FIRST STAGE

The first stage of the Periodic Revew is to establish the intentions of basic manufacturers with respect to updating the data base for the pesticide in question. Most manufacturers, if they are interested in supporting the continued use of the pesticide, will be updating GAP and residue data (at least for some uses) and toxicology at the same time. Once governments know the intentions of basic manufacturers with respect to individual pesticides, they can judge whether it will be worthwhile and/or necessary to carry out residue studies to support uses of particular interest to their countries.

YEAR 1, APRIL (CCPR MEETING)

1. Identify candidate chemicals for re-evaluation - On an annual basis the Working Group on Priorities lists chemicals according to the criteria in section 5 above and presents the list at the CCPR meeting.

2. At the CCPR meeting GIFAP and national governments are asked, for each chemical, to contact current data owners or other parties willing to support existing CXLs, requesting that written comment be provided to the following:

- Chaiman, Priorities
- Chairman, CCPR
- JMPR Secretariat

3. The written comment should include the following information:

a. A list of all the commodities for which the manufacturer (and governments if possible at this time) are willing to support CXLs.

b. A brief summary of all current GAP information pertinent to residue data can be provided to the JMPR (e.g. country, commodity, labels etc).

c. A list of all chemistry, toxicology, metabolism, animal transfer, processing, storage stability studies and analytical methods (each fully identified) that have been submitted in the past

Pesticides which could appear at Year 1

1. Pesticides which might be inserted into the system at this point could be those for which ADIs were established in 1981 and 1982 i.e. carbofuran, chlorpyrifos, cypermethrin, deltamethrin, edifenphos, ethiofencarb, etrimfos, fensulfothion, metalaxyl, pirimicarb, propargite, 2,4,5-T. It is suggested, however, that this group be delayed until there is further progress on the pesticides currently undergoing the periodic review.

and/or for a which there is a commitment for their provision for periodic review of the pesticide and the earliest date the data package will be ready for submission to the JMPR.

3. The request is repeated in the Circular Letter which is distributed with the report of the CCPR meeting.

YEAR 2, APRIL (CCPR MEETING)

Pesticides at Year 2

1. The Priorities Group provides a report to the CCPR on the status of the commitments received. This information will be used to to schedule JMPR review if the commitment is adequate.

Of the pesticides for which ADIs were established between 1976 to 1980, commitments have been received, from manufacturers, for data submissions on the following: diquat (031) fenthion (039), trichlorfon (066), thiometon (076), phosmet (103), guazatine (114).

As these were not treated according to the draft procedure above, a follow-up letter could be sent to those companies that responded, requesting the information as outlined in the steps for year 1.

2. Those pesticides for which no response has been recieved or for which there has been an indication that little or no updated data will be forthcoming are also identified.

Pesticides with ADIs established prior to 1976: pirimiphos-methyl (086), chlormequat (015), ethoxyquin (035), formothion (42), pyrethrins (063)

3. For the pesticides described by the paragraph above decisions are required whether to:

- determine if data will become available from other sources e.g. as a result of government evaluation programs;
- whether a review of old and possibly some new data will yield any useful results;
- whether it is closely related to other pesticides and data needs may at least be partially met;
- whether the pesticide has qualities, in spite of an inadequate data base, which makes keeping it desirable;
- whether there is still use
- how critical it is and what the situation is with respect to alternatives;
- how long the CXLs should be allowed to remain in the system in order to allow countries time to adjust practices.

For the above pesticides, responses to a questionnaire sent to countries and companies in 1988/89 indicated that there is some use ongoing (in some cases limited) but that little or no new basic data (either toxicology or residues) would be forthcoming.

Pesticides with ADIs established between 1977-1980: dichloran (083), cartap (097).

The above pesticides were identified at the 1991 CCPR for periodic review and GIFAP requested information of manufacturers. Responses were either not forthcoming or indicated that the manufacturer would not be providing further data.

