codex alimentarius commission

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

JOINT OFFICE: Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel.: 52251 Telex: 625825-625853 FAO I Cables: Foodagri Rome Facsimile: (6)5225.4593

ALINORM 95/24

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION
Twenty-first Session
Rome, 3-12 July 1995

REPORT OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES
The Hague, The Netherlands
11-18 April 1994

(Does not include Appendix I - List of Participants)

Note: This document incorporates Codex Circular Letter 1994/12-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.: 52251 Telex: 625825-625853 FAO I Cables: Foodagri Rome Facsimile: (6)5225.4593

CX 4/40.2

CL 1994/12 -PR
May 1994

TO:
- Codex Contact Points
- Participants at the Twenty-sixth 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: **Distribution of the Report of the 26th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (ALINORM 95/24)**

The report of the 26th session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) will be considered by the 21st Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, to be held in Rome from 3-12 July 1995.

PART A: MATTERS FOR ADOPTION BY THE 21ST SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

1. PROPOSED DRAFT MRLS AT STEP 5, DRAFT MRLS AT STEP 8 AND DELETION OF CODEX MRLS

These will be included in document, ALINORM 95/24A-Add.1 which will be distributed after the 27th Session to be held in April 1995.

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

1. INCLUSION OF FURTHER PESTICIDES IN THE CODEX PRIORITY LISTS

Governments wishing to propose pesticides for inclusion on the Codex Priority List are requested to forward comments to Ms. Janet K. Taylor, Director, Plant Industry Directorate, food Production and Inspection Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0C5 Canada, with a copy to Chief, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.

2. INFORMATION ON REQUIREMENTS FOR MINIMUM DATA BASE FOR MRL SETTING

The 26th Session of the CCPR considered the need to develop (minimum) data base requirements as a guidance to the JMPR. Though it was pointed out that data requirements were different at the national and the international levels and the definition of a minimum data base might not be practical at the international level, the Committee decided to request governments and industry to inform the FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR on their minimum data base requirements, etc. used for MRL setting as a basis for a future discussion between JMPR and CCPR on this subject (paras. 60-66).

Governments are invited to provide their information on minimum data base requirements, such as the number of trials, and methods of evaluation, including extrapolation between commodities, statistical treatment, etc. to Mr. B. Murray, FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR, Plant Protection Service, AGP, FAO, Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy, not later than 31 October 1994.

3. MONITORING DATA AND INFORMATION ON EMRL SETTING

The 26th CCPR discussed the need for establishing criteria for the use of monitoring data to elaborate EMRLs and agreed to invite governments to submit to the JMPR information on how monitoring data were used in establishing EMRLs at national level (data requirements, methods of evaluations, statistical treatment, etc.).

The Committee also agreed to invite governments to provide monitoring data on the pesticides on the EMRL list, including data indicating that no residues were detected as the importance of this type of information as well as of data on detected residue levels was noted (paras. 323-330).

Information and data should be sent to Mr. B. Murray (for address see Part B.2), not later than 31 October 1994.

4. RESIDUES AND TOXICOLOGICAL DATA REQUIRED FOR EVALUATION BY THE JOINT FAO/WHO MEETING ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES (JMPR) AND INTAKE DATA

(i) Pesticides scheduled for evaluation or periodic re-evaluation by the JMPR

Governments and interested international organizations are invited to send residue and toxicological data for pesticides on the agenda of the JMPR, as contained in Appendix VI of ALINORM 95/24.

Information on use patterns, good agricultural practice, residue data, national MRLs, etc. should be sent to Mr. B. Murray (for address see Part B.2). (See para. 56 and Appendix VI for deadlines.)

Toxicological data should be sent to Dr. J. L. Hermann, International Programme on Chemical Safety, WHO, CH- 1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland.

(ii) Pesticides for which MRLs are being elaborated

The 26th Session of the CCPR decided to keep draft MRLs which might give rise to potential intake concern at Step 7C for a period of one year, requesting governments to provide intake calculation, preferably EDI calculation to WHO. Those countries specified under each compound, MRL(s) of which are kept at Step 7C, are requested to submit the above information to Dr. G. Moy, Food Safety Unit, WHO, 20 Avenue Appia, CH-1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland, with a copy to this office not later than 30 November 1994.

Those countries specified under individual compounds concerning matters related to the FAO Panel of the JMPR (GAP, residue evaluation, etc.) on specific commodity(ies) are requested to consult the tentative review schedules and send information on data availability to Mr. B. Murray (for address see Part B.2), not later than 31 October 1994, except otherwise states.

Those counties specified under each compound concerning toxicological matter are invited to send toxicological data or written comments to Dr. J.L. Hermann, International Programme on Chemical Safety, WHO, CH-1211 Geneva 27, Switzerland, not later than 30 November 1994.

For the following pesticides (excluding those contained in review schedules in Appendix VI, unless specific requirements were stated in the Report of the 26th CCPR, ALINORM 95/24), governments and interested international organizations are invited to information of dataavailability on matter specified below to Mr. B. Murray (GAPs, residue data, residue definition) or to Dr. J.L. Hermann (toxicological data), not later than 31 October 1994:

Azinphos-methyl (002)	Method of analysis for almond and wheat (para. 68);
Inorganic bromide (047)	Current GAPs, use patterns and residue data for MRLs at Step 5 and CXLs;
Monocrotophos (054)	Current GAPs and Residue data for beans, cereals (small grain), citrus fruits, cotton, egg plant, maize, onion, peanuts, pepper (chili), rice, soya bean, sugar beet, sugar cane, sunflower, watermelon (paras. 134);
Ortho-phenylphenol (056)	Current GAPs for apple, citrus fruits, pear (para. 145);
Cyhexatin (067)/Azocyclotin (129)	Current GAP information and availability of data on pome fruits, stone fruits and tomato (paras. 171, 234-235).
Thiometon (076)	Data on existing CXLs (para 193);
Chlorpyrifos-methyl (090)	Current GAP data for all cereals, including rice (para. 200);
Methacrifos (125)	Current GAPs for cereals, including wheat (para. 232);
Triadimefon (133)	New data on existing MRLs and CXLs (para. 238);
Vinclozolin (159)	Toxicological data on hormonal and reproductive effects at low doses and residue data for apricot (paras 262-263);
Oxydemeton-methyl (166)	GAPs and residue data on almond, barley, cabbage, kale, citrus fruits, lettuce, grapes, peas, pome fruits, potato, rape, strawberry, sugar/fodder beet, sunflower and other commodities (paras. 268-270);
Hexaconazole (170)	Animal transfer study for wheat and wheat straw and fodder, dry (para. 274);
Glufosinate-ammonium (175)	Information on residue definitions at national level (para. 281);
Dithianon (180)	Toxicological data, especially concerning kidney tumour formation (para. 301).

If no data is received on the following pesticides, the 27th CCPR will recommend deletion of the CXLs and/or MRLs for these pesticides. Therefore, data on existing CXLs/MRLs are requested for:

Ethoxyquin (035) (para. 104); **Fensulfothion (038)** (para. 105); **Dicloran (083)** (para 196); **Ethiofencarb (107)** (para 211); **2,4,5-T (121)** (para 223).

5. EXPRESSION AND APPLICATION OF MRLS FOR FAT-SOLUBLE PESTICIDES IN ANIMAL PRODUCTS

Governments and interested international organizations are invited to comment on the Revised Proposed Codex Approach to the Expression and Application of MRLs for Fat-Soluble Pesticides in Animal Products, as contained in Appendix II of ALINORM 95/24. Comments should be sent to Dr. D.G. Kloet, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, Department for Environment, Quality and Nutrition, P.O. Box 20401, 2500 EK Den Haag, The Netherlands, with a copy to this Office, not later than 30 November 1994.

6. PESTICIDES USED BOTH AS PESTICIDES AND VETERINARY DRUGS

Governments and interested international organizations are invited to comment on Pesticides Used Both As Pesticides and Veterinary Drugs, as contained in Appendix III of ALINORM 95/24. Comments should be sent to Mr. I. Coleman, Director, Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Section, Crops Division, Department of Primary Industries and Energy, P.O. Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601, Australia, with a copy to this Office, not later than 30 November 1994.

7. METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Governments, manufacturers and concerned international organizations are invited to provide information on methods of analysis for the following compounds: cycloxydim (179), ethofenprox (184) and fenpropathrin (185).

Information is also requested on analytical data and limit of determination for methidathion (051), especially for those commodities for which higher detection limits were proposed.

Comments should be sent to the Chairman of the Working Group on Method of Analysis, Mr. 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, no later than 31 December 1994.

8. INFORMATION ON NATIONAL DIETS

At the 26th CCPR, the need for revision of a regional and global diets was raised. The Committee agreed to the recommendations elaborated by the Ad Hoc Working Group on Acceptances, one of which recommends counties to continue to submit national food consumption data promptly (Appendix IV).

Governments are once again invited to provide national diet or national food consumption data to Dr. G. Moy (for address see Part B.4.ii), not later than 30 November 1994.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

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

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE COMMISSION:

The Committee:

- Recommended for adoption **Draft MRLs** at Step 8 and **Proposed Draft MRLs** at Step 5 as contained in document ALINORM 95/24A - Add.1;

- Recommended for adoption **Priority Lists** of Pesticides for new and periodic evaluations by the JMPR (Appendix VI); and

- Reccommended that the Commission should be invited to consider the following (Appendix IV):

  - a meeting through appropriate international fora to consider the need for revision of regional and global diets; and
  - the revision of the *Guidelines on the Prediction of the Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues.*

OTHER MATTERS FOR INTEREST TO THE COMMISSION:

The Committee:

- Agreed to the attendance of a representative of the **Press** (para. 5);

- Expressed general support for the recommendations concerning **risk analysis** as contained in document ALINORM 93/37. The Committee noted that it was impracticable to achieve uniformity in risk analysis among Codex Committees though it was important that the principles for risk assessment be the same (paras. 10-16);

- Noted that several countries were currently in the process of accepting Codex MRLs or harmonizing national MRLs with Codex MRLs (paras. 37-40) and that several countries had published or collected monitoring data on pesticide residues (paras. 51-52);

- Decided to keep draft MRLs which might give rise to potential intake concern at Step 7C for a period of one year, requesting governments to provide intake calculation, preferably EDI calculation to WHO (para. 59);

- Decided to request governments to submit to the JMPR information on their **requirements for minimum data base** used for MRL setting (para. 66);

- Decided to request governments to submit to the JMPR information on **how monitoring data were handled in establishing EMRLs at national level** and **monitoring data** including that no residues were found (para. 330);

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (cont.d)

- Decided to invite government comments on the revised proposal on Codex Approach to the **Expression and Application of MRLs for Fat-soluble Pesticides in Animal Products** and to bring the original document on this matter to the attention of the CCRVDF (para. 339);

- Decided to invite government comments on document concerning **Pesticides Used Both As Pesticides and Veterinary Drugs** (para. 345);

- Agreed to the **Summary of Recommendations by the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Acceptances**, as contained in Appendix IV;

- Decided that **Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk, Milk Products and Eggs** should be revised for consideration at Step 7 by the 27th Session (para. 356);

- Agreed that a paper on **Harmonization of the Terms and Definitions** be revised for the next Session (para 362);

- Agreed that the **Questionnaire** on major pesticides used in developing countries and pesticide/commodity combinations should be revised and circulated for information and comments for the next Session (para. 367);

- Agreed to amend **Current Status of Work** by the CCPR (para. 380-381).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.d)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.d)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.d)

LIST OF APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues held its 26th Session in The Hague, The Netherlands, from 11-18 April 1994. Dr. W. H. van Eck, of the Netherlands Ministry of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs served as Chairman. The Session was attended by 53 Codex member countries and 8 international organizations. The list of participants 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 for Health, on behalf of the Minister of Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs. He welcomed the Committee to The Hague on the occasion of its 26th Session. In his opening address, Dr. Sangster highlighted the importance of the recently concluded GATT Uruguay Round Agreement as related to the activities of the CCPR. In referring to the 20th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the Director-General noted that considerable time was devoted to the need for having transparent risk assessment approaches to be used by Codex Committees and Expert Meetings. He stressed the urgency for the CCPR to improve the implementation of risk assessment in the elaboration of MRLs for pesticides.

3. In reply to these remarks the Chairman thanked Dr. Sangster for his interesting words. The Chairman noted that the CCPR was fully aware of the necessity to improve risk assessment in considering proposals for pesticide residue limits.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 2)

4. The Provisional Agenda, as contained in CX/PR 94/1, was adopted by the Committee, with the understanding that document CX/PR 94/15 under Agenda Item 13(a) would also be considered as indicated in CX/PR 94/1 - Add.1.

5. Pending discussions by the Codex Committee on General Principles concerning the participation of the Press at Codex meetings, the Committee agreed to the attendance of a representative of Food Chemical News, provided that the participation would be limited to taking written notes of the proceedings.

APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEURS (Agenda Item 3)

6. Mr. C.W. Cooper (United States of America) and Mr. M. Watson (United Kingdom) were appointed to act as rapporteurs to the Committee.

MATTERS OF INTEREST (Agenda Item 4)

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM THE TWENTIETH SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES (Agenda Items 4(a) and 4(b))

7. The Secretariat introduced document CX/PR 94/2, which summarized matters of interest to the CCPR arising from the 20th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other Codex Committees. It was noted that most of these issues were presented for information only or were scheduled for discussion elsewhere. The Committee was also provided with an oral report which included the following issues:

- Agreements on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures and on Technical Barriers to Trade (CL 1994/3-GEN)

8. Discussions concerning the implications these Agreements would have on the future work of Codex were postponed for the time being, as this matter was scheduled to be considered at the 41st Executive Committee (28-30 June 1994, Rome).

The 19th Session of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis (ALINORM 95/23)

9. The Committee noted that the 19th Session of the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS), held in March 1994, considered the draft General Guidelines on Sampling and agreed that the document should be revised in the light of comments made and circulated for comments at Step 3. It was also informed that the CCMAS agreed to advance the Protocol for the Design, Conduct and Interpretation of Collaborative Studies and the Harmonized Protocol for the Proficiency Testing of (Chemical) Analytical Laboratories to the Commission for adoption.

Risk assessment procedure used by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its subsidiary and advisory bodies

10. The Secretariat introduced background information and the extensive discussion which took place at the 20th Commission on risk assessment procedures used by Codex. The Commission had considered this issue based on a document, ALINORM 93/37, prepared by a Consultant, Dr. S.C. Hathaway.

11. In his presentation at the Commission, Dr. Hathaway had emphasized that the objective of the paper had been to help improve the performance of the Codex Committees by adopting risk analysis principles and methodology. He had described three major components of risk analysis: risk assessment, risk management and risk communication. He had stressed that risk assessment and risk management be separated but at the same time work in an interactive manner. He had described Codex Committees as risk managers while JECFA and JMPR acted as a bridge between scientific researchers and risk managers. The importance of quantitative exposure assessment, especially of "at-risk" population groups, had been stressed. The interventions at the Commission related to the CCPR had focused on three major points: (a) Importance of increasing transparency; (b) Exposure characterization relative to dietary intake needed to be improved; and (c) There was no direct link between the MRLs and the ADI for pesticides.

12. The Committee was informed that the Commission had unanimously welcomed the recommendations set forth in ALINORM 93/37 and noted the need for rapid progress in implementing risk analysis in Codex work.

13. The Commission had agreed to send the paper to all relevant Codex Committees for discussion. Following the Commission, this issue was discussed by the 1993 JMPR, the 42nd Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA, for veterinary drug residues), and the 26th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants (CCFAC).

14. The Committee was informed that the CCFAC welcomed the general direction of the document, ALINORM 93/37, which gave a broad overview of risk assessment within the Codex System. The CCFAC reaffirmed the importance of risk analysis and noted that the paper provided an initial basis for Codex to elaborate principles of risk analysis. (For consideration by the JMPR, see para. 26)

15. The CCPR expressed general support for the recommendations. The importance of separating science from risk management in order to increase transparency was reiterated. The Representative of the EEC expressed strong support for the JMPR. He stressed that the quality of science of JMPR was well regarded and that JMPR was continuously improving. The Committee noted that the CCPR had already addressed the issue of risk analysis through the work of the Working Group on Acceptances. It was also expected that the Working Group on Acceptances would give guidance to the CCPR as to how to proceed when the EMDI calculated for a pesticide exceeded the ADI.

16. It was emphasized that the CCPR would keep improving transparency and harmonization. It was also stressed in response to the intervention made at the Commission that the CCPR used different method from that used by the CCRVDF in elaborating MRLs. It was noted that currently it was impracticable (and probably not necessary) to achieve uniformity in risk analysis among Codex Committees though it was important that the principles for risk assessment be the same.

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM WORK OF OTHER BODIES IN THE FIELD OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN FOOD (Agenda Item 4(c))

International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC)

17. The Representative of IUPAC reported that the Commission on Agrochemicals in the Applied Chemistry Division had been examining chemical aspects of pesticides. Its projects included, among others, "The Effects of Processing and Storage on Pesticide Residues in Food", "Glossary of Terms Relating to the Chemistry of Agrochemicals" and a new project, "Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues Risk Assessment" which would be brought to the attention of the CCPR in future. Short issue papers would be published on subjects related to pesticides and pesticide residues.

18. The Committee was also informed of the Eighth International Congress of Pesticide Chemistry scheduled to be held 4-9 July 1994 in Washington, USA. Among the main topics which would be discussed, "Pesticides and the Global Regulatory Environment" might be of special interest to the CCPR.

