COMISIÓN DEL CODEX ALIMENTARIUS

S

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Alimentación y la Agricultura

Organización Mundial de la Salud

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Roma, Italia - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - Correo electrónico: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

Tema 9 del programa **CX/PR 25/56/11**

Agosto de 2025

PROGRAMA CONJUNTO FAO/OMS SOBRE NORMAS ALIMENTARIAS

COMITÉ DEL CODEX SOBRE RESIDUOS DE PLAGUICIDAS

Quincuagésima sexta reunión
Santiago (Chile)
8-13 de septiembre de 2025

ESTABLECIMIENTO DE LOS CALENDARIOS Y LISTAS DE PRIORIDADES DEL CODEX EN MATERIA DE PLAGUICIDAS PARA EVALUACIÓN POR LA JMPR

(Preparado por el Grupo de trabajo por medios electrónicos sobre prioridades presidido por Australia)

ANTECEDENTES

1. Después de la quincuagésima quinta reunión del CCPR en 2024, se remitieron a la Comisión las listas de prioridades para la Reunión Conjunta sobre Residuos de Plaguicidas (JMPR) de 2025, y se restableció el Grupo de trabajo por medios electrónicos (GTE) para seguir desarrollando la lista de prioridades para la JMPR de 2026.

2. En septiembre de 2024 se inició la actividad del GTE sobre el establecimiento de los calendarios y las listas de prioridades en materia de evaluación de plaguicidas para la JMPR de 2026 y años posteriores. Se pidió a los miembros del GTE que presentaran nuevas propuestas y observaciones sobre las propuestas existentes o los compuestos que figuran para evaluación periódica, a más tardar el 30 de noviembre de 2024. Tras el anuncio de que la CCPR56 se aplazaría de mayo a septiembre de 2025, se abrió una segunda ronda de observaciones en el GTE, debiendo presentar las observaciones finales el 16 de mayo de 2025.

3. La carta circular CL 2024/89-PR se distribuyó en enero de 2025, con el 25 de marzo de 2025 como plazo para la presentación de observaciones. En esa circular se presentaban los Calendarios y las listas de prioridades de plaguicidas del CCPR (Cuadros 1 a 4) que estaban vigentes en diciembre de 2024. Se alentó encarecidamente a los miembros y observadores del Codex a que presentaran observaciones sobre los calendarios y las listas de prioridades de plaguicidas del CCPR para evaluación/reevaluación por la JMPR. A la CL 2024/89-PR se recibieron respuestas de Canadá, Egipto, la Unión Europea, Kenya, Arabia Saudita, el Grupo de trabajo industrial II sobre datos de investigación de 2,4-D, IUFoST y Drexel Chemical Company. Estas respuestas figuran en el apéndice I.

4. La carta circular CL 2025/44-PR se distribuyó en julio de 2025, con el 20 de agosto de 2025 como plazo para la presentación de observaciones. En esa circular se presentaban los calendarios y las listas de prioridades de plaguicidas del CCPR (Cuadros 1 a 4), que incorporaban las observaciones recibidas en respuesta a la CL 2024/89-PR, actualizadas hasta el 2 de julio de 2025. A la CL 2025/44-PR se recibieron respuestas de Brasil, Canadá, Egipto, la Unión Europea, India, Tailandia y los Emiratos Árabes Unidos. Estas respuestas figuran en el apéndice II.

5. Con base en la correspondencia por correo electrónico, las observaciones de los participantes en el GTE sobre prioridades y las respuestas a la carta circular CL 2024/89-PR y CL 2025/44-PR, se presenta lo siguiente para que el CCPR lo someta a consideración.

A. CALENDARIOS Y LISTAS DE PRIORIDADES

6. En el apéndice A se incluyen los Calendarios y las listas de prioridades del Comité del Codex sobre Residuos de Plaguicidas (CCPR) en materia de plaguicidas (cuadros 1 a 4), como se especifica en los “Principios para el análisis de riesgos aplicados por el Comité del Codex sobre Residuos de Plaguicidas (CCPR)” del Manual de procedimiento de la Comisión del Codex Alimentarius (CAC).

7. Las enmiendas a los calendarios y las listas de prioridades del CCPR realizadas después de recibir las observaciones de los participantes del GTE sobre prioridades y las respuestas a la carta circular CL 2024/89-PR y CL 2025/44-PR desde la 55.ª reunión del CCPR, se muestran en letra en rojo. Se hace todo lo posible para registrar con precisión las propuestas presentadas durante este período. Dado que se trata de una hoja “de trabajo”, pueden hacerse correcciones y enmiendas inmediatamente.

- Se alienta a los miembros y observadores que presentaron propuestas a que revisen cuidadosamente las hojas de trabajo para asegurarse de su exactitud.