PERIODIC REVIEW, SECOND STAGE

The second stage of the review process deals with those CXLs for pesticides for which sufficient data was supplied for the JMPR to carry out a rereview of the ADI and reconfirm or change it. Insufficient residue and/or GAP data, however, were provided to confirm certain CXLs and the JMPR recommendation is withdrawn.

Year 1, (April CCPR after completion of JMPR review.)

1. The JMPR indicates all those CXLs for which the recommendation has been withdrawn.

2. Countries and companies are requested to:

- inform the JMPR secretariat and the CCPR chairman whether such data are likely to be provided and when;

- to submit data, when available, directly to the JMPR.

Year 2, (April CCPR)

1. Secretariat informs the CCPR of those CXLs for which neither data nor a commitment has been provided.

2. Deletion of CXLs is recommended where no commitment or response has been provided.

Year 3 (April CCPR)

1. If promised data have not been provided, recommend deletion of CXLs.

Pesticides which are currently at this stage i.e. listed in the 1991 Report with recommendation for withdrawal.

Azinphos-methyl (002)
Apricot; citrus fruits; Brussels, sprouts; celery; sunflower seed; pea vines, green;

Azocyclotin (129)
Kiwifruit; tea, green, black

Matters for further consideration

1. Format for data list submission (and possibly updating mechanism).

2. Tracking of CXLs in the various stages of the review process.

JMPR EVALUATIONS, PROCEDURAL MATTERS

At the 1991 JMPR it became apparent that some procedural matters needed to be clarified. An increased workload and the periodic review of old compounds has exacerbated the situation. In particular, the periodic review process for old compounds and obsolete MRLs has introduced some new procedural requirements. Procedures need to be more explicit, and, in particular made clear to members of JMPR preparing residue evaluations.

The Joint Meeting has only a short time each year to make decisions and to prepare reports and evaluations. Where procedures are unclear, the time of the Joint Meeting is used in debating procedural matters and keeping track of situations. Also, reviewers must be aware of the policy, which helps them prepare consistent recommendations prior to the meeting. The Joint Meeting should concentrate on scientific and expert work.

Numerous combinations of history, old and new information and changing circumstances lead to a variety of situations. Attempts must be made to treat them consistently. The FAO Secretary provided a history file for each compound being reviewed to each appropriate JMPR reviewer in 1991. This action proved to be very valuable, particularly to those JMPR members who had not recently participated in CCPR and JMPR meetings.

If no MRL exists for the commodity or the relevant group commodity there is little difference in the treatment of information supplied normally or under the periodic review programme.

Under the periodic review programme the lack of information which was requested becomes significant. For example, if no GAP information is supplied for a particular commodity the JMPR reviewer can assume that there is no GAP for that commodity. This has a large effect on an MRL for that commodity. In normal circumstances if no information is supplied the MRL would remain. In the periodic review programme withdrawal of the MRL would be recommended.

It has also been noted that for compounds in the periodic review programme residue supporting information (metabolism studies, animal transfer studies, processing studies, analytical methods, and storage stability of analytical sample studies) should be included in the package of data supplied to JMPR where there are previous data gaps.

Recommendations

1. That submissions which are part of the periodic review programme should be clearly identified as such by the FAO Secretary when they are sent to JMPR reviewers.

2. That the FAO Secretary provide guidance for JMPR reviewers on procedures to be followed for compounds being reviewed under the periodic review programme. For example, when no current GAP is available the withdrawal of the JMPR MRL recommendation is advised in the periodic review.

3. That a document on JMPR FAO Panel procedural matters be developed for discussion at JMPR in 1992 and at CCPR 25. The intention is to include a section on such procedural matters in the FAO Guide.

4. That submitters of data for new compounds, for significant expansions of uses, or for compounds in the periodic review programme, should provide lists of studies of the residue supporting information (metabolism studies, animal transfer studies, processing studies, analytical methods, and storage stability of analytical samples studies) which have been and are being supplied to JMPR. The lists will assist in identifying data gaps.