International Federation of National Associations of Pesticide Manufactures (GIFAP)

19. The Representative of GIFAP reported that GIFAP had recently published a new *Guidelines for the Safe Formulation and Packing of Pesticides*, an update of the first GIFAP Guidelines published in 1981, *Pesticide Residues in Food*, an extensive report containing residue data, MRLs and residues intake levels, and its summary, *Pesticide Residues in Food - Overview.*

European Economic Community (EEC)

20. The Representative of the EEC reported that Directives 93/57/EEC and 93/58/EEC had come into force on 1 January 1994 and concerned cereals, foodstuffs of animal origin (meat, dairy produce and eggs) and fruits and vegetables, oilseed, potatoes, tea etc.. Both Directives provided for mandatory MRLs for 23 pesticides.

21. The Committee noted that Directive 91/414/EEC on the placing on the market of plant protection products provided the re-authorization of existing and authorization of new plant protection pesticides. The first 90 compounds in the re-authorization process had recently been published and registrants would have one year to May 1995 to provide dossiers.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE 1993 JOINT FAO/WHO MEETING ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES (Agenda Item 5)

22. The FAO Panel of the 1993 JMPR completed a review of thirty one pesticide active ingredients as well as ETU (ethylenethiourea) and PTU (propylenethiourea). This consisted of nine pesticides considered under the periodic review procedure as well as two new pesticides. A special session of the FAO Panel convened immediately prior to the 26th CCPR conducted a full periodic re-evaluation of four compounds (diquat, ethephon, ethion and iprodione) as well as consideration of the benomyl/ carbendazim/thiophanate-methyl group, profenofos, propiconazole and dimethoate. These pesticides would be included on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for consideration by the WHO Group and included in the Report and Evaluations of the 1994 JMPR.

23. At the 24th and 25th Sessions of the CCPR, it was recognized that there was a need to better define the criteria to be considered in determining the need for animal transfer studies when estimating pesticide maximum residue levels. Countries were requested at these meetings to provide information on national approaches. The data provided by the United States, the United Kingdom and Norway formed the basis for the development of guidelines in this area, which were included in the Report.

24. A further activity was the development of guidelines on the preparation of data submissions to the FAO Panel. The formats of the working paper and the organization of the submission were intended as guides, which would be amended on the basis of comments received and experience gained in their

implementation. The development of the guidelines had resulted in improvements in the quality of the submissions provided to the FAO Panel and would facilitate the review process. These guidelines were distributed to countries in August 1993 with the request for information to support the compounds scheduled for review by the 1994 JMPR.

25. Twenty compounds were evaluated toxicologically by the 1993 JMPR, which included ETU (ethylenethiourea) and PTU (propylenethiourea). Three pesticides were evaluated for the first time.

26. A section was included in the report under "General Considerations" that discussed risk assessment procedures used by JMPR in the context of issues raised in the working paper considered by the Codex Alimentarius Commission at its 20th Session titled "Risk Assessment Procedures used by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and its Subsidiary and Advisory Bodies". The need was expressed for obtaining better intake data, in particular for specific population groups such as infants and children. In this context, the JMPR stressed that theoretical predictions of maximum dietary intake should be used only as a screen to identify those pesticides whose use might have the potential to exceed the ADI, and that theoretical predictions should not be a substitute for more realistic intake estimates based upon actual residue levels and food intake at the national and/or local level, when such information was available. It was noted that the purpose of MRLs was to ensure that good agricultural practice in the use of pesticides had been followed, and that such limits could not be used for making realistic estimates of pesticide intake.

27. Another section, titled "Improving the Assessment of Dietary Risk to Pesticides" addressed the need for additional information to assess special population groups such as infants and children. The JMPR recommended that governments address this need by conducting appropriate dietary surveys.

28. In response to a request of the Working Group on Acceptances at the 25th Session of CCPR, the JMPR considered the implications of a situation where the ADI was based on the no-observed-adverse-effect level (NOAEL) in a short-term exposure study (such as a teratogenicity study) or where the effect seen at the lowest dose above the NOAEL was an acute one (such as acetylcholinesterase inhibition). The JMPR felt that the term "ADI" should continue to be used in such circumstances, because the ADI was based upon the **total** data base, which provided confidence that long-term intakes were safe at the level of the ADI. The JMPR recognized that for those pesticides on which the ADI was based on acute effects or short-term exposure it might be appropriate to compare the ADI with short-term exposure. The CCPR was invited to request advice from the JMPR when it was not clear which comparison should be used. It was agreed that this would be considered when the *Guidelines for Predicting Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues* were revised.

29. The WHO Joint Secretary of the JMPR announced that the International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS) planned on expanding pesticide assessments to include assessments of occupational and environmental exposure by means of the "Joint Meeting on Pesticides". Highest priority would continue to be placed on pesticides of interest to the CCPR. IPCS hoped to begin phasing in the JMP in 1995 by expanding the reviews of 3-4 pesticides on the agenda of the JMPR to include occupational exposure and environmental assessments. The primary impact of this new activity would be on manufacturers who would have to consider availability of data not only on toxicity but also data relevant to the environmental assessments.

30. The Vice-Chairman of the 1993 JMPR brought to the attention of the Committee that the JMPR had reached the critical point with respect to the JMPR workload, noting the increase of the size of the FAO Monograph (360 to 886 pages) from only 1989 to 1992. The increased workload had resulted in part from greater detail for transparency purposes, but primarily due to the introduction of periodic reviews. Experience showed these to be much more resource intensive than new chemicals. In spite of completion of draft documents prior to the 1993 JMPR, time constraints required the Meeting to postpone consideration of 10 compounds (4 periodic review) until a special April 1994 FAO Panel Meeting. These compounds would be included in the 1994 JMPR Report and Evaluations for consideration by the 28th CCPR.

31. The Vice-Chairman expressed the view that increased review needs could not be met within current resources. He urged the Committee delegates to convey the seriousness of the situation with regards to adequate resources for the JMPR to appropriate national authorities for consideration at high levels in UN bodies.

32. The Delegation of France noted that the large workload was a problem not only for the JMPR but also for governments. This called for new approaches to reviewing data and the possible restructuring of organizations to work more efficiently. The WHO Joint Secretary of the JMPR outlined some of the steps that IPCS was taking to deal with this problem, which included a project on harmonization of approaches to risk assessment, including assessment of carcinogenicity and reproductive toxicity, ways to make better use of national reviews, and work within the context of the JMP.

33. The Representative of the EEC emphasized the importance of highlighting when short-term exposure was important and pointed out that quickly-reversible toxic effects should be distinguished from more slowly reversible effects when considering food intake. The EEC shared JMPR concern about the absence of a method to distinguish between propineb and the EBDCs, and supported efforts to develop analytical procedures to determine them individually.

REPORTS ON GOVERNMENT ACCEPTANCES OF CODEX MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS (Agenda Item 6)

SUMMARY OF ACCEPTANCES RECEIVED (Agenda Item 6 (a))

34. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 94/3, which contained a summary of acceptances received to date. The Committee was informed that Malaysia had provided corrections to their acceptances subsequent to the publication of the working paper, while the Delegation of Cuba had submitted an update of their acceptances to the Codex Secretariat at the current meeting.

35. The Committee noted that subsequent to the inclusion of "free distribution" into the Codex acceptance procedures for pesticide residues in 1991, the number of acceptances had significantly increased. Namely, among current replies, 37% are "free distribution", 33% are full acceptance and 30% are "not accepted".

36. In response to a recommendation to re-circulate the *Form for the Declaration of Acceptance or Non-Acceptance of Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues*, the Committee noted that the form would be distributed with Supplement 1 to Volume 2 of the *Codex Alimentarius* as soon as the publication was translated into French and Spanish.

REPORTS BY DELEGATES (Agenda Item 6 (b))

37. The Delegation of Jordan informed the Committee that all Codex MRLs had been accepted and that written notification of such acceptance would be provided in the future. The Delegation of Brazil also indicated that written notification would be provided concerning their acceptance of 210 MRLs.

38. The Delegation of Australia indicated that they either had the same MRLs as Codex or accepted imported products which met Australian standards for more than 30% of the total number of Codex MRLs. It was also noted that a further 30% of the Codex MRLs had no corresponding MRLs set in Australia. The Delegation of Australia also informed the Committee of its efforts to actively examine the remaining MRLs in an effort to further harmonize these with those set by Codex and New Zealand.

39. The Delegation of Japan informed the Committee that as of April 1994, pesticide residue standards were established for 89 chemicals in 130 commodities. It was noted that pesticide residue standards would be increased to 105 chemicals in the near future.

40. The Delegation of Japan also noted that 6137 pesticide residue limits were currently established, which included 1376 items where Codex MRLs were set. Among these 1376 Japanese MRLs, 1079 of the MRLs (78%) were equivalent to Codex MRLs.

CONSIDERATION OF INTAKE OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES (Agenda Item 7)

PROGRESS REPORT BY WHO ON PREDICTION OF DIETARY INTAKE OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES (Agenda Item 7 (a))

41. The Committee had before it CX/PR 94/4 (Progress Report by WHO on Prediction of Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues) and Conference Room Document 5, which provided details of calculations as well as 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 most of the pesticides evaluated by the 1993 JMPR. The TMDI was not calculated for the following compounds for which no MRLs had been proposed or where all existing MRLs had been proposed for withdrawal: amitrole, carbosulfan, ethephon, ethylenethiourea, metiram, propylenethiourea and zineb.

42. Based on existing and pending MRLs and current Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI), the following results were obtained: a) compounds for which the TMDI did not exceed the ADI: aldicarb, benalaxyl, bromopropylate, carbofuran, chlorothalonil, cycloxydim, diazinon, DDT, dithiocarbamates (mancozeb and maneb), endosulfan, etofenprox, fenbutatin oxide, fenpropathrin, fentin, flucythrinate, flusilazole, folpet, hexaconazole, procymidone, propineb, and pyrazophos; b) compounds for which the TMDI exceeded the ADI, but for which the EMDI was not calculated because no reduction factor was found: azinophos-methyl, chlorpyrifos-methyl, diquat, heptachlor and phosalone; c) compounds for which the TMDI exceeded the ADI, but for which the EMDI did not exceed the ADI: triazophos; and d) compounds for which both the TMDI and EMDI exceeded the ADI: dichlorvos, monocrotophos and phorate.

43. The TMDI greatly overestimates the likely pesticide intake because a) only a small proportion of the treated crops are expected to contain the pesticide at the MRL level; b) residues are normally reduced through storage, commercial processing, preparation and cooking; and c) the pesticide is unlikely to be used on every commodity for which an MRL has been established or proposed. The EMDI may introduce reduction factors for processing, preparation and cooking, but is still an overestimate of actual exposure. In recognizing that improvements in the calculations would result in more realistic estimates, the WHO Representative informed the Committee that an expert consultation was being planned to revise the *Guidelines for Predicting Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues.*

44. In regard to paragraph 2.2 of Circular Letter 1993/26-PR issued in August 1993, the Committee had before it Conference Room Document 6, which reported on the responses by Member States to the request for information on predicting the intake of pesticide residues. Based on responses from the Governments of Australia, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain and the United States as well as information from other sources, data on national diets was currently available in 27 countries, although most reflected the European diet. Information on the ratio between the MRL and median residues for a given commodity in field trial studies was received from Germany (around 4), The Netherlands (around 3) and the United States (about 3 to 12). Only the United States reported that EDI (estimated daily intake) calculations were performed at the national level.

45. Australia, Japan and the United Kingdom reported that additional and more recent dietary intake information was available in their countries.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE JOINT UNEP/FAO/WHO FOOD CONTAMINATION MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT PROGRAMME (Agenda Item 7 (b))

46. The Committee had before it CX/PR 94/5 (Report on the Activities of the Joint UNEP/FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring and Assessment Programme). Since 1976, GEMS/Food had informed governments, the Codex Alimentarius Commission and other relevant

institutions as well as the public on levels and trends of contaminants, including organochlorine and organophosphorus pesticide residues, in food, their contribution to the total human exposure and significance with regard to public health. The programme, which now included institutions in 59 countries, is an important part of national and international efforts to provide assurance regarding the safety of the food supply and provides the basis - where appropriate - for remedial actions, for food control, for industry and public education and for resource management.

47. Recent assessments of GEMS/Food priority contaminants including 14 pesticides residues had been published as *The Contamination of Food* (UNEP/GEMS Environmental Library No. 5, UNEP, Nairobi, 1992) and *Assessment of the Dietary Intake of Chemical Contaminants* (WHO/HPP/FOS/92.6) which are available on request from the WHO Food Safety Unit.

48. A GEMS/Food paper on the chemical contamination of breast milk, including certain organochlorine pesticides, was in preparation. Monitoring of breast milk and human tissues would form the basis of a new strategy by GEMS/Food to obtain information on dietary exposure to chemical contaminants, particularly in developing countries where little information was currently available. Such information would assist in orienting research toward those foods and contaminants which pose the greatest hazard to health.

49. Delegates from Australia, Denmark and France indicated that they had carried out similar studies in their countries and were prepared to share their experience with GEMS/Food.

50. GEMS/Food-EURO, operating within the WHO Region of Europe, continued to expand its activities. Most recently, a Workshop on the Reliable Evaluation of Low-Level Contaminants (Kulmbach, Germany 3-5 March 1994) considered a number of issues of relevance to the Committee.

REPORTS BY MEMBER STATES (Agenda Item 7 (c))

51. The Delegation of the United States reported that the 1992 pesticide monitoring data compiled by the Food and Drug Administration was available on six 3.5 inch diskettes and included data by country/food commodity/pesticide combination.

52. The Delegation of Australia announced the availability of their 1992 Market Basket Survey and distributed copies to the meeting. The Delegate from Brazil stated that pesticide monitoring data was available in animal products, including meat, milk and fish. The Delegate from Japan indicated that a market basket survey for pesticides was conducted in 1992. The Delegate from Jordan advised that their survey showed the presence of organochlorine pesticide residues in imported commodities of plant origin, but not above the Codex MRLs. The Delegation of Finland also reported on their recent intake studies on domestic products, which indicated that the intake was well below the ADI.

RESIDUES OF PESTICIDES IN FOODS AND ANIMAL FEEDS (Agenda Item 8)

CONSIDERATION OF MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS (Agenda Item 8.1 (a), (b), (c) and (d))

53. The Committee had before it the following documents:
- CX/PR 2-1994 "Status of Codex Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides in Food and Animal Feed";
- CX/PR 94/6, 7 and 8, containing government comments on the MRLs under discussion;
- CX/PR 94/6-, 7- and 8-add.1, containing additional comments from Cuba;
- CX\PR 94/6-, 7- and 8-add.2, containing additional comments from The Netherlands; and
- CX/PR 94/9 "General Maximum Residue Limits for Fruits and Vegetables".

54. Recommendations by the 1993 JMPR would be discussed at the 27th Session of the CCPR in the light of the decision made by the 25th Session. The 1993 JMPR had evaluated the following compounds (T, toxicological evaluation; and R, residue evaluation):

- New Compounds
  Etofenprox (184) (T,R); Fenpropathrin (185) (T,R); Metiram (186) (T);

- Periodic Re-evaluations
  Diazinon (022) (T,R); Dichlorvos (025) (T,R); Diquat (031) (T); Mancozeb (050) (T,R); Bromopropylate (070) (T,R); Amitrole (079) (T,R); Chlorothalonil (081) (R); Dithiocarbamates (105) (T,R); Maneb (T.R); Propineb (T,R); Zineb (T); Ethylenethiourea (ETU) (108) (T,R); Propylenethiourea (PTU) (150) (T,R);

- Evaluations
  Azinphos-methyl (002) (R); DDT (021) (R); Endosulfan (032) (R); Fentin (040) (R); Folpet (041) (T,R); Heptachlor (043) (R); Monocrotophos (054) (T); Phosalone (060) (T); Chlorpyrifos-methyl (090) (R); Carbofuran (096) (R); Ethephon (106) (T); Fenbutatin oxide (109) (R); Phorate (112) (R); Aldicarb (117) (R); Procymidone (136) (R); Triazophos (143) (T,R); Carbosulfan (145) (R); Flucythrinate (152) (R); Pyrazophos (153) (R); Benalaxyl (155) (R); Flusilazole (165) (R); Hexaconazole (170) (R); Cycloxydim (179) (R).

55. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR drew the attention of the meeting to the final schedule of the FAO Panel of the 1994 JMPR and the fact that seven countries (Canada, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Spain and Thailand) had provided data in response to the request made at the 25th CCPR and to the letter circulated in August 1993.

56. A tentative agenda and the rationale for why compounds were scheduled for review by the FAO Panel of the 1995 JMPR had been circulated to member countries with the request that they determine if there were data available at the national level which they would like to have considered by the FAO Panel. Countries were requested to provide an inventory of the information they had available to the FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR by 30 November 1994. The deadline for submission of information for consideration by the FAO Panel of the 1995 JMPR is 28 February 1995.

MRL proposals which might give rise to intake concern

57. After a preliminary discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Acceptances on how to proceed with MRL proposals which might give rise to intake concerns, it was suggested not to proceed with the proposals of the compounds where TMDI/EMDI calculations exceeded the ADI for a period of one year. This would allow governments the opportunity to submit their comments on draft guidelines for consideration by the *Ad Hoc* Working Group.

58. The Delegation of Australia did not in general support the holding of proposals at a Step when TMDI/EMDI calculations exceed the ADI. Exposure information from Australia's market basket surveys indicated that Australia's food was safe and that pesticide levels were well below MRLs.