- Los calendarios y las listas de prioridades se finalizan durante la reunión del CCPR. Los miembros y observadores pueden debatir los cambios propuestos en los cuadros que figuran en el apéndice A con la presidencia del GTE sobre prioridades inmediatamente antes o durante las primeras fases de la sesión.

8. El calendario del CCPR para las evaluaciones de la Reunión Conjunta FAO/OMS sobre Residuos de Plaguicidas (JMPR) correspondiente a 2025 está cerrado pero se incluye en la hoja de trabajo únicamente como referencia.

B. FINALIZACIÓN DEL CALENDARIO PROPUESTO PARA 2026

9. A fin de facilitar el examen de la programación para 2026, la propuesta de calendario del CCPR para las evaluaciones de la JMPR en 2026 se ha extraído de los Cuadros 1 y 2A, y aparece en tres hojas de trabajo con el prefijo "2026". A reserva de la confirmación de la JMPR, algunos compuestos propuestos anteriormente pueden no estar incluidos en la JMPR de 2025 y pueden diferirse a la JMPR de 2026.

10. En la hoja de trabajo "2026 new cpd" figuran dos compuestos. Se ha confirmado el registro nacional de esos dos compuestos.

11. En la hoja de trabajo "2026 new use – other" figuran 25 propuestas para evaluaciones de nuevos usos y de otro tipo. Probablemente, en un año solo podrán evaluarse los 20 primeros compuestos. Se han aportado pruebas del etiquetado o el registro nacional de productos para los 20 primeros compuestos. Los cinco compuestos que no se encuentran entre los 20 primeros se identifican como compuestos "reservar para 2026 o diferir para 2027".

- **No pueden aceptarse más propuestas para este calendario.**
- **Las propuestas deberán aportar pruebas de registro nacional y se otorgará prioridad al compuesto propuesto que figure con la indicación de fecha más antigua en la hoja de trabajo "2026 newuse-other".**

12. En la hoja de trabajo "2026 periodrev" figuran seis compuestos en la propuesta de calendario de revisiones periódicas de 2026. Se ha confirmado el apoyo para dos compuestos, indoxacarb (216) e hidrazida maleica (102). Se invita a los Estados miembros y organizaciones observadoras a que confirmen el apoyo y la disponibilidad de paquetes de datos completos para los otros cuatro compuestos, carbarilo (008), bromuro de metilo (52), disulfotón (74) y flumetrin (195). Además, en los calendarios de revisiones periódicas de 2024 puede haber compuestos que no se sometieron a la evaluación de la JMPR o se sometieron de forma incompleta. Por lo tanto, esta lista de "2026-periodic review" puede modificarse en función de la información adicional de la JMPR y los patrocinadores, y las decisiones del CCPR.

13. En respuesta a la carta circular CL 2025/44-PR, se recibió apoyo para los calendarios y las listas de prioridades en materia de plaguicidas propuestos. Salvo el traslado de revisión periódica de pirimifos-metil (86) de 2026 a 2027 tras una petición del patrocinador, desde que la CL 2024/43-PR se publicó en julio de 2025, en la hoja de trabajo solo se han realizado pequeñas modificaciones.

Notas de recomendaciones (evaluaciones de nuevos usos y de otro tipo)

14. En la 48.ª reunión del CCPR se adoptó el enfoque de que los Estados miembros y las organizaciones observadoras (patrocinadores) que propongan compuestos para el calendario presentado para evaluaciones de nuevos usos y de otro tipo pueden confirmar un lugar en el calendario únicamente aportando pruebas documentadas de un uso registrado/etiqueta de fórmula autorizada/buenas prácticas agrícolas (BPA), o al menos pruebas de la presentación de un expediente ante una autoridad de registro nacional con miras a obtener un registro/etiqueta de fórmula autorizada/BPA antes de la sesión del CCPR que someterá a consideración esa propuesta.

15. En el caso de que más de 20 propuestas de compuestos incluidas en el calendario de evaluaciones de nuevos usos y de otro tipo cumplan el requisito de uso registrado/etiqueta de fórmula/BPA, se programará la evaluación de los 20 primeros compuestos que cumplan los requisitos y a los compuestos posteriores se asignará el estado de RESERVA. Este enfoque ha sido utilizado para la lista de 2026.

16. Según el enfoque propuesto para los nuevos compuestos, la JMPR puede optar por evaluar un compuesto de RESERVA en el caso de que se presente la oportunidad.

