

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

Agenda item 8

CRD08

June 2023

Original language only

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

54th Session

Beijing, P.R. China

26 June - 1 July 2023

REPORT OF THE VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE JOINT CCPR-CCRVDF WORKING GROUP

INTRODUCTION

1. A virtual meeting chaired by the United States took place to provide a status update of the work performed by the Joint CCPR-CCRVDF electronic working group (EWG). A report of the electronic working group was previously prepared and disseminated and a circular letter was issued seeking comments from members and observers.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

2. The EWG Chair began the discussion by stating that the goal of the virtual meeting was to present the work of the EWG and address comments that had been made in response to the circular letter with the goal of reaching agreement on the recommendations of the working group as modified by the 26th Session of CCRVDF (CCRVDF26, 2023). The EWG Chair emphasized the importance of agreeing with the recommendations of the EWG, so that the EWG could begin their work.
3. The EWG Chair provided a history of the EWG, the work that had been conducted, and the conclusions made by CCRVDF26. For a detailed account of this information, please refer to the report of the EWG 1.
4. Next, the EWG Chair presented comments made in response to the circular letter and provided some thoughts for consideration and recommendations to CCPR.
5. The EWG Chair explained that, regarding revised Recommendation 5, three comments were made that indicated a desire to conduct a JECFA or JMPR re-evaluation of the harmonized MRL that might be recommended by the EWG to CCPR and/or CCRVDF. The EWG Chair stated that a JECFA or JMPR assessment of a harmonized MRL value was discussed during CCRVDF26. At this time, the JECFA Secretariat noted that, in cases where there are divergent MRLs for dual use compounds, both MRL values had been determined to be health protective by JECFA and JMPR. The JECFA Secretariat continued that asking for an additional risk assessment might be superfluous and could be removed from the original recommendation from the EWG. After this advice from the JECFA Secretariat, CCRVDF decided to remove the portion of Recommendation 5 that called for a JECFA or JMPR assessment of the harmonized MRL value. The EWG Chair noted that the revised Recommendation 5 is purposely broad and open. As written, the recommendation does not preclude consultation with JECFA and JMPR if needed. To that end, the EWG Chair recommended that CCPR endorse revised Recommendation 5 and noted that, within the EWG, members can determine, on a case by case basis, whether advice from JECFA or JMPR is needed. Regarding the use of contemporary data, the EWG chair noted that this might be challenging as new toxicology data may not be available for some older compounds. The EWG Chair recommended language about contemporary data not be added to revise Recommendation 5, noting that this also could be discussed on a case by case basis within the EWG.
6. The next comment was a recommendation that, if a harmonized MRL value is developed, then Codex should retain a reference to the two previous MRL values so that members could use those values within their national programs. The EWG Chair agreed that retaining this information is valuable but suggested that, instead of changing the recommendations, this approach could be discussed within the EWG as part of the work conducted under revised Recommendation 5.

7. The next comment was a suggestion to limit the list of dual use compounds described by revised Recommendation 4 to those compounds that have at least one set of MRLs or to those compounds that are currently in the Step procedure of either CCPR or CCRVDF. The EWG Chair explained that this topic was discussed at CCRVDF26. CCRVDF noted that, by limiting the list to compounds that have at least one set of Codex MRLs, we might miss the opportunity to identify compounds that have dual uses when they are added to one of the committee's priority list. For this reason, CCRVDF decided to keep the contents of the list broad so that both committees could identify compounds with dual uses when they are added to their priority list. Because of this, the EWG Chair recommend that CCPR not limit the contents of list of dual use compounds.
8. The final comment presented by the EWG Chair was a suggestion to add an additional recommendation as follows:

“Examine the classification of commodities of animal origin in both CCPR and CCRVDF as to identify and list food descriptors that would need to be harmonised, and recommend on a case-by-case basis, a single, harmonized food descriptor for the relevant commodity(ies), i.e., the part of the commodity to which the CXL applies”
9. The EWG Chair expressed that he thought the additional term of reference added by CCRVDF26 addressed this issue: “Task the joint EWG to consider matters related to harmonized food descriptors to be used by JECFA and JMPR.” The member country who made the suggestion stated that it might strengthen the call to harmonize descriptions if the language was included as a recommendation. Following advice from the Codex Secretariat, the EWG Chair proposed that, instead of adding a new recommendation, the working group could include the suggested language in the report of the virtual meeting so that the EWG could refer to it when considering matters related to harmonized food descriptors. The member country stated that this approach was agreeable.
10. Another member country asked for further clarification on the new term of reference regarding harmonized food descriptors, noting that the 53rd Session of CCPR (CCPR 53, 2022) had agreed to adopt the CCRVDF definitions for edible offal, fat, meat, and muscle. The EWG Chair agreed that CCPR previously agreed to adopt those CCRVDF definitions but noted that there might be additional work to be done on this topic. As an example, the EWG Chair noted that several terms are used to describe skin with adhering fat for poultry. The EWG Chair explained that the task for the EWG is to look beyond those terms previously harmonized and determine if any additional terms could benefit from harmonization.

CONCLUSIONS

11. The participants of the virtual meeting agreed with the recommendations made by the EWG, as modified by CCRVDF26, and the additional terms of reference added by CCRVDF26.
12. Recommendations from the Joint CCPR CCRVDF EWG, as modified by CCRVDF26:
 1. Ask JECFA and JMPR to continue working towards harmonizing their risk assessment methodologies, including ways to establish single, harmonized acceptable daily intake values and MRLs for dual-use compounds. This might include exploring the feasibility of a joint evaluation of dual-use compounds and the formation of Joint JMPR/JECFA EWG;
 2. Ask JECFA and JMPR to consider ways in which data can be shared between the two expert committees. This might include JECFA/JMPR asking sponsors to consent to data sharing upon submission of the data packages;
 3. Continue to support the current joint EWG to identify and prioritize issues affecting both committees and recommend ways to address the issues and to inform CAC accordingly;
 4. Develop a list of compounds with dual use as a pesticide and veterinary drug for which no or only one Codex MRL has been established and that member countries will provide the information to populate this list;
 5. Identify dual-use compounds that have different Codex MRLs for a similar edible commodity of animal origin and recommend on a case-by-case basis, a single, harmonized MRL(s) for the compound(s) and affected commodity(ies). The EWG might recommend that CCRVDF/CCPR consider selecting the higher MRL value;
13. Additional terms of reference:
 1. Continue the work of the EWG chaired by the United States of America and co-chaired by Brazil;
 2. Consider the matter related to harmonized food descriptors to be used by JECFA and JMPR;
 3. Recommendations 4 and 5 above.

RECOMMENDATIONS

14. Based on the agreement reached within the virtual meeting, the EWG recommends that CCPR endorse the recommendations made by the EWG, as modified by CCRVDF26, and the additional terms of reference added by CCRVDF26.