59. The Committee decided to adopt a procedure proposed by the Chairman of the CCPR to advance proposals where possible. Only those proposals which might give rise to potential intake concern were to be kept for a period of one year at Step 7C, requesting governments to provide to Dr. Moy of WHO with their concern on intake, preferably EDI calculations, in writing. If no information was sent, the MRL of concern would be advanced to Step 8.

Data base requirements for MRL setting

60. The Committee was asked by the Chairman of the CCPR for its opinion on the need to develop (minimum) data base requirements as a guidance to the JMPR in recommending MRLs.

61. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR explained that no strict data base requirements and extrapolation rules existed at the moment, in order to maintain flexibility in the system of MRL setting.

62. The Representative of the EEC considered the development of guidelines, including minimum data requirements, of utmost importance to improve consistency and transparency in MRL setting. Many countries had already developed such guidelines.

63. As a result of a discussion between the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the 1992 and the 1993 JMPR respectively, the Committee was informed on the JMPR perspective on minimum data base requirements. It was pointed out that data requirements were different at the national and the international levels. One important distinction was that the JMPR was a scientific group and not a regulatory authority. While data were developed at the national level to support national registrations, data provided for JMPR review was based on already existing registrations.

64. It was pointed out that the MRL estimates were based on all available information, including information on the basic metabolism, the type of application or cultural practice. Data from similar crops might be used to increase the effective size of the data base and other data not strictly following GAP could often be used to supplement GAP data or could be used in a confirmatory way. It was explained that the desire for the definition of a minimum data base was understandable, but that it might not be practical at the international level. The JMPR had recognized the need to detail the basis for its recommendations, and had attempted to do so in recent years.

65. It was also noted that some guidance was already provided in Codex Guidelines or JMPR reports and a further opportunity would be afforded by proposed FAO Guidelines on data evaluation.

66. After some discussion, the Committee decided to request governments and industry to inform the FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR on their minimum data base requirements etc. used for MRL setting as a basis for a future discussion between JMPR and CCPR on this subject.

AZINPHOS-METHYL (002)

67. The Committee noted that the 1991 JMPR had reevaluated both toxicological and residue data and that the compound was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1995 JMPR. Many delegations expressed their concern for draft MRLs of commodities which showed that the calculated TMDI and EMDI exceeded the ADI. The Representative of the EEC questioned the critical GAP for peach, nectarine and plums because the GAP was different from that of the EEC.

Almonds; wheat

68. The Delegation of Germany questioned the adequacy of the colorimetric method of analysis for almonds and wheat. Several delegations observed that the data base was not sufficient to establish MRLs for wheat. The Committee decided to refer the proposals back to the JMPR for further clarification.

Apple

69. The Delegations of Canada, France, Finland, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO. The Delegations of Chile, France, Germany and the Representative of the EEC questioned the GAP. The Delegation of Canada informed the Committee that they would provide information on GAP and residues to the JMPR, while the Delegation of Germany, on behalf of the manufacturer, would provide information on newly performed processing studies.

Cherries

70. The Delegations of France and Germany indicated that the draft MRL was not supported by the residue data evaluated according to their standards.

Fruits (except..)

71. The Delegation of Finland indicated that residues were still present in or on citrus fruit and grapes. The Delegation of Germany, on behalf of the manufacturer, informed the Committee that studies were in progress for citrus fruits and would be made available to the JMPR in 1996.

Nectarine

72. The Delegations of Finland and Germany expressed their reservations on the draft MRL. They were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO.

Peach

73. The Delegations of Finland and Germany were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO.

Pear

74. The Delegations of France, Germany, Norway and Sweden were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO.

Pecan

75. The Delegation of Germany sought clarification on the PHI. The Committee was informed that the treatment was indicated in the growth stage of the product.

Peppers, sweet

76. The Delegations of France and Germany indicated that the draft MRL was not supported by adequate data.

Plums (including prunes)

77. The Delegation of France indicated that the draft MRL was not supported by the data. The Delegations of Finland and Germany were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO.

Tomato

78. The Delegations of France and Germany were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B:	almonds; wheat.
At Step 7C:	apple; cherries; nectarine; peach; pear; plums (including prunes); tomato.
At Step 8:	alfalfa fodder; alfalfa forage (green); blueberries; clover hay or fodder; cranberry; cucumber; melons, except watermelon; pecan; peppers, sweet; potato; soya bean (dry); sugar cane; walnuts; watermelon.
Deletion:	CXLs of alfalfa forage (green); melons, except watermelon; potato, soya bean (dry) and wheat straw and fodder, dry.

CAPTAN (007)

79. The Committee noted that captan was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1994 JMPR and toxicological evaluation by the 1995 JMPR.

CARBARYL (008)

80. The Committee noted that carbaryl was under periodic review and on the agenda of the 1996 JMPR for toxicological and residue evaluation.

CHLORFENVINPHOS (014)

81. The Committee noted that chlorfenvinphos had been scheduled for toxicological evaluation by the 1994 JMPR. The compound was removed from the 1994 JMPR schedule for residue evaluation because data would not be available in time.

CHLORMEQUAT (015)

82. The Committee noted that chlormequat was scheduled for a periodic re-evaluation for toxicology and residue limits by the 1994 JMPR.

2,4-D (020)

83. The Committee noted that 2,4-D was scheduled for toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1996 JMPR.

DIAZINON (022)

84. The Committee was informed that additional information was provided for hops. The compound was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1994 JMPR. The general MRLs for fruit and vegetables would be deleted when the MRLs for separate commodities reached step 8.

DICHLORVOS (025)

85. The TMDI and the EMDI (except for the European diet) calculated after the 1993 JMPR exceeded the ADI. The Committee decided to maintain CXLs for fruits and vegetables until the separate MRLs for commodities reached Step 8.

DICOFOL (026)

86. The Committee noted that the 1992 JMPR had reevaluated both toxicological and residue data. Delegation of Sweden expressed general reservation. The Representative of the EEC expressed their concern on intake considering the calculation of the EMDI exceeding the ADI. The Delegations of Austria, Finland, Germany, Norway, Spain and Sweden were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO. The Delegation of Norway was also requested to send information on the possible carcinogenic effects of the compound to WHO.

Cattle, edible offal of

87. The Delegations of France and the United States of America and the Representative of the EEC commented on the residue definition, which had to be changed in view of the presence of a major metabolite (FW 152) in the cattle liver. The JMPR was requested to reevaluate the expression of the residue. The Delegation of the United States of America and the Representative of the EEC were requested to submit their observations in writing to the JMPR.

Cherries

88. The Delegations of France and Chile indicated that the available data base on residues was limited and did not accommodate GAP, respectively.

Citrus fruits

89. The Delegation of The Netherlands preferred separate limits for citrus fruit commodities, while the Delegation of Spain indicated the preference for one limit for citrus fruits.

Common bean (pads and/or immature seeds); cotton seed oil, crude; cotton seed oil, edible

90. The Delegation of France questioned the validity of the proposed MRLs.

Garden pea (young pods)

91. The Delegation of France, supported by the Delegation of Germany, expressed a firm reservation on the proposed MRL.

Grapes

92. The Delegation of France questioned the GAP and noted that the residue data (as cited to come from France) were incorrect. The Delegation of France would contact the manufacturer and was requested to inform the JMPR accordingly.

Milks

93. The Delegation of Germany was requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO. The Delegation of France expressed a reservation on the proposed MRL.

Peach

94. The Representative of the EEC reserved its position as the GAP was questioned.

Plums (including prunes)

95. The Delegation of France questioned the GAP and reserved its position.

Pome fruits

96. The Delegations of Finland, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway and Sweden were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO. The Representative of the EEC questioned the GAP and reserved its position.

Poultry meat

97. The Delegation of Germany were requested to submit their comments on the problem of residue definition and concerns regarding available feeding study to the JMPR.

Strawberry

98. The Delegation of Spain wanted to maintain the CXL.

Tea, green, black

99. The Delegations of France and Germany expressed their reservations for the GAP taken into account.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: cattle, edible offal of; cherries; citrus fruits; common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); cotton seed oil, crude; cotton seed oil, edible; garden pea (young pods); grapes; milks; peach; plums (including prunes); pome fruits; poultry meat; prunes; tea, green, black.

At Step 5/8: beans, dry; cattle meat; cotton seed; cucumber; eggs; hops, dry; melons, except watermelon; pecan; peppers; poultry, edible offal of; squash, summer; walnuts.

Deletion: CXLs of cucumber; gherkin; hops, dry; strawberry.

DIMETHOATE (027)

100. The Committee noted that dimethoate should be considered a candidate for periodic review. The MRLs at Step 7B and 7C were on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR. The Delegation of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that they had recently reviewed the compound dimethoate and concluded that the ADI should be lowered to 0.0008 mg/kg b.w.

DIQUAT (031)

101. The Committee noted that diquat was under periodic review and on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation; the 1993 JMPR had lowered the ADI to 0.002 mg/kg b.w..

ENDOSULFAN (032)

102. The Committee decided to maintain CXLs for fruits and vegetables until the MRLs for separate commodities reached Step 8.

ETHION (034)

103. The Committee noted that ethion was under periodic review and scheduled for evaluation by the 1994 JMPR. The Delegation of France informed the Committee that ethion was widely used in South Europe on apples, carrots, pears and other vegetables. Also that it was used in tea plantations. The Delegations of France and the United Kingdom agreed to investigate the availability of data for tea, green, black.

ETHOXYQUIN (035)

104. The Committee noted that ethoxyquin was removed from the agenda of the 1994 JMPR and that the manufacturer was not supporting CXLs for apple and pear. The Committee was informed by the Delegation of the United States of America that in the US GAP data were being developed. The Delegation of the United Kingdom indicated that they would try to get data to support their registered use. The Committee recommended deletion of all existing CXLs if no information became available by its 27th session.

FENSULFOTHION (038)

105. The Committee noted that no further data were being generated and recommended deletion of all existing CXLs if no information became available by its 27th Session.

FENTHION (039)

106. The Committee noted that fenthion was scheduled for toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1995 JMPR.

FENTIN (040)

107. The Committee noted that the proposed MRL for fentin on hops, dry, was on the agenda of the 1993 JMPR for residue evaluation. Data to support the CXL for pecan had been provided to the 1994 JMPR. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that no information was to be provided to support the MRL for peanut.

FOLPET (041)

108. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that folpet was scheduled for residue evaluation on cucumber by the 1994 JMPR and for toxicological evaluation by the 1995 JMPR. More detailed residue data was needed for apples, and there was no known registered use for tomato. The Delegation of France informed the Committee that new data for apples would be available for the 1995 JMPR. The manufacturer reported GAP registration pending in Israel this year.

FORMOTHION (042)

109. The Committee was informed that formothion was under review and no longer supported by the manufacturer. The Delegation of Spain expressed a reservation for deletion because they still had registered uses. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR stated that for an MRL for citrus fruits a full data package was required and there was no recent toxicological information. The Committee decided to recommend deletion of the CXL for citrus fruits.

HYDROGEN CYANIDE (045)

110. The Delegation of The Netherlands informed the Committee that there were no longer authorized uses in their country. The Committee decided to recommend deletion of the CXLs for cereal grains and wheat flour.

INORGANIC BROMIDE (047)

111. The Committee was informed that the withdrawal of the general MRL for fruit had been postponed in 1993 to this session of the CCPR.

112. The Delegation of The Netherlands stated that it was reluctant to accept the proposed MRLs in view of the inconsistency and the inadequacy of the data base. The MRLs now in force in The Netherlands for cucumber and other commodities were much lower. Only the proposed MRLs for broccoli and sweet peppers are acceptable. The delegation also stated that the main trade partners of The Netherlands had not shown to be willing to accept higher levels than now in force in The Netherlands. Two of the trade partners of The Netherlands, Sweden and Finland, confirmed this statement. The Delegation of Germany, supported by Austria and France, informed the Committee it could not accept the proposed levels and noted that the number of trials for some commodities was too low. The Delegation of Israel informed that Israel was currently reviewing their GAP and that lower MRLs would be acceptable for them. The Delegation of the United States of America reserved its position on the proposed limits, because its GAP on organic bromide was also currently under review. The United States of America, Mexico and Israel suggested a periodic review in the near future, taking uses of methyl bromide into account. The Delegation of Egypt informed the Committee that methyl bromide was used for stored products and that no alternative was available.

113. The former Chairman of the JMPR informed the Committee that a similar discussion was held in the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of Chile informed the Committee that in the United States of America

studies on fresh fruit were being conducted for EPA reregistration, which would be finished this year. The EPA registration could not be confirmed by the Delegation of the United States of America.

114. The Committee decided not to recommend deletion of the general MRL for fruits, pending the receipt of additional data.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: broad bean (green pods/immature seeds); broccoli; cucumber; garden pea (young pods); okra; peppers (sweet); radish; squash (summer); turnip greens, turnip, garden.

MALATHION (049)

115. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1995 JMPR for toxicological and for residue evaluation. However, Representative of the GIFAP informed the Committee that long term study would not be completed before the end of 1995.

MANCOZEB (050)

116. See Dithiocarbamates (105).

METHIDATHION (051)

117. The Committee noted that the compound was evaluated for toxicology and residue limits by the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of France advocated a fixed limit of determination of 0.02 mg/kg in view of the low ADI for almonds, artichoke, globe and pecan. The Delegation of The Netherlands reserved its position for beans, dry; peas, dry; cabbages, head and safflower seed, because a review was not possible due to the fact that the individual data were not tabulated. The Delegation of Germany would provide information on intake to WHO.

Artichoke, globe

118. The Delegation of France reserved its position for the proposed MRL.

Cotton seed

119. The Delegation of the United States of America indicated that the JMPR was not correctly informed about their GAP specifics. US GAP did not require an MRL of 1 mg/kg and the United States preferred a limit of 0.2 mg/kg. The Delegation was requested to send the full data on GAP to the JMPR.

Cotton seed oil, crude

120. The Delegation of The Netherlands wanted clarification for the proposed MRL of 2 mg/kg.

Cucumber

121. The Delegations of Germany and France questioned the MRL, because the data from outdoor trials were taken for indoor use. The JMPR was requested to re-examine the cucumber evaluation.

Grapes

122. The Delegation of Sweden was requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO.

Macadamia nuts

123. The Delegations of Ireland and the United Kingdom advocated a higher detection limit (0.02 mg/kg) in view of the use in enforcement. The problem was referred to the Working Group on Methods of Analysis.

Mandarins

124. The Delegation of Sweden pointed to an error in CX/PR 93/4-Add.1 concerning the correction factor, which had been given as 0.33 instead of 0.03, and was requested to advance their comment to WHO.

Nectarin; apricot

125. The Delegation of Spain wanted to maintain the CXLs in view of a comparable use on peaches. The CXLs would be kept for another year, awaiting the information from Spain and Chile on data for registered uses.

Pear

126. The Delegation of Sweden was requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO.

Peas, dry

127. The Delegation of The Netherlands indicated that the data base for the proposed MRL was too limited.

Safflower seed

128. The Delegation of The Netherlands preferred an MRL of 0.05 mg/kg.

Shaddocks or pomelos

129. The Delegation of the United States of America questioned the deletion of the CXL because grapefruit was included in the definition of this commodity. The U.S. tolerance for grapefruit was 2 mg/kg. The Delegation of Spain also wanted to keep this general entry. The Committee decided to include an MRL of 2 mg/kg for grapefruit in Step 3(a) for consideration by the governments.

Sunflower seed

130. The Delegation of France preferred an MRL of 0.1 mg/kg.

Tea, green, black

131. The Delegation of Germany indicated that the data base for setting an MRL was insufficient.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3(a): grapefruit.

At Step 5: almonds; artichoke, globe; beans (dry); cabbages, head; cotton seed; cotton seed oil, crude; cucumber; grapes; macadamia nuts; pear; peas (dry); pecan; radish; safflower seed; sugar beet; sunflower seed; tea, green, black; walnuts.

At Step 5/8: alfalfa forage (green); goat fat; goat meat; goat, edible offal of; hops, dry; milks; olive oil, virgin; olives; onion, bulb; pineapple; rape seed; sorghum.

Deletion: CXL of cauliflower; common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); hops (dry); leafy vegetables; milks; and sorghum.

METHYL BROMIDE (052)

132. See the discussion under Agenda Item 8.2, "Reconsideration of Guideline Levels" (para. 331).

MEVINPHOS (053)

133. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1996 JMPR for toxicological and for residue evaluation.

MONOCROTOPHOS (054)

134. The 25th CCPR had proposed a full re-evaluation by the 1994 JMPR based on updated GAPs and residue data to be provided by national governments and had decided not to advance any MRLs nor to delete existing MRLs. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that no new information on GAP had been provided by countries. Industry would support use on beans, cereals (small grain (wheat, barley, oats)), citrus (stem injection), cotton, eggplant, maize, onion, peanuts, pepper (chili), rice, soya beans, sugar beet, sugar cane, sunflower, watermelon. The commodities pome fruit (apple, pear), banana, citrus (foliar treatments), brussels sprouts, cabbage, cauliflower, cocoa and coffee beans, grapes, mango, tea, tomato, turnip would not be supported in future.

135. The Delegation of Sweden, supported by Finland, had a general reservation concerning draft MRLs and CXLs above the limit of determination, since the EMDI calculation indicated a possible intake of 4 times the ADI. The Delegation of Egypt informed the Committee that they were in the process of cancelling uses of monocrotophos based on information from EPA that the compound concentrated in oil and that it was heat resistant. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that uses were cancelled and residues would not be accepted in the United States if the US tolerances were revoked.