RECOMMENDED METHOD OF SAMPLING FOR THE DETERMINATION OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN MILK, DAIRY PRODUCTS AND EGGS
(At Step 3 of the Codex Procedure)

1. Introduction

The Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues (CAC/PR 5-1984) has been recommended by the Codex Alimentarius Commission for the inspection of lots of food commodities and to obtain a "final sample" representative of the lot. This General Sampling Plan has been reviewed by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) with the aim of selecting a more detailed sampling plan for the same commodity group. The 19th Session of the Commission adopted the "Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Meat and Poultry Products for Control Purposes" which will be incorporated into the General Sampling Plan in a future publication.

The CCPR decided to advance a review on establishing guidelines for sampling of milk and fish in in its General Sampling Plan.

2. Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk and Dairy Products

According to the proposal prepared by the United Kingdom, it will be necessary to extend the wording of paragraph 5 of the "Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Meat and Poultry", as follows:

a) Class B: Primary Food Commodities of Animal Origin

Mammalian meat, fat, edible offal and milks (Type 06 - Nos. 030, 031, 032 and 033) and Poultry meats, fat, edible offal and eggs (Type 07 - Nos. 036, 037, 038 and 039) are included etc.

b) Class E: Processed Foods of Animal Origin

Only Class E Processed Foods of Animal Origin which are derived from the selected Class B commodities were considered, etc.

The extension to the existing guideline relates to the following commodities:-

Selected Class B: Primary Food Commodities of Animal Origin

Type 06 Mammalian Products
No. 033 Milks
Type 07 Poultry Products
No. 039 Eggs

Selected Class E: Processed Foods of Animal Origin made only from Primary Food No. 033

Type 16 - Secondary Products
No. 082 Secondary Milk Products
Type 17 - Derived Edible Products
No. 087 Derived Milk Products
Type 18 - Manufactured Food (single ingredient)
No. 090 Manufactured Milk Products
Type 19 - Manufactured Food (multi-ingredient)
No. 092 Manufactured Milk Products

COMMODITY	INSTRUCTIONS FOR TAKING A PRIMARY SAMPLE	MINIMUM QUANTITY REQUIRED FOR LABORATORY SAMPLE
Group 033 **Milks**		
Whole Liquid Milk raw, pasteurized, UHT & sterilised	In bulk. Mix thoroughly and immediately take a sample by means of a dipper. In retail containers. Take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	500 ml
Group 082 Secondary Milk Products		
A. Skimmed Milk skimmed and semi-skimmed milk;	As for whole liquid milk.	500 ml
B. Evaporated Milk Evaporated full cream & skimmed milk;	Bulk containers (barrels, drums). Mix the contents carefully and scrape adhering material from the sides and bottom of the container. Remove 2 to 3 litres, repeat the stirring and take a 500 ml sample. Small retail containers. Take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	500 ml
C. Milk Powders		
1. Whole;	Bulk containers. Pass a dry borer tube steadily through the powder at an even rate of penetration. Remove sufficient bores to make up a sample of 500 g. Small retail containers. Take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	500 g
2. Low Fat;	As for whole milk powders.	500 g

COMMODITY	INSTRUCTIONS FOR TAKING A PRIMARY SAMPLE	MINIMUM QUANTITY REQUIRED FOR LABORATORY SAMPLE
Group 087 **Derived Milk Products**		
A. Cream Fresh, frozen & UHT Single, whipping, whipped, double & clotted;	Bulk containers. Plunge to ensure thorough mixing moving the plunger from place to place avoiding foaming, whipping and churning. Take a 200 ml sample by means of a dipper. Small containers. Take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	200 ml
B. Butter including whey butter and low fat spreads containing butterfat;	In bulk. Take two cores or more of butter so that the minimum total sample weight is not less than 200 g. In pats or rolls. For units weighing over 250 g divide into four and take opposite quarters. For units weighing less than 250 g take one unit as sample.	200 g
C. Butteroil including anhydrous butteroil and anhydrous milkfat;	Mix thoroughly and take a 200 g sample.	200 g
Group 090 **Manufactured Milk Products** (single ingredient)		
A. Yoghurt Natural, low fat through to full cream;	Select number of units sufficient to meet laboratory requirements.	500 g