Egg plant

136. The Delegation of Germany, supported by the Delegations of France and the United Kingdom, stated that the critical GAP for egg plants was not covered by the proposed figure of 0.2 and that they find the data base insufficient to cover the highest use rate. The Delegation of France, supported by the Delegation of the United Kingdom, stated that the MRL was based on GAP in Sudan and trial data from Bangladesh, while extrapolation was difficult because of the difference in weather conditions. The Committee noted the insufficient data base and the existence of a possible intake problem.

Peppers, chili

137. The Delegations of Germany and France stated that the data base was also insufficient.

Tea, green, black

138. The Delegation of France noted that the manufacturer did not support the use on tea. The Representative of the EEC informed the Committee that for tea there was an "open position" in the EEC, and that the MRL would be set at the limit of determination if data would not become available. The Committee recommended to withdraw the MRL for tea at its next Session.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: tea, green, black.

At Step 5: egg plant; peanut; peppers, chili; sugar cane; watermelon; wheat.

OMETHOATE (055)

139. The Chairman informed the Committee that the manufacturer had indicated that the compound was no longer supported. However, all CXLs should not be deleted since omethoate residues could result from uses of dimethoate. The deletion of all CXLs might result in problems in international trade.

140. Furthermore, there was a problem in deleting individual CXLs because it was not clear whether they originated from omethoate or dimethoate use.

141. Several countries reserved their position regarding the proposed MRLs at Step 3 and 6, based on toxicological concern. The Representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that the main manufacturer of the compound dimethoate was willing to submit a full data package on this compound within 2 years. This proposal, however, had still to be agreed in the Task Force.

142. Following the discussions on this compound the Committee decided to postpone discussions on the proposed MRLs and to recommend deletion of all CXLs with a note that they would enter the system again at Step 3.

Status of MRLs

At Step 3: artichoke, globe; banana; beans, except broad bean and soya bean; broccoli; brussels sprouts; cabbages, head; carrot; cauliflower; celery; cereal grains; citrus fruits; cucumber; currant, black; hops, dry; kale; lettuce, head; lettuce, leaf; onion, bulb; peas; peppers; potato; spinach; strawberry; sugar beet; tomato; turnip, garden.

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

ORTHO-PHENYLPHENOL (056)

143. The Committee was informed that the compound had been originally scheduled for the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation. According to the FAO Joint secretary of the JMPR, the data base was insufficient for reconsideration. Current GAPs were only available for citrus fruits and pear. The manufacturer had informed the JMPR that it was not interested in maintaining the existing CXLs. Therefore, the compound had been withdrawn from the 1994 agenda.

144. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that new data on citrus fruits and pears would become available in 1996. The Delegations of Egypt and Israel informed the Committee that they had registered uses on citrus fruits. The Delegation of Spain informed the Committee they had registered uses on citrus fruits, pear and possibly also apple.

145. The Committee decided to delete all existing CXLs except those for citrus fruits, pear and apple. Countries were asked to make available all data on these commodities and the Delegation of Spain was also asked for information on apple.

PARAQUAT (057)

146. No further action required. (see ALINORM 93/24A, para. 79)

PARATHION (058)

147. The Committee noted that parathion had been evaluated for residues by the 1991 JMPR and was scheduled for toxicological evaluation by the 1994 JMPR and for residue evaluation by the 1995 JMPR (data on apples had become available). The WHO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that although the evaluation was still scheduled, presently no toxicological information was available. The Representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that the manufacturer would submit data for the 1994 JMPR.

148. The Representative of the EEC made a reservation on consideration of the proposed MRLs at the present meeting in view of the very old toxicological data base of this compound (ADI from 1967).

149. Upon a general remark of the Delegation of The Netherlands, which was supported by the Delegation of France, the Committee decided to request the JMPR to reconsider the limit of determination of parathion at a future evaluation in view of the low ADI of parathion, especially in comparison with the lower LOD of parathion-methyl.

Apple

150. The Committee decided to advance the proposal to Step 7B, awaiting new data from the manufacturer and evaluation by the 1995 JMPR.

Cotton seed; maize; sorghum; soya bean; sunflower seed

151. The Committee decided to advance the proposals to Step 7C, awaiting further information from the USA on registered uses.

Leek

152. The Committee advanced the proposal to Step 8, noting the reservation of The Netherlands, indicating to prefer adding an (*) to the MRL value to show that the level was at or about the LOD.

Lemon; mandarin; oranges

153. The Committee advanced the proposals to Step 8, noting the reservations from the Delegations of Germany and France, indicating that the data base were insufficient to set MRLs for these commodities.

Olive oil, virgin; olives

154. The Delegation of Spain indicated that the proposal for olive oil was not acceptable for toxicological reasons, based on an intake study. The Delegation of The Netherlands made reservations for both commodities, indicating the limited number of trials on which the proposals were based. The Committee decided to advance the proposals to Step 8, noting the reservations from both countries. The Delegation of Spain was asked again to send the information on their intake study to the JMPR.

Potato

155. The Committee agreed to advance the proposal to Step 8.

156. The Committee agreed to recommend deletion of the CXLs for citrus fruits and vegetables (except...) since the individual proposals were advanced to Step 8, and to maintain the CXL for fruits.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: apple.

At Step 7C: cotton seed; maize; sorghum; soya bean (dry); sunflower seed.

At Step 8: leek; lemon; mandarin; olive oil, virgin; olives; oranges, sweet, sour; potato.

Deletion: CXLs of citrus fruits; vegetables (except...).

PARATHION-METHYL (059)

157. The Committee was informed that the compound was scheduled for the 1994 JMPR for periodic re-evaluation on toxicology and residues. In 1992 the JMPR had recommended the withdrawal of all CXLs. The Representative of GIFAP informed the Committee that the manufacturer would submit data for the 1994 JMPR.

158. The Delegation of the United States of America opposed the deletion of all existing CXLs. They informed the Committee that in the USA data were being developed for all CXL commodities and some others (except for tea). They were willing to make the data available when the trials and reports were completed. The data on hops had already been made available to the 1994 JMPR. Taking notice of the reservation of the United States of America, the Committee decided in principle to the withdrawal of the existing CXLs, but to postpone further discussions on this matter to the 27th CCPR, pending the outcome of the 1994 JMPR evaluation. The Committee agreed to advance all proposals from Step 3 to Step 5/8.

159. The Committee decided to delete the CXL for fruit, although there was a strong reservation by the Delegation of France, indicating that there were uses also on other fruits not yet referenced in the list, for example, apple and peach. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR confirmed that there was GAP available on fruits at the 1992 JMPR, but it was not supported by residue data. The representative of the manufacturer informed the Committee that data on pome fruits and grapes would be sent to the 1994 JMPR. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR confirmed that this data would be evaluated in 1994.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5/8: cherries; gooseberry; plums (including prunes); raspberries, red, black.

Deletion: CXL of fruits.

PHOSALONE (060)

160. The Committee noted that the compound had been evaluated for toxicology by the 1993 JMPR, which had lowered the ADI from 0.006 to 0.001 mg/kg b.w. The residue evaluation was scheduled for the 1994 JMPR. The FAO Joint secretary informed the Committee that there would not be support for chestnut and peas.

PIPERONYL BUTOXIDE (062)

161. The Committee noted that the compound had been reviewed by the 1992 JMPR for both residues and toxicology and would be scheduled again for the 1996/97 JMPR for residue evaluation and the 1995 JMPR for toxicological evaluation.

Cereal grains

162. In relation to the proposal for wheat, the Delegation of Spain made a reservation on the deletion of the CXL for cereal grains, indicating that Spain not only had registered uses on wheat, but also on other cereals (e.g. barley), and that such GAP information had been sent to the JMPR. The FAO Joint Secretary

of the JMPR informed the Committee that the Task Force for this compound would submit data to the JMPR only on pre-harvest uses, and not on post-harvest uses (e.g. barley). The former Chairman of the JMPR informed the Committee that at the 1992 JMPR the data available was insufficient for a periodic review, and therefore the deletion of the CXL was proposed.

163. The Committee decided to withdraw the CXL on cereal grains, also in view of the fact that the proposal for wheat had reached Step 8. The Committee also decided to delete the CXLs for all other commodities.

Wheat

164. The Committee decided to advance the proposal to step 5/8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5/8: wheat

Deletion: cereal grains; dried fish; dried fruits; dried vegetables; oilseed, except peanut; peanut; tree nuts.

PYRETHRINS (063)

165. The compound was originally scheduled for the 1994 JMPR for both toxicological and residue evaluation. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that the Task Force for this compound had planned residue studies that would not become available before 1995. Therefore, the evaluation was scheduled for the 1996/97 JMPR. The WHO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that evaluation was scheduled in 1997.

166. The Delegations of Sweden and Spain made a general comment regarding the deletion of the CXL for cereal grains for piperonyl butoxide (see paras 162-163). The underlying reason for this was that piperonyl butoxide was a synergist in formulations with pyrethrins or pyrethroids. In their opinion, it was not logical to keep a CXL on cereal grains for pyrethrins in force, while deleting it for piperonyl butoxide. The Chairman agreed with this view, but he felt it was not justified to keep an obsolete CXL (no underlying residue data available) in the system.

QUINTOZENE (064)

167. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1995 JMPR for toxicological and residue evaluation.

THIABENDAZOLE (065)

168. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1996 JMPR for toxicological and residue evaluation. The WHO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that, following the request of 25th CCPR, there had been a discussion between the JECFA and the JMPR on the problem of how to handle a compound that was used as a pesticide and as a veterinary drug. Since the JECFA had evaluated this compound in 1992, they would probably also be responsible for further toxicological evaluations. This fact, however, would not have any impact on MRL setting. This would remain under the responsibility of the JMPR.

TRICHLORFON (066)

169. The compound had been tentatively on the agenda of the 1995 JMPR for a periodic review on both toxicology and residues. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that the compound was removed from the schedule for residue evaluation, pending clarification from the manufacturer as to whether or not it was supported.

CYHEXATIN (067)

170. The Committee noted that the proposals for peach and plums (including prunes) were referred back to the CCPR by the 20th Session of the CAC.

171. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR pointed out that the situation concerning the proposed MRLs for stone fruits and pome fruits was complicated as a result of combining the lists for cyhexatin and azocyclotin, and needed to be revised, preferably in a periodic re-evaluation.

172. The Delegations of Spain, France, Sweden and Finland expressed their reservation against advancing the proposed MRLs, also because the underlying GAPs needed revision. They were requested to send GAP data to the JMPR. The Representative of the EEC drew the attention to the inadequacy of the trial data for establishing MRLs for stone fruits.

173. The Committee decided to advance the proposals to Step 7C, awaiting a periodic re-evaluation on stone fruit and pome fruit by a future JMPR meeting and information from governments on GAP.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7C: nectarine; peach; plums (including prunes).

BENOMYL (069)

174. The Committee noted that benomyl/carbendazim/thiphanate methyl (077) were evaluated by the FAO Panel of the JMPR in April 1994 and was scheduled for toxicological evaluation in 1995.

CARBENDAZIM (072)

175. See benomyl (069) (para. 174).

DEMETON-S-METHYL (073)

176. This compound would be discussed under oxydemeton-methyl (166) (para. 267-270).

DISULFOTON (074)

177. The compound had been evaluated by the 1991 JMPR as part of the periodic review programme and had already been discussed in the CCPR last year.

178. The Delegations of Germany, Sweden, Finland, Spain, The Netherlands and Austria and the Representative of the EEC expressed their reservation against existing CXLs as well as the advancement of several of the proposed MRLs, because of concern on intake. These MRLs were potential candidates for advancement to Step 7C, as explained in para. 59. Countries mentioned were requested to provide the WHO with details of their intake calculations.

179. Upon a request on the availability of EMDI calculations the Committee was informed that such calculations had already been carried out last year by the WHO (see Room Document 7 of the 25th CCPR).

180. The Delegation of Germany mentioned that in the Evaluations 1991 no general reduction factors could be identified from the processing studies; the WHO Representative undertook to review the processing studies. The Representative of the manufacturer informed the Committee that additional processing factors were currently being generated on coffee, corn, oats, potato, rice and sorghum and would be available in december 1996. Also data on cooking would become available.

181. The Delegation of The Netherlands was of the opinion that demeton-S should be deleted from the residue definition, and they preferred, supported by the Delegation of Ireland, higher limit of determination of 0.02 mg/kg for enforcement purposes.

182. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that the compound was again on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR because additional information on several commodities had become available, and that this opportunity could also be used to review the residue definition.

183. With regard to the appropriate limit of determination, the Committee decided to ask the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Methods of Analysis for its opinion on this matter.

184. The Delegations of Spain and The Netherlands expressed their concern on high draft MRLs for fodder commodities which might be toxic to the animal itself. As a follow-up to a discussion held in the 25th CCPR on sorghum forage (green), the Delegations of The Netherlands, Chile, the United States of America and France were once again requested to provide the JMPR with their detailed comments.

Broccoli; cabbage,head; cauliflower; common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); milk of cattle, goats and sheep

185. The Delegations of The Netherlands, France and Germany expressed reservations against several of the proposed MRLs with regard to the availability and/or the interpretation of the data on which these proposals were based. It was decided to advance these proposals to Step 7B, and to request the JMPR to reconsider them in addition to other commodities which were already on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR. Countries having additional information were requested to provide this to the FAO Secretary of the JMPR by the end of May 1994. France was requested to submit detailed comments concerning MRLs for broccoli, cabbage,head, cauliflower, common bean and milk.

Lettuce, head; lettuce, leaf

186. The Delegations of France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Spain and The Netherlands could not agree with the draft MRLs because of concern on intake. They were invited to provide WHO with their detailed calculations as outlined in para. 59.

Maize

187. The Delegation of Finland asked wether the proposed figure should not be identified as limit of determination; it was decided to bring this matter also to the attention of the JMPR.

Oat forage(green); oat straw and fodder, dry; wheat forage (whole plant); wheat straw and fodder, dry

188. The Delegation of Ireland drew the attention of the Committee to an inconsistency between the figures for forage(green) and straw and fodder, dry for oats and wheat. It was decided to request the JMPR to reconsider these proposals also at their 1994 meeting.

Tomato

189. Germany was requested to provide written comments on evaluation of tomato data.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: barley; beans(dry); broccoli; cabbages, head; cauliflower; common bean(pods and/or immature seeds); cotton seed; garden pea (young pods); garden pea, shelled; maize; milk of cattle, goats and sheep; oat forage (green); oat straw and fodder, dry; pecan; sorghum; sorghum forage (green); tomato; wheat; wheat forage (whole plant); wheat straw and fodder, dry .

At Step 7C: asparagus; chicken eggs; lettuce, head; lettuce,leaf; oats; poultry meat; sweet corn (corn-on-the-cob); sweet corn (kernels).

At Step 8: alfalfa fodder; barley straw and fodder, dry; coffee beans; maize fodder; maize forage; radish, Japanese; sugar beet; sugar beet leaves or tops.

Deletion: CXLs of alfalfa fodder; celery; coffee beans; soya bean (dry); sugar beet.

PROPOXUR (075)

190. The Delegation of France expressed a reservation for common bean (pods and/or immature seeds), because the MRL was based on old GAP data.

191. The Delegation of Germany expressed a reservation for garden pea (young pods) based on an insufficient data base. The Delegation of Germany, on behalf of the manufacturer, indicated that no additional studies were scheduled.

192. The Delegation of France expressed a strong reservation for lettuce, head and (supported by the Delegation of The Netherlands) for potatoes, because the MRLS were based on very old data. The Delegation of The Netherlands proposed a withdrawal of the MRL, when no additional data became available. The Delegation of Germany, on behalf of the manufacturer, informed the Committee that for re-evaluation new data on potato would be submitted to the 1996 JMPR. It was also indicated that additional studies were scheduled for lettuce. The Committee decided to move the proposals from Step 6(a) to Step 8.

Status of MRLs

At step 8: 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.

Deletion: CXLs of root and tuber vegetables; vegetables.

THIOMETON (076)

193. The FAO Joint Secretary of JMPR indicated that no new data would become available before 1995. The compound would therefore be scheduled for periodic review for toxicological and residue data by the 1997 JMPR.

THIOPHANATE-METHYL (077)

194. The Committee noted that the compound was under periodic review and was scheduled for toxicological evaluation by the 1995 JMPR. The data base for residue data was not complete.

VAMIDOTHION (078)

195. The Committee decided to move the proposal for pome fruits from Step 6 to Step 8.

DICLORAN (083)

196. The Committee noted that no information would be provided by the manufacturer and decided to recommend deletion of all CXLs at the next session of the CCPR if no information was provided by governments.

DODINE (084)

197. The Committee noted that dodine was scheduled for toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1996 JMPR.

PIRIMIPHOS-METHYL (086)

198. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation.

CHLORPYRIFOS-METHYL (090)

199. The Committee noted that the compound had been on the agenda of the 1993 JMPR for the evaluation of processing studies on maize and rape seed. Several delegations expressed their concern because the TMDI exceeded the ADI. In view of these problems chlorpyrifos-methyl was referred to the Working Group on Priorities as a candidate for periodic review.

200. The Committee was informed that only one response was obtained from the United States of America in relation to a Circular Letter inviting governments to inform JMPR on current GAPs for all cereals. Several Delegations indicated that the MRLs for cereals were too high. In addition, the Representative of the EEC indicated that 10 mg/kg in cereals would result in 20 mg/kg in bran. The Delegation of the United States of America stated that post harvest use on rice was not accommodated. The Delegations were urgently requested to send GAP data on all cereals, including rice, to the JMPR.

201. The Delegation of France supported by the Delegation of Germany indicated that the proposed MRL for oranges was not supported by the data base. The Delegation of Spain informed the Committee that there were data on citrus fruits.

202. The Delegation of the United States of America drew attention to previous JMPR evaluations in which effects on cholinesterases in several animal species, including humans, were reviewed. The 1992 JMPR revised its ADI and used as its basis a human study in which no effects were noted at any level tested. The NOELs from animal studies for cholinesterase inhibition in brain and erythrocytes were in the order of 1-4 mg/kg b.w. and with a NOEL in rat adrenal of 1 mg/kg b.w. A 100 fold safety factor for either of these effects resulted in an ADI higher or equal to 0.01 mg/kg and seemed more reasonable than to base it on a study in humans in which no effect of any kind was observed in any subject at any dose. The Delegation was requested to send this information to the WHO.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: barley; oats.

At Step 8: dates;grapes; mushrooms; oranges, sweet, sour; peppers;

Deletion: CXL of peppers; MRL of rape seed (at Step 6).

BIORESMETHRIN (093)

203. The Committee noted that bioresmethrin had been on the agenda of the 1991 JMPR for toxicological and residue evaluation. The Delegations of Germany and France questioned the proposed MRLs for wheat products and noted that the MRL for wheat flour was considered too high. The former Chairman of the JMPR noted that this was due to the variation of results in determining the residues. The Committee decided to move the proposals to Step 8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: wheat; wheat bran, unprocessed; wheat flour; wheat germ; wheat wholemeal.

ACEPHATE (095)

204. The Committee noted that acephate was on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation.

CARBOFURAN (096)

205. The Committee noted that carbofuran was on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for toxicological evaluation.

CARTAP (097)

206. The Committee noted that cartap was scheduled for periodic review and on the agenda of the 1995 JMPR for toxicological and residue evaluation.

EDIFENPHOS (099)

207. The Committee noted that edifenphos was a candidate for periodic review. The Chairperson of the Working Group of Priorities informed the Committee that this compound was used only in Japan for rice and that the manufacturer was not interested in supporting it. Since Japan did not export much rice, this compound did not meet the criterion of affecting international trade. The Committee decided to recommend deletion of all CXLs for rice at the 27th Session of the CCPR.

METHAMIDOPHOS (100)

208. The Committee noted that methamidophos was on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation. The manufacturer was requested to send in summary data of about 150 trials of acephate on cotton seed. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that they had already sent their written comments on the 0.1 mg/kg proposal for cotton seed that might not be high enough to accommodate acephate uses.

PHOSMET (103)

209. The Committee noted that phosmet was scheduled for periodic review and on the agenda of the 1994 JMPR for toxicological evaluation. Residue evaluation was not scheduled yet.

DITHIOCARBAMATES (105)

210. It was stated that thiram, ferbam, ziram and propineb should be mentioned separately from EBDCs as these compounds did not generate the more toxic ETU (108).

ETHIOFENCARB (107)

211. The Committee noted that ethiofencarb was under periodic review and on the agenda of the 1993 JMPR. The Committee was informed by the Chairperson of the Working Group on Priorities that the manufacturer did not provide data to the JMPR and that the economic importance of the compound was decreasing. The Committee agreed that ethiofencarb was a candidate for withdrawal of existing CXLs at the next CCPR Session.

IMAZALIL (110)

212. The Committee noted that imazalil was scheduled for the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation.

IPRODIONE (111)

213. The Committee was informed that residue data was evaluated in April 1994.

PHORATE (112)

214. After discussion on the limit of determination (0.05 mg/kg) in relation to the low ADI, the Committee noted that the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Methods of Analysis reviewed the limit of determination and did not change it.

Carrot

215. The Committee noted that the MRL for carrot should be at Step 6 instead of 7C since the United Kingdom had provided information to the 1993 JMPR on revised GAP which supported a lower figure.

Potato

216. The Delegations of Austria, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Spain, United Kingdom and the Representative of the EEC expressed their concern for the proposed MRL because the calculated TMDI and EMDI exceeds the ADI. They were requested to advance information on intake, preferably EDI calculations, to WHO. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee about their market basket data.

Status of MRLs

At Step 6: carrot.

At Step 7C: potato.

At Step 8: maize; sweet corn (corn-on-the-cob)

PROPARGITE (113)

217. The Committee noted that propargite was planned to be scheduled for periodic review.

GUAZATINE (114)

218. The Committee noted that guazatine was scheduled for periodic review for toxicological and residue evaluation at the 1996 JMPR.

TECNAZENE (115)

219. The Committee noted that tecnazene was scheduled for toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1994 JMPR.

TRIFORINE (116)

220. The Committee noted that triforine was scheduled for periodic review for toxicological and residue evaluation at the 1996 JMPR.

ALDICARB (117)

221. The Committee noted that aldicarb was scheduled for periodic review for residue evaluation at the 1994 JMPR. The Committee was also informed that the 1993 JMPR changed the MRL for brussels sprouts from 0.05 to 0.1, and a footnote reflecting this change would be included.

CYPERMETHRIN (118)

222. The Committee noted that cypermethrin was planned to be scheduled for periodic review.

2,4,5-T (121)

223. The Representative of GIFAP indicated that they were not aware of a producer of this compound and therefore, the Committee agreed to delete all CXLs at its 27th session if no additional information was received.

AMITRAZ (122)

224. In view of the lack of responses to repeated requests to submit information on national residue definitions to the JMPR, the Committee agreed to maintain the residue definition as currently defined.

ETRIMFOS (123)

225. The Committee noted that etrimfos was planned to be scheduled for periodic review.

226. As no additional information was received on lettuce, head, subsequent to the 25th CCPR, the Committee decided to delete the MRL for this commodity.

Deletion: MRL of lettuce, head (at Step 7B).

METHACRIFOS (125)

227. The Committee noted that methacrifos was reviewed at the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation.

Beans (dry); cacao beans; field pea (dry); peanut; peanut, whole

228. All proposals for the above commodities at step 7B were withdrawn as current GAP was not supported by the manufacturer.

Cattle meat; cattle, edible offal of

229. The Committee advanced the above proposals to step 5/8.

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

230. The Committee was informed of government comments submitted concerning intake, whereby it was noted that the EMDI calculations significantly exceeded the ADI. It was also noted that there were current uses on cereal grains in Argentina.

231. The Delegation of the United States of America drew attention to the WHO evaluations in which a human study was used as the basis for raising the ADI. However, the purity of the material administered was "unspecified", which raised concern for two reasons: 1) there was no assurance of how much was ingested, and 2) no effects of any kind were observed at the highest dose. Thus, it seems inappropriate to use 0.06 mg/kg body weight as a NOEL upon which the ADI was based. This was of even greater significance since both the TMDI and EMDI estimates exceed the ADI several fold.

232. On the basis of the above discussions, the Committee decided to advance proposals for the above commodities to step 7C pending further intake calculations by WHO. Governments would be requested by a Circular Letter to provide information of GAPs. Manufacturers would also be requested to provide cereal GAPs.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5/8: cattle meat; cattle, edible offal of.

At Step 7C: cereal grains; wheat bran, unprocessed; wheat flour; wheat wholemeal.

Deletion: MRLs beans (dry); cacao beans; field pea (dry); peanut; peanut, whole (at Step 7B).

PHENTHOATE (128)

233. The Delegation of France asked the Committee whether there was a manufacturer known for this compound. In view of the time schedule of this Session the Chairman preferred to postpone this subject to a future date.

AZOCYCLOTIN (129)

Pome and stone fruits

234. The Committee was informed that the 20th Session of the Commission had not adopted the draft MRLs for stone and pome fruit commodities at step 8, due to toxicological concerns, which had been expressed by several countries at the last session of the CCPR. Therefore, the Committee decided - in line with the approach for cyhexatin (067) - to advance all proposals for stone and pome fruits to step 7C, requesting clarification as to the availability of residue data to support a re-evaluation of these commodities by a future JMPR.

Tomato

235. Several countries made a reservation for this MRL (also not adopted by the Commission at step 8) on toxicological grounds. The Delegation of Sweden suggested to ask the JMPR to take this commodity also in their future review, because of the reservations concerning the same subject (toxicological concern and underlying GAP). The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that the MRL for tomato was 'translated' from cyhexatin. The Committee decided to request clarification as to the availability of residue data to support a re-evaluation by a future JMPR. The Committee decided to advance the MRL to step 7C, awaiting evaluation by the JMPR.

Status of MRLs:

At Step 7C: apple; nectarine; peach; pear; plums (including prunes); tomato.

ISOFENPHOS (131)

236. The Committee was informed that this compound had been evaluated by the 1992 JMPR. In order to harmonise the residue definitions, the MRLs for meat and poultry had been complemented with the addition 'fat'.

TRIADIMEFON (133)

237. The Chairman pointed out to the Committee that the 1992 JMPR had changed the residue definition for the compounds triadimefon and triadimenol and made separate lists of MRLs for these 2 compounds.

238. The Delegations of Germany, France and the United Kingdom, and the Representative of the EEC made a general reservation on all proposals, in regard to the subject 'combined or separate lists'. Although normally supporting the separation of lists for relating compounds, in this specific case they expressed a strong reservation to separating the lists of triadimenol and triadimefon, since most MRLs were based on old studies in which only the total residue values were given. They added that future residue studies should be carried out on the compounds separately, allowing at a later stage the separation of lists. The manufacturer informed the Committee that since the 1980s, studies were carried out analyzing both compounds and this would also be the case in the future.

239. The Chairman of the 1992 JMPR agreed that the data base available at the 1992 JMPR could be considered inadequate. Based on the available data, however, the JMPR came to these proposals. He also stated that when new data became available the conclusions could change.

240. The Delegation of the United States of America reserved its position on all triadimefon MRL proposals and to the residue definition. In the United States of America a different residue definition was used, based also on metabolites of the compound.

Barley

241. The Committee decided to advance the proposal to step 8, noting the reservations of the EEC and France. The Delegation of France opposed advancing proposals to step 8 in view of the fact that when proposals were advanced to step 8, it would be difficult to draft a separate list. The Representative of the EEC reserved its position, stating that the proposed MRL was higher than necessary and that a PHI of 35 days would seem more appropriate for barley.

Coffee beans

242. The Committee decided to advance the proposal to step 5, noting the reservation by the Delegation of Cuba, concerning the limit of determination.

Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits

243. The Committee decided to advance the proposal to step 5, noting the reservation by the Delegation of The Netherlands. The Netherlands supported the opinion of the 1992 JMPR that more data reflecting GAP were desirable to confirm the proposed levels.

Pineapple

244. The Delegation of Germany stated that the assumption made by the 1992 JMPR of a 1:1 ratio between residues of triadimefon and triadimenol, based on the data base available to the 1992 JMPR, was unrealistic. They informed the Committee that new data, supporting their view, were available. The manufacturer confirmed that new data on pineapples were available and that they would submit this to the JMPR. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR stated that there was a possibility to schedule the review of this data on the 1995 JMPR. The Committee decided to advance the proposal to step 5, with a note that the proposal should not be advanced further, awaiting the evaluation by the JMPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: chick-pea (dry); coffee beans; currant, black, red, white; eggs; fodder beet; fodder beet leaves or tops; fruiting vegetables, cucurbits; hops dry; mango; meat; milks; onion, Welsh; peas; peppers, sweet; pineapple; poultry meat; spring onion; strawberry; tomato.

At Step 8: 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.

245. Several delegations noted general reservations to all proposals.

DELTAMETHRIN (135)

246. The Committee decided to advance the MRL for tree tomate to step 5/8.

247. The Committee decided to advance the MRLs for Wheat bran, unprocessed, wheat flour and wheat wholemeal to step 8, noting the reservation of the Delegation of France. France stated that for

wheat bran a lower value would be appropriate and that for wheat flour a higher value was needed to cover all treatments.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5/8: tree tomato.

At Step 8: wheat bran, unprocessed; wheat flour; wheat wholemeal.

BENDIOCARB (137)

248. According to the proposal of the last years session, the Committee decided to delete all Temporary MRLs, due to lack of data.

Deletion: Temporary CXLs of mushrooms; rice straw and fodder, dry; rice, husked.

METALAXYL (138)

249. The Committee noted that residue data on lettuce, onions, spinach and strawberries had been reviewed by the 1992 JMPR and that the compound was a candidate for periodic re-evaluation by a future JMPR.

Lettuce, head; spinach

250. The Delegations of The Netherlands and France (and for spinach also the Delegation of the United States of America) and the EEC Representative questioned the underlying data base for these proposals and asked for clarification. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR explained that these MRLs had formerly been temporary pending clarification of GAPs. As updated GAP information had been considered by the 1992 JMPR in relation to existing trial data, these MRLs were no longer temporary.

Onion, bulb

251. The Delegations of France and Germany and the EEC Representative questioned the underlying data base and/or the evaluation of the data resulting in the proposal. The Delegation of the United States of America explained that, as could be seen from the 1989 Evaluations, the proposed figure resulted from the determination of the total residue (including the metabolites).

Strawberry

252. The Delegations of France and Germany and the EEC Representative questioned the underlying data base for the proposal. The EEC Representative also informed the Committee that the EEC was currently considering an MRL of 0.5 mg/kg while 0.2 mg/kg would not cover all uses, which was confirmed by the Delegation of the United States of America. The EEC would submit data justifying the higher level to JMPR.

253. The representative of the manufacturer undertook to provide additional residue data by February 1995 to enable JMPR to re-evaluate the situation on strawberries in its 1995 meeting.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: strawberry.

At Step 8: lettuce, head; onion, bulb; spinach.

TRIAZOFOS (143)

254. The Committee noted that a full ADI had been allocated by the 1993 JMPR. The Committee was informed that the MRLs for the following commodities had been automatically advanced to Step 8 from 7A since the full ADI had been allocated: broad bean, shelled (succulent); cattle meat; cattle milk; cauliflower; coffee beans; common bean (pods and/or immature seeds); cotton seed; peas; pome fruits.

CARBOSULFAN (145)

255. The Delegation of Spain informed the Committee that there was still a registered use on citrus in Spain, and that data were available. Spain was requested to provide the JMPR with these data.

CLOFENTEZINE (156)

256. The Committee decided to move the proposal for citrus fruits from Step 6 to 8 and the proposal for grapes from Step 3(a) to Step 5/8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5/8: grapes.

At Step 8: citrus fruits.

CYFLUTHRIN (157)

257. The Committee noted that the compound was evaluated by the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of Germany supported by the Delegations of The Netherlands, France, United Kingdom and the EEC Representative indicated that an MRL of 0.2 mg/kg was sufficient for apple. The Chairman of the 1992 JMPR informed the Committee that when all values were taken into account the MRL of 0.5 mg/kg was justified.

258. The Delegation of France supported by the Delegation of Germany and the EEC Representative indicated that the data base for peppers, sweet was insufficient to set an MRL.

259. The Delegation of Germany pointed out a misprint in the MRL figure for tomato, which should read 0.5 mg/kg instead of 0.05. For this reason the proposal for tomato was kept at Step 6. The Committee decided to move all other proposals to Step 8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 6: tomato

At Step 8: apple; cattle milk; cotton seed; maize; peppers, sweet; rape seed.

GLYPHOSATE (158)

260. The Committee noted that the compound was on the Agenda of the 1994 JMPR for residues evaluation on soya beans.

261. The MRL for wheat bran, unprocessed, was not adopted at Step 8 by the 20th Session of the CAC. The Committee was informed that new wheat processing data were available and decided to refer the data to the 1994 JMPR to be considered with previous information. After discussion on the high MRL proposed for this commodity the Committee decided to set an MRL of 20 mg/kg but to refer back to the JMPR for the matter of procedures. It was decided to advance it to Step 8 with the possibility to reconsider the decision at the next session.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: wheat bran, unprocessed.

VINCLOZOLIN (159)

262. The Delegation of Finland urgently requested that the ADI should be reconsidered in view of the hormonal and reproductive toxic effects at low doses and reserved its position. The Committee noted that vinclozolin was scheduled for toxicological evaluation by the 1995 JMPR.

263. The Delegation of Australia indicated that their MRLs for stone fruit except peach were temporary because the residue data for apricot were inadequate. The Committee decided to consider withdrawal of the MRL for apricot at the next session and to move the proposal for lettuce, head, to Step 8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 6: apricot

At Step 8: lettuce, head.

PROPICONAZOLE (160)

264. The Committee noted that the compound was evaluated by the FAO Panel of the JMPR in April 1994 and would consider deletion of the MRL for barley at the next session.

ANILAZINE (163)

265. The Committee noted that the compound was evaluated by the 1992 JMPR. The Committee decided to move the MRLs at Step 3 to Step 5/8 and the MRLs at Step 6 to Step 8.

Status of MRLs:

At Step 5/8: cattle meat; cattle, edible offal of; eggs; goat meat; goat, edible offal of; milks; poultry meat; poultry, edible offal of.

At Step 8: barley straw and fodder, dry; celery; tomato; wheat straw and fodder, dry.

DIMETON-S-METHYLSULPHON (164)

266. The Committee decided to discuss this compound together with oxydemeton-methyl (166).

OXYDEMETON-METHYL (166)

267. The Committee noted that oxydemeton-methyl was under periodic review and on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for residue evaluation. Many delegations had sent in their comments noting that the calculated TMDI and EMDI exceeds the ADI.