COMMODITY	INSTRUCTIONS FOR TAKING A PRIMARY SAMPLE	MINIMUM QUANTITY REQUIRED FOR LABORATORY SAMPLE
B. Cheeses All varieties;	Make two cuts radiating from the centre of the cheese if the cheese has a circular base, or parallel to the sides if the base is rectangular. The piece removed should meet the laboratory sample size requirements. For small cheeses and wrapped portions of cheese take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample requirements.	200 g
Group 092 **Manufactured Milk Products** (multi-ingredient)		
A. Dairy Ice Cream Only ice cream containing 5% or greater of milk fat.	Select block or units sufficient to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	500 ml
B. Processed Cheese Preparations	Select units sufficient to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	200 g
C. Flavoured Yoghurt	As for natural yoghurt.	500 g
D. Sweetened Condensed Milk	As for evaporated milk.	500 ml
Group 039 **Eggs**		
Chicken eggs	12 whole unshelled	
Duck eggs	6 whole unshelled	
Goose eggs	6 whole unshelled	
Quail eggs	24 whole unshelled	

EXTRANEOUS MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD

This list of Extraneous Maximum Residue Limits (EMRLs) refers to pesticide residues arising from environmental sources (including former agricultural uses). These residues are treated as contaminants and EMRLs will in future be determined by principles for the control of contaminants in food. All of these limits are to be reviewed by the JMPR on the basis of food contamination monitoring data.

The EMRLs are considered the maximum concentration of a pesticide residue that is recommended by the Codex Alimentarius Commission to be legally permitted or recognized as acceptable in or on a food, agricultural commodity or animal feed.

Code	Substance	MRL (mg/kg)	Food or Commodity
1	ALDRIN AND DIELDRIN	0.006	Milks;
		0.02	Cereal grains;
		0.05	Fruits;
		0.01	Asparagus; Broccoli; Brussels sprouts; Cabbages, Head; Carrot; Cauliflower; Cucumber; Egg plant; Eggs; Horseradish; Lettuce, Head; Onion, Bulb; Parsnip; Peppers; Peppers, Sweet; Potato; Radish; Radish leaves;
		0.2	Meat;
12	CHLORDANE	0.002	Milks;
		0.02	Almonds; Eggs; Fruits and vegetables; Hazelnuts; Maize; Oats; Pecan; Rice, polished; Rye; Sorghum; Soya bean oil, refined; Walnuts; Wheat;
		0.05	Cotton seed oil, crude; linseed oil, crude; Meat; Soya bean oil, crude;
		0.5	Poultry meat;
21	DDT	0.05	Milks;
		0.1	Cereal grains;
		0.5	Eggs;
		5	Meat;

Code	Substance	MRL (mg/kg)	Food or Commodity
33	ENDRIN	0.0008	Milks;
		0.02	Apple; parsley; Cotton seed oil, edible; Rice, husked; Rice, polished; Sorghum; Sweet corn (corn-on-the cob);
		0.1	Cotton seed; Cotton seed oil, crude; Meat;
		0.2	Eggs;
		1	Poultry meat;
43	HEPTACHLOR	0.006	Milks;
		0.01	Citrus fruits; Pineapple;
		0.02	Cereal grains; Cotton seed; Soya bean (immature seeds); Soya bean oil, refined; Tomato;
		0.05	Eggs; Sugar beet; Vegetables (except ...);
		0.2	Carrot; Meat; Poultry meat;
		0.5	Soya bean oil, crude;

NOTE: The above list has been revised taking into consideration the comments provided by the 24th Session of the CCPR which expressed concern about the inclusion of MRLs of fenitrothion for meat and milks on lindane for carrot, eggs and poultry meat (see paras. 202-203). Government comments were requested (see CL 1992/12-PR - Item 4).