268. The German Delegation, on behalf of the manufacturer, informed the Committee that they would no longer produce and support demeton-S-methyl (073) and demeton-S-methylsulphon (164). For oxydemeton-methyl only the commodities almond, barley, cabbage and kale, citrus fruits, lettuce, grapes, peas, pome fruits, potato, rape, strawberry, sugar/fodder beet and sunflower would be supported, with changed GAP. More information would become available next year.

269. The Delegation of the United Kingdom informed the Committee that in the United Kingdom a company wished to support demeton-S-methyl to continue registration in the United Kingdom.

270. The Committee decided to maintain all proposals at current Steps. The MRLs would be withdrawn at the next Session of the CCPR if new data was not provided.

TRIADIMENOL (168)

271. See discussion under triadimefon (133).

272. Although a delegation was of the opinion that the data base was not suitable for setting separate MRLs for triadimefon and triadimenol, the Committee decided to advance all Step 3 proposals to Step 5 and all Step 6 proposals to Step 8. The Delegation of Spain questioned the different values set for triadimefon and triadimenol on hops.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: artichoke, globe; banana; chick-pea (dry); currants, black, red, white; fodder beet; fodder beet leaves or tops; fruiting vegetables, cucurbits; hops, dry; mango; oat straw and fodder, dry; oats; onion, welsh; peas; peppers, sweet; pineapple; pome fruits; raspberries, red, black; spring onion; strawberry; sugar beet; sugar beet leaves or tops; tomato.

At Step 8: barley; barley straw and fodder, dry; coffee beans; eggs; grapes; meat; milks; poultry meat; rye; rye straw and fodder, dry; wheat; wheat straw and fodder, dry.

CYROMAZINE (169)

273. The Committee was informed that the 1992 JMPR had decided to maintain the definition of residue established in 1990.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: peppers.

HEXACONAZOLE (170)

274. The Committee decided to postpone consideration of the proposals, pending consideration by the JMPR of the need for animal transfer studies.

PROFENOFOS (171)

275. The Committee decided to postpone consideration of these proposals until the 28th CCPR, as profenofos was scheduled for evaluation at the 1994 JMPR.

BENTAZONE (172)

276. The Committee noted that bentazone was scheduled for residue evaluation at the 1994 JMPR. The Committee was also informed that the United States of America had provided GAP and residue data for field pea (dry) and dried peas to the JMPR. The Delegation of Germany noted that the 1991 Evaluation incorrectly identified German trials on broad beans as on common beans.

277. The Committee decided to postpone consideration of this compound pending the 1994 JMPR evaluation.

BUPROFEZIN (173)

278. The Committee noted that the compound was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1995 JMPR. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that a firm commitment to provide

required data was received from the manufacturer. The Committee decided to advance all proposals to Step 7B, awaiting the 1995 JMPR evaluation.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: cucumber; oranges, sweet, sour; tomato.

CADUSAFOS (174)

279. The Delegation of Germany repeated its reservation on potato, because the data base was considered insufficient. The Committee decided to advance the MRLs for banana and potato to Step 8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 8: banana; potato.

GLUFOSINATE-AMMONIUM (175)

280. The Committee noted that the compound was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 1994 JMPR. It had been recommended that the MRL for soya bean be withdrawn since the manufacturer no longer supported the use as soya bean desiccant. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR, however, indicated that there was another use (early season use) for soya bean which was supported by data, and deletion would not be justified. For many commodities new information was received.

281. The Delegation of The Netherlands, supported by the Delegation of France, reiterated its reservation concerning the residue definition, requesting that the residue definition be limited to the active ingredient only. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR supported by the former Chairman of the JMPR stated that JMPR would be reluctant to change the residue definition and invited member countries to provide information concerning their national residue definitions to the JMPR.

282. The Delegation of Germany stated that they had a reservation with regard to sunflower, requesting a MRL of 3 mg/kg instead of 2 mg/kg.

283. The Delegation of Germany and France were requested to submit their comments on rape seed and sunflower in writing.

284. It was decided to advance all proposals to Step 7B awaiting the residue evaluation in the 1994 JMPR and to leave the residue definition as it was for the time being.

Status of MRLs:

At Step 7B: banana; berries and other small fruits; citrus fruits; grapes; kiwifruit; maize; pome fruits; potato; rape seed; soya bean (dry); stone fruits; sunflower seed.

HEXYTHIAZOX (176)

285. The Committee was informed that the compound was scheduled for the 1994 JMPR for residue evaluation. At the last session of the CCPR the compound was discussed for the first time and reservations were expressed to almost all MRLs because of concern regarding the GAPs. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR informed the Committee that all GAPs were confirmed by the manufacturer and information on GAP was provided by The Netherlands, Germany and Spain. The Committee decided to advance all proposals to Step 7B awaiting the 1994 JMPR, and to discuss at the 1995 CCPR.

Status of MRLs

At Step 7B: apple; cherries; citrus fruits; common bean (pods and /or immature seeds); cucumber; currant, red, white; grapes; peach; pear; plums (including prunes); strawberry; tomato.

ABAMECTIN (177)

286. The Committee noted that abamectin had been evaluated as a new compound by the 1992 JMPR and was re-scheduled for both toxicological and residue evaluation by the 1994 JMPR. As the re-evaluation in 1994 would probably not affect the current MRL proposals, they were discussed at this session of the CCPR.

287. The Committee was informed that the CAC had recently adopted 4 MRLVDs resulting from veterinary uses of the related compound ivermectin, for which an ADI was estimated by the JECFA.

288. The Committee was also informed that avermectin was registered in Europe for veterinary use on non-lactating cattle, which could result in residues up to 0.02 mg/kg in cattle liver.

289. The Delegations of the United Kingdom and France considered the limit of determination at 0.01 mg/kg too low; the Committee decided to refer this item to the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Methods of Analysis.

290. The Delegation of The Netherlands was of the opinion that for the risk assessment all uses of this compound should be taken into account.

291. As the proposed MRLs did not cover veterinary uses, the Committee agreed to consider proposed MRLs as pesticides for the time being and to request the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF) also to consider this compound.

292. The Delegations of The Netherlands and Germany had the experience that residues in fruiting vegetables under glass strongly depend on the season of application.

293. The representative of the manufacturer informed the Committee that additional trials on tomatoes under glass in short daylight periods and other additional trials were in progress.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: cattle meat; cattle milk; cattle, edible offal of; citrus fruits; cotton seed; cucumber; goat meat; goat milk; goat, edible offal of; pear; peppers, sweet; tomato.

BIFENTHRIN (178)

294. The Committee noted that the compound had been evaluated as a new compound by the 1992 JMPR.

Hops, dry

295. The Delegations of Germany and France considered the available data base inadequate for the proposed MRL.

Cattle fat

296. The Delegation of France considered the proposed figure too low to accommodate registered uses on agricultural commodities.

Cattle milk

297. The Delegation of The Netherlands questioned whether the asterisk to the proposed MRL was justified.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: cattle fat; cattle milk; hops, dry.

At Step 5/8: barley; barley straw and fodder, dry; cattle meat; cattle, kidney; cattle, liver; chicken eggs; chicken fat; chicken meat; chicken, edible offal of; grapefruit; lemon; maize; maize fodder; maize forage; orange, sweet; pear; potato; strawberry; wheat; wheat forage (whole plant); wheat straw and fodder, dry.

DITHIANON (180)

298. The Delegation of Sweden indicated that the TMDI calculations exceeded the ADI. The Chairman of the 1992 JMPR informed the Committee that according to WHO calculation the TMDI did not exceed the ADI. The Delegations of Sweden and Germany were requested to advance information on intake preferably EDI calculations to WHO.

299. The Delegation of The Netherlands indicated that the proposed MRL for grapes should be raised to 5 mg/kg. The Delegation of France questioned the data base for grapes.

300. The Delegations of France and Sweden preferred an MRL of 3 mg/kg for pome fruits, while the Delegation of Germany indicated that processing studies were needed.

301. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that in the 1992 JMPR evaluations a hypothesis was proposed for the mechanism of kidney tumour formation. This hypothesis was not supported by data. The question was raised if additional information would be made available to WHO. The Joint WHO secretary indicated that the manufacturer should give this information.

302. The Committee decided to move the proposal for grapes and pome fruits from Step 3 to Step 5 and the proposals for the MRLs for the other commodities from Step 3 to Step 5/8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: grapes; pome fruits

At Step 5/8: cherries; hops, dry; mandarin; shaddocks or pomelos.

MYCLOBUTANIL (181)

303. The Committee noted that the compound was on the agenda of the 1992 JMPR for toxicological and residue evaluation. The Delegations of Germany and France questioned the U.S. and UK GAP for grapes and cherries. The Delegation of the United States of America would confirm their current GAP for all commodities, while the Delegation of the United Kingdom would confirm current GAP for pome fruits. The Committee decided to advance the MRLs of apricot, cherries, grapes, peach, plums (including prunes) and pome fruits to Step 5. The MRLs for the other commodities were advanced to Step 5/8.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: apricot; cherries; grapes; peach; plums (including prunes); pome fruits.

At Step 5/8: cattle meat; cattle milk; cattle, edible offal of; eggs; poultry meat; poultry, edible offal of; prunes.

PENCONAZOLE (182)

304. The Committee noted that penconazole was evaluated as a new compound by the 1992 JMPR.

Grapes

305. The Delegation of Germany informed the Committee that they had sent GAP data to the JMPR. Based on German trials, Germany required 0.5 mg/kg instead of the proposed figure of 0.2 mg/kg. The supporting residue data had not been available to the 1992 JMPR. The Delegation of Switzerland, on behalf of the manufacturer, informed the Committee that the data were available and would be provided for review by the 1995 JMPR.

Pome fruits

306. The Delegation of Germany informed the Committee that they had changed GAP and that their interpretation of the figures presented in the 1992 JMPR evaluations were different. They were requested to send written comments and their GAP to the 1995 JMPR.

Cucumber, strawberry, tomato

307. The Delegation of France requested clarification on GAP concerning glass houses or open field trials.

Status of MRLs

At Step 5: cucumber; grapes; melons, except watermelon; pome fruits; strawberry; tomato.

At Step 5/8: cattle meat; cattle milk; cattle, edible offal of; chicken eggs; chicken meat; hops, dry; nectarine; peach.

PROPHAM (183)

308. The Committee was informed that no residue information had been provided to the JMPR and decided to recommend deletion of propham. The Delegation of Sweden expressed concern as the compound had not been cleared toxicologically by the JMPR.

EXTRANEOUS MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS AT VARIOUS STEPS

309. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 2-1994, Part 2, List of EMRLs at various Steps. For future Sessions, the list should be preceded by explanatory notes as requested by the Committee. For discussions on general matters regarding EMRLs, see paras. 323-330.

ALDRIN AND DIELDRIN (001)

310. The Delegation of Norway expressed a general reservation against the proposed levels because the EMDI exceeds the ADI. The Delegation of Sweden informed the Committee that about 20,000 samples had been investigated and that only in a few cases residues above 0.02 mg/kg had been found. The Delegation of The Netherlands and the Representative of the EEC were of the opinion that the proposed EMRLs were, in general, too high and that criteria should be established for EMRL setting. The

Delegations of Norway and Sweden and the Representative of the EEC agreed to provide the JMPR with available monitoring data. The Delegation of the United States of America offered to submit monitoring data and the approach used to set levels for contaminants.

Status of EMRLs

At Step 5: bulb vegetables; citrus fruits; fruiting vegetables,cucurbits; leafy vegetables; legume vegetables; pome fruits; poultry meat; pulses; root and tuber vegetables.

Deletion: CXLs for asparagus; broccoli; brussels sprouts; cabbages, head; carrot; cauliflower; cucumber; egg plant; fruits; horseradish; lettuce, head; onion, bulb; parsnip; peppers; peppers, sweet; potato; radish; radish leaves.

CHLORDANE (012)

311. The Committee noted that for this compound no action was required.

ENDRIN (033)

312. The Representative of the EEC questioned in general the high levels of the proposed EMRLs with the observation that there was insufficient geographical spread of data.

Status of EMRLs

At Step 5: Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits; poultry meat.

Deletion: CXLs for apple; barley; cotton seed; cotton seed oil, crude; cotton seed oil, edible; eggs; meat; milks; rice, husked; rice, polished; sorghum; sweet corn (corn-on-the-cob); wheat.

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

313. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 94/10, which summarized current status and relevant CCPR recommendations concerning related compounds and combined lists of MRLs.

CYHEXATIN (067)/AZOCYCLOTIN (129)

314. The 25th CCPR had decided to harmonize the residue definition as the sum of azocyclotin and cyhexatin expressed as cyhexatin and to have two separate but identical lists. (See also paras. 170-173 and 234-235 for discussions on cyhexatin and on azocyclotin.)

TRIADIMEFON (133)/TRIADIMENOL (168)

315. See paras. 237-240 for discussions concerning "combined or separate lists" for triadimefon and triadimenol.

DIMETHOATE (027)/FORMOTHION (042)/OMETHOATE (055)

316. See paras. 100, 109 and 139-142 for discussions on dimethoate, formothion and on omethoate.

BENOMYL (069)/CARBENDAZIM (072)/THIOPHANATE METHYL (077)

317. The Delegation of the United Kingdom reserved its position concerning the deletion of the CXLs for thiophanate methyl when the MRLs for carbendazim reached Step 8. It was reported that benomyl was metabolized rapidly, therefore not found in crops, while thiophanate methyl was metabolized more slowly and found in crops. The Delegation also mentioned that the definition of carbendazim excluded

thiophanate methyl but did not exclude carbendazim derived from thiophanate methyl. The Delegation of Germany reported that they had not had problems in analysis as the method of analysis included a hydrolysis process.

ACEPHATE (095)/METHAMIDOPHOS (100)

318. Decision was postponed as this group was scheduled to be evaluated by the 1994 JMPR.

CARBOFURAN (096)/CARBOSULFAN (145)

319. The Committee was informed that the Working Group on Priorities recommended adding benfuracarb and furathiocarb. This group would be discussed at the next session as the 1993 JMPR evaluated these compounds.

METHOMYL (94)/THIODICARB (154)

320. The Committee had already decided on combined list for these compounds.

DEMETON-S-METHYL (73)/DEMETON-S-METHYLSULPHON (164)/OXYDEMETON-METHYL (166)

321. See paras. 267-270 for discussions on these compounds.

MANCOZEB (50)/DITHIOCARBAMATES (105)/METIRAM (186)

322. The Committee was requested to include in dithiocarbamates all EBDCs in the Codex system. The Committee noted that the EBDCs would be included in the texts of future working documents.

CONSIDERATION OF A SEPARATE LIST OF EXTRANEOUS RESIDUE LIMITS (Agenda Item 8.1 (f))

323. The Committee had before it document CX/PR 94/11 for consideration, which contained follow-up information and an extract of Supplement 1 to *Codex Alimentarius* Volume 2 which was published in early 1994.

324. The Committee recalled that the 25th Session of the CCPR had supported the elaboration of a separate list of EMRLs for those pesticides no longer used in agricultural practice or where no GAPs were recognized. The Committee was informed that the 20th Session of the Commission endorsed the establishment of separate list of EMRLs on the basis of contamination monitoring data as opposed to GAP.

325. The Committee noted that several countries, including Sweden, Norway, The Netherlands and the United States, and GEMS/Food had been accumulating monitoring data of those compounds contained in the EMRL list. It was pointed out that generally the residue levels of these compounds were decreasing. The Chairman of the 1992 JMPR noted the importance of not only data on detected residue levels but also information where no residue was found.

326. The Representative of the EEC, supported by The Netherlands, stressed the need for establishing criteria for the use of monitoring data. The EEC Representative noted that currently available data were not appropriately distributed throughout the world, and they were of the opinion that maximum values should not be used as EMRLs.

327. The Representative of the EEC, supported by The Netherlands, also proposed to include HCB and α- and β-HCH in the list. The Committee noted that for these compounds, monitoring data were available and the EEC had set residue limits for cereal grains, feedingstuffs and foodstuffs of animal origin. The FAO Joint Secretary of the JMPR stated that the JMPR would schedule evaluation of these compounds after the establishment of the criteria and if data were available.

328. The WHO Joint Secretary of the JMPR stated that in light of the importance of the ADI concerning safety, even insufficient toxicological data for those pesticides for which EMRLs had been, and would be, set would be useful.

329. It was pointed out that there were 3 MRLs for lindane followed by a letter "E". However, the Committee was reminded that since lindane was still registered for use, it was not included in the list.

330. The Committee agreed to include HCB and α- and β-HCH in the list. The Committee also agreed to invite governments by a Circular Letter to submit to the JMPR information on how monitoring data were handled in establishing EMRLs at national level (data requirements, methods of evaluation, etc.) and monitoring data including data indicating that no residues were detected.

RRECONSIDERATION OF GUIDELINE LEVELS (Agenda Item 8.2)

METHYL BROMIDE (052)

331. The Committee noted that no action was required.

ETHEPHON (106)

332. The Committee noted that the compound had been evaluated in April 1994.

PROPYLENETHIOUREA (150)

333. The FAO Joint Secretary of JMPR noted inconsistencies between ETU and PTU evaluations which would be revised at the 1994 JMPR.

EXPRESSION AND APPLICATION OF MRLS FOR FAT SOLUBLE PESTICIDES IN MEAT, ANIMAL FAT AND EDIBLE OFFAL (Agenda Item 9)

334. The Committee had before it documents, CX/PR 94/12 and CX/PR 94/12-add 1, 2 and 3. In introducing the document, the author, Mr. Kloet, focused first on the comments received from governments on the previous document, Appendix II of ALINORM 93/24A. These comments were mentioned and discussed in Appendix I of document CX/PR 94/12 and led to the conclusion that it would be appropriate to go forward with a more explicit proposal on how to deal with residues of fat soluble pesticides in the CCPR. The proposal, laid down in document CX/PR 94/12, was shaped in such a way that the administrative burden and the necessary changes in the present system would be as small as possible. The Annex I was added to show the scope of the required changes and the remaining questions that needed further assessment; Annex II was added to give insight into actual fat content of animal products. Annex III contained a reaction on the application of the system in practice.

335. Several delegations asked for clarification of various aspects of the document. In response to a question from the Delegation of Australia regarding potential changes in sampling, certification, inspection and cost effects, the author stated that no major implications were envisioned. Sampling and analysis for fat-soluble residues would remain to be preferentially performed in a carcass fat sample, as indicated in the Codex Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Meat and Poultry Products for Control Purposes. Sampling and analysis of meat as such would only occur if this was intended, or would be based on the necessity to analyze the product when not enough fat tissue was available.

336. One delegation expressed concern about the apparent problem in the interpretation of the proposal and mentioned the need for more time to study the consequences. The Representative of AOAC emphasized that the JMPR had always recommended MRLs on a product basis. He was of the opinion that application of calculation in deriving MRLs would mean infringement of the principles of the GATT Agreement. The author stated that the CCPR had already recommended the application of this type of MRL on meat (by applying it to the fat in the meat) and that a recommendation to amend this application by introducing a provision for low-fat meat would serve to overcome analytical and regulatory problems

in judging such a product. When the JMPR was of the opinion that the MRL on carcass fat could not be applied on meat, this should be indicated by confining the proposed MRL to animal fat and data on meat should be requested. It was also clarified that the proposal would not introduce general MRLs for fat of lean animals and would only alleviate problems in the application of MRLs that already existed. It was agreed that MRLs for meat as such should only be established on the basis of suitable data.

337. Some delegations expressed their full support to the document and the proposals it contained. The Delegation of the United Kingdom welcomed the proposal for striving for a system of double MRLs for animal products for the primary product as such and for the fat. This system would enable the Committee to establish an appropriate system for dealing with residues of intermediate lipophility.

338. The Delegation of Australia noted that MRLs for eggs in Codex were always expressed on a whole commodity basis, and that eggs were analyzed on a whole commodity basis. Australia was concerned that expression on a fat basis would incur additional analytical costs. The author stressed that this was a matter of choice, and this option was chosen to achieve consistency between primary and derived products, and also regarding the general policy towards residues in milk, meat and eggs.

339. The Committee decided to attach the revised proposals (Section 6 of CX/PR 94/12) to the report as Appendix II and to send out a Circular Letter inviting governments to send further comments. It was noted that because of the technical complexities involved in the issue and the proposals, it would be useful to send the document for discussion to the JMPR. The Secretariat would also be requested to bring the document and the proposals to the attention of the CCRVDF.

CONSIDERATION OF PESTICIDES USED BOTH AS PESTICIDES AND VETERINARY DRUGS (Agenda Item 10)

340. The Committee had for its consideration draft document CX/PR 94/13 as prepared by Australia, which was distributed immediately prior to the Session.

341. In presenting the working paper, the Delegation of Australia highlighted what they felt were potential problems in the elaboration of Codex maximum residue limits for compounds which were used as both pesticides and veterinary drugs.

342. It was noted by Australia that this included the consideration of issues related to the identification of responsibilities between JMPR and JECFA; consistency in the scientific principles used by both bodies; and liaison/coordination between the respective bodies.

343. While noting that flumethrin was scheduled for both toxicological and residue evaluation at the 1996 JMPR (also see para. 376), some delegations supported the compounds evaluation within the JMPR as it was primarily used as a pesticide. Other Delegations were of the opinion that flumethrin should be evaluated by JECFA as it was primarily used as an ectoparasiticide. The Delegation of Germany pointed out that the *Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual* defined ectoparasiticides as being pesticides. It was therefore suggested that these chemicals were clearly within the area of the CCPR.

344. In response to a statement that the evaluation of compounds within JECFA and the JMPR followed totally different approaches, the JMPR Secretariat confirmed that the general principles used by JECFA and JMPR for elaborating MRLs were similar, with differences in some details primarily in consideration of intake.

345. While agreeing to the importance of examining this issue in greater detail, the Committee decided to append the discussion paper to the report for circulation and government comment. The paper is attached to this report as Appendix III.

REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP ON ACCEPTANCES (Agenda Item 11)

346. The Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Acceptances (Conference Room Document 1) was presented by its Chairman, Mr Richard Mascall (United Kingdom). The Committee focused its discussions on the Summary of Recommendations contained in Appendix IV.

347. Two of the four agenda items discussed had resulted in no agreement being reached in the Working Group. The first was a set of draft guidelines for progressing MRLs in the Codex step system when dietary intake estimates exceeded the ADI. The second was a EEC proposal for addressing problems arising from differences in Good Agricultural Practice. The Committee agreed that both should be referred back to members of the Working Group for further discussion.

348. For the third agenda item the FAO Secretary of the JMPR presented a paper which provided information on the development and use of processing information at national level. The Committee agreed that the work done thus far by the FAO should be supported. The work should continue and a circular letter would be sent requesting member countries to submit data on processing data requirements as they were developed.

349. The fourth agenda item required the group to re-examine recommendation 3 of the 25th CCPR - JMPR (WHO Group) should develop guidelines for assessing the toxicological significance of dietary exposure where adverse health effects might result from single or short-term exposure; JMPR (WHO Group) should consider the definition of the ADI (or appropriate concept) in such cases - and further discuss the toxicological significance of dietary exposure. In the absence of a conclusion the Committee agreed that this topic should be put on the agenda of the 1995 *Ad Hoc* Group meeting.

350. The Committee agreed to the Summary of Recommendations, as contained in Appendix IV.

351. The Committee thanked the Working Group and its Chairman and decided to set up a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group which would function until the end of the next session under the present Chairman.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR METHODS OF RESIDUE ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING (Agenda Item 12)

SAMPLING FOR THE DETERMINATION OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN MILK, MILK PRODUCTS AND EGGS (Agenda Item 12.1)

352. The Committee had for its consideration document CX/PR 94/14, which was a summary of comments received on the above sampling paper as circulated under CL 1993/33-PR.

353. The Committee recalled its previous discussions concerning this issue, whereby the 25th CCPR Session (para. 227, ALINORM 93/24A) had agreed to send the previously elaborated proposed draft Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk, Dairy Products and Eggs to the Commission for adoption at Step 5, with the understanding that provisions related to the sampling of fish would not be considered.

354. The 20th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission adopted the proposed draft Method of Sampling at Step 5 (para. 142, ALINORM 93/40). Subsequent to this decision, the Method was amended slightly and circulated for government comments at step 6 under CL 1993/33-PR.

355. In discussing the document as presented in the Circular Letter, some delegations were of the opinion that several general principles within the paper were inconsistent with those principles contained in the previously adopted Codex Recommended Methods of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues (Section 3, Volume 2 of the Codex Alimentarius). Although it was explained that such differences could be attributed to different types of sampling procedures based on the relevant commodity examined, it was agreed that such inconsistencies between the texts should be harmonized.

356. The Committee decided that the draft Recommended Method of Sampling for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Milk, Milk Products and Eggs would be revised by the Delegations of the United Kingdom and the United States for consideration by the 27th Session of the CCPR. In making this decision, it was agreed that the document should take account of existing Codex texts as well as those comments summarized in document CX/PR 94/14.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS (Agenda Item 12.2)

357. The Chairman of the Working Group on Methods of Analysis, Mr. L. Tuinstra (The Netherlands), presented the report of the Working Group (Conference Room Document 2), which is attached as Appendix V. The Committee noted that the Working Group discussed the revision of the list of recommendations for methods of analysis, storage stability of analytical samples, limits of determination, screening methods, sampling, and accreditation programmes.

358. The Delegation of the United States of America informed the Committee that the *FDA Pesticide Analytical Manual*, which covered multi-residue analytical methods, would be made available to government laboratories free of charge.

359. Concerning the limit of determination (LOD), the Delegation of the United Kingdom stated that as the level of pesticide decreased, the uncertainty of the measurement and of the identification increased. The LOD was a level at or about which the uncertainty becomes too great to permit sound conclusions to be drawn. As the LOD was an indication of uncertainty it could not be considered to be a fixed analytical value but would vary from laboratory to laboratory, from analyst to analyst and from day to day. Thus, in some cases, the specific level indicated by an asterisk (ie, LOD MRLs) might not be achievable in routine monitoring for compliance with MRLs. In other cases, the data used to set a LOD MRL might have been derived by extrapolation - a practice which was now widely considered to be of doubtful validity.

360. The Delegation of the United Kingdom proposed that a simple and clear explanation of what was meant by the analytical term "limit of determination" should be prepared for the next session of the Committee and volunteered to prepare the document. The Chairman of the Working Group pointed out that the definition of the LOD had already been stated in ALINORM 89/24. The Committee agreed that a paper concerning LOD be made available to members of the Working Group for discussion next year.

361. The Committee also agreed that a paper prepared by Dr. Hill would be revised by the United Kingdom and the United States for the next meeting taking account comments made by the participants at the current meeting. The Committee agreed to discuss the revised paper at its next session.

362. The Committee thanked the Working Group for its efforts and decided to set up a new *Ad Hoc* Working Group under the Chairmanship of Mr. L. Tuinstra (The Netherlands) and Vice-Chairmanship of Mr. P. van Zoonen (The Netherlands).

IDENTIFICATION OF PROBLEMS RELATIVE TO PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN FOODS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (Agenda Item 13)

363. The Committee had for its consideration document CX/PR 94/15 and Conference Room Document 3 when discussing this agenda item, which included a discussion paper concerning this subject and the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries, respectively.

Information on Pesticides Used in Developing Countries

364. The FAO Representative summarized the discussion paper, (CX/PR 94/15) which was based on an updated list of data provided by developing countries in response to a request to identify major pesticides used in their areas. He emphasized that information on rejections due to violative pesticides was

one of the most important sources to identify problems facing importing and exporting countries in trade which should become an ongoing system for developing countries to establish priority issues of concern related to the use of pesticides.

365. Several countries expressed interest for the system currently used through the circulation of a Questionnaire requesting direct information from developing countries. However, they considered that the questionnaire should be revised to facilitate the transmission of data. They were also of the opinion that the collection of data through the report on problems arising from international trade was an additional way to obtain more information on pesticide residue issues of concern to developing countries.

366. Other delegations noted that not only information on violative pesticide residues in food moving in trade should be collected but also data concerning the acceptance and rejection of commodities by importing and exporting countries. The availability of data through the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification was also highlighted.

367. The Committee agreed that the Questionnaire, to be revised by the Working Group at the earliest opportunity, should be transmitted to the Codex Secretariat for its circulation, government comment and consideration at the next Session of the CCPR.

Report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Pesticide Residue Problems in Developing Countries

368. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group (Conference Room Document 3) was presented to the Committee by its Chairman, Ms. Salwa Dogheim (Egypt).

369. The Committee was informed that a large number of developing and other countries attended the meeting and that the Working Group had discussed its new terms of reference following the recommendation arising from the previous session of the CCPR held in Havana. In particular, three main points were highlighted in the new proposed terms of reference for the working group;

- the collection of data arising from reports of international trade

- collaboration with developed countries and manufacturers in assistance which should be provided in the elaboration of GAP data

- collaboration between regional networks in developing countries.

370. The Committee agreed to the following revised terms of reference for the Group:

1 To identify major pesticides used in developing countries and the food crops on which they are used.

2 To provide information that would allow for the elaboration of MRLs for pesticides used in individual countries, through the process of requesting developing countries to provide information on pesticides in current use in their countries.

3 To identify pesticide residues issues of concern to developing countries through the collection of data arising from reports on violative and non violative pesticide residues in food moving in international trade, elaborated by importing and exporting countries.

4 To encourage the participation of developed countries and manufacturers in the working group in order to facilitate the elaboration of data necessary to support the work requested by the CCPR in the process of harmonization of MRLs of interest to the trade of developing countries.

5 To emphasize and increase collaboration on basis of regional networks between developing countries in concerning pesticide residue problems.

6 To liaise with Codex Regional Coordinating Committee and the Codex Committee on Food Import and Export Inspection and Certification where appropriate.

371. The Committee also agreed that the *Ad Hoc* Working Group would continue the collection of information on pesticide residue problems in developing countries, according the new terms of reference and under the Chairmanship of Ms. Salwa Dogheim (Egypt), with a view towards proposing priorities for review by the CCPR Working Group on Priorities.

CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITIES (Agenda Item 14)

372. The report of the Working Group on Priorities (Conference Room Document 4) was presented to the Committee by its Chairman, Ms. J. Taylor (Canada).

373. In discussing the report of the Working Group, the Committee was informed that tebufenozide was suggested for evaluation at the 1995 JMPR by New Zealand, with the understanding that data could be supplied by the manufacturer in a timely manner. The Delegation of Israel had also proposed that fenbuconazole be evaluated by the JMPR at the earliest opportunity, and indicated that they could likely supply data in time for the 1996 JMPR.

374. The Committee was informed of those compounds scheduled for evaluation at the 1994, 1995 and 1996 meetings of the JMPR. The Committee agreed that these lists of compounds should be attached to the report of the meeting for information (see Appendix VI).

375. The Committee also noted other issues discussed at the Working Group meeting as to the identification and updating of the list of compounds scheduled for periodic review. This included a discussion of possible criteria for the prioritization of compounds for such a review. A Table reflecting the application of these criteria to a representative group of compounds was presented to the Committee under Conference Room Document 8.

376. In discussing the scheduling of flumethrin for the 1996 JMPR, the Committee decided that its consideration should be postponed for the time being pending the development of a position paper on the Consideration of Chemicals Used Both as Pesticides and Veterinary Drugs (see para. 343).

Status of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Priorities

377. As current activities of the Working Group were primarily limited to the tracking of compounds for priority review by JMPR, the Committee agreed with a suggestion of the Working Group Chair to continue its deliberations on the basis of informal discussions within a small group held between and during future sessions of the CCPR. This decision was taken with the understanding that the Working Group might need to be re-convened in the future.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 15)

378. The Committee had before it CX/PR 94/2, which contained Medium-Term Objectives by Programme Area as Appendix I and the Committee's current status of work as Annex 1 of Appendix I.

379. The Secretariat informed the Committee that as indicated in CX/PR 94/2, all Codex Committees had been requested by the Commission to consider their medium-term objectives as a standing agenda item. It had been decided by the Commission that a report on the current status of work should be made to the Executive Committee on a regular basis, to be reviewed in the light of the medium-term objectives. The Secretariat highlighted those medium-term objectives relevant to the CCPR, namely, contaminants (including pesticide residues), risk assessment, and acceptances. The Committee was asked to propose amendments to these objectives and consider the current status of work.

380. The Committee was reminded that a few years ago the CCPR had considered 2 separate papers on fumigants and on grain protectants other than fumigants and was of the opinion that the work had been completed. Therefore, the Committee agreed to delete item 176 from the list of current status of work of the CCPR.

381. The Committee decided to change the number 0 in "Step" column of item 178, pesticides for which the ADI was established more than 10 years ago; review to 9 to indicate that this was now a continuing activity.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION

382. The Chairman informed the Committee that its 27th Session would be held in The Hague, The Netherlands, from 24 April - 1 May 1995.

SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK

Subject	Step	For Action By:	Document Reference
Draft MRLs	8	21st CAC	ALINORM 95/24A-Add.1
Proposed Draft MRLs and EMRLs	5	21st CAC	ALINORM 95/24A-Add.1
Consideration of the 1994 proposals for the Priority Lists	-	41st CCEXEC Governments	ALINORM 95/24, Appendix VI
Draft MRLs kept at Step 7	7	Governments JMPR CCPR	ALINORM 95/24
Draft MRLs	6	Governments Secretariat 27th CCPR	CX/PR 2-1994
Proposed Draft MRLs and EMRLs	3	Governments Secretariat 27th CCPR	CX/PR 2-1994
Method of sampling for the determination of pesticide residues in milk, milk products and eggs	7	The United Kingdom/ The United States Governments 27th CCPR	ALINORM 95/24, paras. 352-356
Combined list of MRLs for related compounds	-	JMPR Secretariat	ALINORM 95/24 paras. 312-322
Expression of fat-soluble pesticides	-	Governments The Netherlands 27th CCPR	ALINORM 95/24, Appendix II & paras. 334-339
Compounds used both as pesticides and veterinary drugs	-	Governments Australia 27th CCPR	ALINORM 95/24, Appendix III & paras. 340-345
Harmonization of the terms & definitions with those of other bodies	-	Governments United Kingdom/ United States 27th CCPR	ALINORM 95/24, para. 361, Appendix V
Identification of pesticides and pesticide/commodity combinations of interest to developing countries	-	Egypt Cuba Secretariat Governments	ALINORM 95/24, paras. 364-367
Review of pesticides for which the ADI was established more than 10 years ago	-	Governments JMPR	ALINORM 93/24A, Appendix V, Annex II
Review of global and regional diets, national EDI	-	Governments FAO/WHO Joint Secretaries of JMPR	ALINORM 95/24, Appendix IV
Methods of Analysis	-	Governments	ALINORM 95/24, Appendix V

Pages 49 - 66

contained Appendix I - List of Participants

REVISED PROPOSED CODEX APPROACH TO THE EXPRESSION AND APPLICATION OF MRLS FOR FAT-SOLUBLE PESTICIDES IN ANIMAL PRODUCTS

GENERAL

The fat-solubility of the residue is indicated in the definition of the residue. MRLs are preferably expressed on the basis of the primary products. Provisions regarding the application of these MRLs to (derived) products with specified fat contents are necessary. Proposals to extend the present provisions are mentioned here. This is effectuated by adding a suffix F after the MRL, where appropriate.

The suffix F is a factor which introduces provisions for the interpretation of the maximum level of residues in (derived) products with other fat contents. The rules regarding the calculation of higher fat-related maximum levels or lower product-related maximum levels from established MRLs do not apply when the MRL is set on the lower limit of analytical determination, indicated by (*). Therefore in such a case the suffix F should not be used. Existing situations for especially milk need evaluation.

The proposed approach will require specific attention to the establishment of specific MRLs for meat. This shall only be done on a suitable data base. The application of MRLs which are based on data on carcase fat and which are presently expressed as meat with an MRL for (fat), and which are recommended to be applied to fat in meat, is proposed to be amended by adding a provision for the application to low-fat meats. Provisions are also introduced to be able to deal with residues of intermediate lipophililty.

SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

The present Codex MRLs for animal products are retained as they are, with only some slight changes in the suffixes, as follows:

- **Meat:** Where the suffix (fat) follows an MRL for meat, this is changed to the suffix F, and the word (fat) is added after "meat".
- **Milk:** Remains the same, as the suffix F is already used.
- **Eggs:** When the residue is considered fat-soluble (as mentioned in the residue definition), a suffix F is added to the MRL.

In the Explanatory notes to the Codex MRLs, the following text is introduced:

Qualification of MRLs

F (following MRLs)	: The residue is fat-soluble. The rules are applicable as explained below as well as in the introductions to this part of the guide and to Volume 2 of the Codex Alimentarius.
(fat) (following meat)	: The MRL applies to the fat of the meat; other provisions are applicable when indicated by F following the MRL.

Explanatory notes on the expression and application of MRLs for fat-soluble residues of pesticides in animal products

A fat soluble residue is indicated in the definition of the residue. When also the suffix F is attached to an MRL, the following rules apply:

1.1 In the case of milks, the MRL is expressed on a product basis and applies to raw and standardised whole cream milk.

The MRL for cow's milk is based on an assumed fat content of 4%.

1.2 For milks with a fat content higher than 4%, and for milk products with a fat content of 2% or more, the residues are related to the fat. The MRL shall in that case be 25 times the MRL specified for milk. For milk products with a fat content lower than 2%, the maximum level of residues in the product is taken as half that set for milk.

1.3 When a separate MRL is defined for milk fat in conjunction with an MRL for milk, the residue level shall be related to the fat in milk products with a fat content higher than the ratio (as a percentage) between the product-based MRL and the fat-based MRL. For milk products with a fat content which is equal to or lower than this ratio, the MRL for milk shall apply (taking into account a concentration factor, when appropriate).

2.1 In the case of meats, the MRL is expressed on a (deboned) product basis. Normally, the MRL shall not be set at a lower level than 0.01 mg/kg. The MRL for meat also applies to meat products with a fat content of 10% and lower. In the case of meats and meat products (including animal fats) with a fat content higher than 10%, the residues are related to the fat. The maximum level of residues in the product shall then be 10 times the MRL specified for meat.

2.2 When only an MRL for meat (fat) or animal fat is specified, this MRL also applies to the residues in the fat of meats and meat products with a fat content higher than 10%. For meats and meat products with a fat content of 10% and lower the residue is related to the (deboned) product; in that case the maximum level of the residues is one-tenth of the MRL specified for fat.

2.3 When a separate MRL is defined for (specified) fat in conjunction with an MRL for meat, the residue level shall be related to the fat in meats and meat products with a fat content higher than the ratio (as a percentage) between the product-based MRL and the fat-based MRL. For meats and meat products with a fat content which is equal or lower than this ratio, the MRL for meat shall apply.

3.1 The MRL for eggs is expressed on the basis of the shelled product. For chicken eggs a fat content of 10% is assumed. Normally, the MRL shall not be set lower than 0.01 mg/kg. The MRL for eggs also applies to egg products with a fat content of 10% or lower. For eggs and egg products with a fat content higher than 10%, the residue level is related to the fat. In that case the maximum level of the residues is 10 times the MRL for eggs.

3.2 When a separate MRL is defined for egg fat in conjunction with an MRL for eggs, the residue level shall be related to the fat in eggs and egg products with a fat content higher than the ratio (as a percentage) between the product-based MRL and the fat-based MRL. For egg products with a fat content equal to or lower than this ratio, the MRL for eggs shall apply.

CONSIDERATION OF PESTICIDES USED BOTH AS PESTICIDES AND VETERINARY DRUGS

BACKGROUND

With the comparatively recent establishment of the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods, and its concomitant involvement in setting MRLs for certain chemicals, has come the need to make sure that the work of JECFA and JMPR in regard to MRLs articulate in a sound and logical fashion.

It is clearly desirable that the work of the various parts of Codex are based on the same or similar general conceptual bases, and it is at overlap points between committees that anomalies are most likely to become apparent. It is quite possible that, because some chemicals are used both as agricultural pesticides and in veterinary applications, MRLs will be arrived at for certain chemical/commodity combinations by both JECFA and JMPR.

The present situation is that applications for a given chemical involving ingestion of a sprayed crop or horticultural product by a food-producing animal, or external treatments on food-producing animals e.g. ectoparasiticides, are evaluated by JMPR and internal uses, e.g. oral treatment with a veterinary product, are evaluated by JECFA.

If these two bodies propose MRLs that are not the same, and they are both officially promulgated, the credibility of Codex as a whole will suffer. There is also the practical difficulty as to which of the two MRLs is to be regarded as the one to be used.

The 25th Session of the CCPR (1991) requested (arising out of discussion on thiabendazole) that both JECFA and JMPR discuss the potential for problems when a chemical is used both as a pesticide and for veterinary purposes (ALINORM 93/24A, paragraph 88). The 1993 JMPR report recommended that procedures be developed to ensure consistency and appropriate exchange of information among the committees involved. (1993 JMPR Report, item 2.5).

ISSUES

The issue is what steps should be taken in order to ensure that the work of JECFA and JMPR in regard to MRLs is consistent, to the appropriate extent; and that no more than one MRL for each chemical/commodity combination is promulgated by CAC.

CONSIDERATION

The problem would seem to have three parts:

1. definition, i.e. the areas of responsibility of each of the two bodies should be confirmed or redefined;

2. technical, i.e. are the scientific principles for determining MRLs by the two bodies as consistent as they can reasonably be?

3. liaison, i.e. there is merit in implementing a system whereby the Secretariats of each body liaise, with a view to no more than one MRL for each chemical/commodity combination being put up for approval by CAC, and, ideally, published in the one document.

Definition

CCPR's approach is believed to be the same as that adopted by regulatory authorities in a number of member countries e.g. the USA, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, but the situation in other countries is not known. For ease of administration in the various member countries, the current practice of CCPR handling external animal treatments needs to be confirmed by both committees or the demarcation of responsibilities jointly redefined.

The area of chemicals in aquaculture will need to be addressed.

To the extent of JECFA is understood to have a greater backlog of unfinished evaluations than JMPR at the present time, it would seem generally desirable not to adopt arrangements which will suddenly increase its workload.

Technical

In general, it would appear that JMPR and JECFA would arrive at similar MRLs if provided with the same data. There are, however, differences in the principles used by the two groups to establish MRLs.

With JMPR, MRLs are estimated with a view that an MRL should be no higher than necessary. JECFA, however, may on occasion estimate an MRL at the level determined by the ADI, where residues cannot be measured by a reliable analytical method. This approach has the potential in some cases to produce higher MRLs than would arise from a determination by JMPR.

It would be desirable if the principles upon which assessment is founded could be harmonised between the two committees.

Liaison

Even when the division of responsibilities between the two committees is clarified, potential still exists for each committee to propose different MRLs for the one chemical/commodity. The 1993 JMPR Report recommends liaison arrangements between the Secretariats of the two expert committees and a coordination role for the Codex Secretariat which should minimise the chance of duplicate MRLs.

RECOMMENDATION

It is suggested that:

1. areas of possible overlap in regard to MRLs be jointly investigated by the Secretariats of JECFA and JMPR, and proposals regarding the delineation of the areas of responsibility of each body be forwarded for consideration at the next meetings of JECFA and JMPR;

2. the Secretariats of JECFA and JMPR look at the scientific bases of the determinations of MRLs by the two bodies. If there are any differences, these should be drawn to the notice of the next meeting of JECFA and JMPR. If the differences cannot be resolved at those meetings, the establishment of a joint JECFA/JMPR working group be considered;

3. recommendations of the 1993 JMPR Report on "Concomitant Pesticide and Veterinary Uses of Chemicals (Item 2.5)" be supported.

AD HOC WORKING GROUP ON ACCEPTANCES

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends that:

1. The Commission should be invited to consider a meeting through the appropriate international fora to further consider the need for revision of regional and global diets, based upon dietary survey results supplied by member countries. Member countries should continue to submit national food consumption data promptly to WHO and FAO to assist this process.

2. The Commission should be requested to consider the revision of the *Guidelines on the Prediction of the Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues* as a matter of urgency.

3. Members of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Acceptances should be invited to consider, and to provide written comments on, the draft guidelines for progressing MRLs through the Codex Step system when dietary intake estimates exceed an ADI. Comments should be sent to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group.

4. Members of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Acceptances should be invited to consider, and to provide written comments on, the EEC document proposing a procedure for dealing with radically different GAPs. Comments should be sent to the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group.

REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* WORKING GROUP ON METHODS 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 organizations attended:

Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iran, Ireland, Mexico, Morocco, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States of America, Zambia, AOAC International, GIFAP, ISO, and OIV.

REVISION OF THE LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR METHODS OF ANALYSIS

1. A revised list of recommendations for methods of analysis was discussed by the Working Group. The elaboration of these recommendations is a continuous and ongoing activity of the Working Group. Information was received on most of the compounds for which special attention was asked in last year's meeting. At present, 187 pesticides are given in the list of methods of analysis. For one pesticide, cycloxidim (179), no method can be given because no methods are available in the open literature. An up-date of the list will be prepared and subsequently transmitted to the participants for comments at the end of 1994; a finalized version of the recommendations will then be made available to the Working Group before next years meeting. The participants are requested to make available information on the following new compounds: ethofenprox (184) and fenpropathrin (185). In the forthcoming years a more comprehensive revision, based on a new set of criteria for the choice of methods for the list of recommendations, will be considered. Therefore it is necessary that the choice of methods in a future major revision of the list should be based on a set of performance criteria to be elaborated by the Working Group in the near future. The wording "recommendations for methods of analysis" should be seen in the light of paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2 of the document.

STORAGE STABILITY OF ANALYTICAL SAMPLES

2. A revision of the GIFAP guidelines on the stability of samples during storage was presented. The revised document will be sent out for comments. The Working Group noted that the UK and the USA also had information available on this topic. This information will be considered in next year's session. The Working Group suggested that the scope of the document should also include sample preparation and proposed to incorporate the information in a future revision of section 4.2 of volume 2 of *Codex Alimentarius*.

LIMITS OF DETERMINATION

3. In the 25th session the determination limits for several compounds were referred to the Working Group. Review of the existing methodology as given in the Recommended Methods of Analysis resulted in:

Phorate (112): 0.05 mg/kg
Prochloraz (142): 0.05 mg/kg
Bentazone (172): 0.05 mg/kg
Glufosinate-ammonium (175): 0.05 mg/kg.

The Working Group however, was of the opinion that a realistic lower practical level for Glufosinate-ammonium (175) is approximately 0.1 mg/kg.

4. The term "limit of determination" had to be seen in the light of the Codex definitions of "limits of determination" and of "lower practical level" (ALINORM 89/24, Appendix III, page 60) and the concept of "at or about the limit of determination", denoted by (*) after an MRL.

5. The Working Group hoped that next year for methidathion (51) analytical data would be available for those commodities for which higher detection limits were proposed, so that a more uniform limit of detection can be established.

SCREENING METHODS

6. In response to a previous request for methodology for the screening of pesticides as a basis for go/no go decisions only few suggestion were received. Apparently, older methods based on fungal growth and cholinesterase inhibition have ceased to be used in common analytical practice while methods based on immunological techniques are not yet widely practiced and validated. The Working Group once more endorsed its views that "simplified methods" based on e.g. paper chromatography or colorimetry do not meet the basic requirements for the determination of residues for regulatory purposes. Therefore these methods are outside the scope of the recommendations for methods of analysis. The Working Group recognized the need for such simple screening methods and advised that countries needing such methods should clearly indicate to the Working Group the pesticide/matrix combination(s) concerned. In these cases the group could try to indicate a way to proceed. For the time being the participants agreed to remove the item from the agenda for coming years.

SAMPLING

7. In the 25th session the Working Group noted that there were inconsistencies in the definitions concerning sampling used by Codex and those used by IUPAC. It was felt that harmonisation of the CCPR definitions and guidelines from other Codex Committees and other bodies such as IUPAC, ISO, IDF, CEN, GIFAP and AOAC should be sought. Dr Hill prepared a preliminary review of the recommendations made for sampling, and of the terms and definitions used by CCPR and other organisations as a first step towards harmonization. Comments from participants and information from other bodies are invited by 30 September 1994, in order to finalize the document so that it can be considered by the CCPR.

ACCREDITATION PROGRAMMES

8. The Canadian delegate presented a document on Guidelines for the accreditation of pesticide residue testing laboratories as used in the Canadian laboratory accreditation programme. The Canadian programme involves proficiency testing.

9. The Working Group noticed an increased interest worldwide for accredition of laboratories. In Europe, Eurachem is uniting the different programmes in the several EC countries. The Working Group was of the opinion that these programmes improve the quality of pesticide residue measurements considerably in both private and governmental laboratories.

10. The Working Group agreed that this item should be included on the agenda of future meetings of the Working Group in order to, at least, maintain awareness of the topic.

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 1994 to 1996.

FINAL AGENDA OF THE 1994 JMPR

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
NEW COMPOUNDS	NEW COMPOUNDS
Clethodim Fenpropimorph	Clethodim Fenpropimorph Metiram Tebuconazole
Tebuconazole Teflubenzuron Tolclofos-methyl	Tolclofos-methyl
PERIODIC RE-EVALUATIONS	PERIODIC RE-EVALUATIONS
	Aldicarb (117)
Chlorfenvinphos (014) Chlormequat (015)	Chlormequat (015) Parathion-methyl (059)
Phosmet (103)	Phosalone (060)

FINAL AGENDA OF THE 1994 JMPR (cont.d)

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
EVALUATIONS	EVALUATIONS
Abamectin (177)	Abamectin (177)
	Acephate (095)
Azocylotin (129)	
	Bentazone (172)
	Captan (007)
Cyhexatin (067)	
	Chlorpyriphos-methyl (090)
	Diazinon (022)
	Dicofol (026)
	Fentin (040)
	Folpet (041)
	Glufosinate ammonium (175)
	Glyphosate (158)
	Heptachlor (043)
	Hexythiazox (176)
	Imazalil (110)
	Methamidophos (100)
	Methidathion (051)
	Monocrotophos (054)
Phorate (112)	
	Primiphos-methyl (054)
Tecnazene (115)	Tecnazene (115)

TENTATIVE AGENDA OF THE 1995 JMPR

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
NEW COMPOUNDS	NEW COMPOUNDS
Chlorpropham Fenarimol Fenpyroximate Haloxyfop	Chlorpropham Fenarimol Fenpyroximate Haloxyfop
PERIODIC RE-EVALUATION	PERIODIC RE-EVALUATION
Benomyl (069)/Carbendazim (072)/ Thiophanate methyl (077) Cartap (097) Fenthion (039) Parathion (058) Parathion-methyl (059) Piperonyl-butoxide (062) Quintozene (064)	Cartap (097) Fenthion (039) Quintozene (064)
EVALUATIONS	EVALUATIONS
Captan (007) Ethephon (106) Flusilazole (165) Folpet (041) Iprodione (111) Vinclozolin (159)	Azinphos-methyl (002) Buprofezin (173) Metalaxyl (138) Parathion (058) Penconazole (182) Triadimefon (133)

TENTATIVE AGENDA OF THE 1996 JMPR

Toxicological evaluation	Residue evaluation
NEW COMPOUNDS	NEW COMPOUNDS
Flumethrin	Flumethrin
Tebufenozide	Tebufenozide
	Teflubenzuron
PERIODIC RE-EVALUATION	PERIODIC RE-EVALUATION
Carbaryl (008)	
Carbofuran (096)	
	Chlorfenvinphos (014)
2,4-D (020)	
Dimethoate (027)/Omethoate (055)/ Formothion (042)	Dimethoate (027)/Omethoate (055)/ Formothion (042)
Dodine (084)	
Ferbam	Ferbam
Guazatine (114)	Guazatine (114)
Mevinphos (053)	
	Phosmet (103)
	Thiram
Ziram	Ziram
EVALUATIONS	EVALUATIONS
	Propoxur (075)