C. LISTAS DE PRIORIDADES PARA 2027 Y AÑOS POSTERIORES – CUADRO 1

17. En la hoja de trabajo "Table 1 – 2027 & beyond—new cpds" figuran propuestas para su inclusión en una programación futura: tres para 2028 y una para 2031. La prueba de registro para estos compuestos no ha sido presentada todavía. En estos momentos, no se ha propuesto ningún nuevo compuesto para evaluación por la JMPR en 2027.

18. En la hoja de trabajo "Table 1 – 2027 & beyond - new use – other" figuran 30 propuestas para programación futura, quince propuestas para 2027, trece para 2028 y dos para 2029. Se ha presentado prueba de registro de 10 compuestos propuestos para evaluación de nuevos usos en 2027. Puede ser necesario incluir en esta hoja de trabajo los cinco compuestos propuestos para 2026 que superan con creces el límite de 20 compuestos. Un número de las propuestas

de nuevos usos son solo para un solo producto y se alienta a los proponentes a apoyar el uso eficiente de los recursos de la JMPR optimizando el número de productos de nuevo uso.

D. LISTAS DE PRIORIDADES DE REVISIONES PERIÓDICAS DE 2027 Y AÑOS POSTERIORES

19. En la hoja de trabajo "Table 2A" se incluyen las listas de prioridades para las revisiones periódicas en 2027 y los dos años siguientes. Todos los compuestos enumerados cumplen la "norma de los 15 años". Se requiere información de los patrocinadores para aclarar el estado del apoyo para esos compuestos y los compuestos no apoyados pueden remitirse al grupo de trabajo por medios electrónicos sobre compuestos no apoyados que no plantean problemas en materia de salud pública programados para revisión periódica.

20. Once compuestos han sido trasladados del Cuadro 2B al Cuadro 2A y figuran como posibles propuestas para revisión periódica en 2029. A estos once compuestos se les dio prioridad en base al tiempo desde que la JMPR realizó la última evaluación completa.

21. Se ha confirmado el apoyo para seis compuestos que figuran en la lista de prioridades para revisión periódica en 2027 y para un compuesto que figura en la lista de prioridades para revisión periódica en 2028. Se invita a los Estados miembros y organizaciones observadoras a que proporcionen información sobre el apoyo para los compuestos restantes que figuran en la lista de prioridades para revisión periódica en 2027, 2028 y 2029, y la disponibilidad de paquetes de datos completos para evaluación por la JMPR.

E. CUADRO 2B

22. En la hoja de trabajo "Table 2B" figuran aproximadamente 50 compuestos que cumplen la "norma de los 15 años", pero no tienen programada todavía su revisión periódica.

F. PREOCUPACIONES EN MATERIA DE SALUD PÚBLICA

23. En consonancia con el proceso de propuesta descrito en los "Principios para el análisis de riesgos aplicados por el Comité del Codex sobre Residuos de Plaguicidas" del Manual de procedimiento del Codex, los miembros y observadores podrán presentar sus preocupaciones en materia de salud pública en relación con cualquier compuesto que figure en la Lista de plaguicidas del CCPR, incluidos aquellos que ya figuran en los Cuadros 2A y 2B. Al presentar sus preocupaciones en materia de salud pública, el proponente debe facilitar datos científicos de apoyo. La JMPR evaluará las propuestas de preocupaciones en materia de salud pública e informará al CCPR si se apoya una revisión periódica.

24. En respuesta a la carta circular CL 2024/89-PR, la UE indicó su intención de presentar formularios para formular preocupaciones para acetamiprid y carbosulfán, que están programados para revisión periódica en 2027. La UE ha presentado un formulario para formular preocupaciones para acetamiprid que se presenta en el anexo II de CX/PR 25/56/5-Add.1.

G. PROPUESTA DE UN COMPUESTO PARA REVISIÓN PARALELA

25. De acuerdo con el informe de la 52.ª reunión del CCPR (REP21/PR, párrafo 226), como parte del trabajo de los calendarios y prioridades del CCPR, existe la oportunidad de que los patrocinadores de datos propongan compuestos para el proyecto piloto de revisión paralela. Ahora se ha presentado una propuesta para revisión periódica, pero se invita a los miembros y observadores a proponer un compuesto adecuado.

H. OTRAS CONSIDERACIONES

26. Se alienta a los miembros del Codex y observadores que presentaron propuestas a que revisen cuidadosamente las hojas de trabajo para asegurarse de su exactitud. La intención de un par de propuestas requiere un debate ulterior con el miembro/observador. La presidencia del GTE sobre prioridades someterá a debate esas propuestas con las partes pertinentes en la 56.ª reunión del CCPR antes de la finalización de los calendarios, para su consideración por el Comité.

I. CALENDARIOS Y LISTAS DE PRIORIDADES EN MATERIA DE EVALUACIÓN DE PLAGUICIDAS POR LA JMPR

27. Este tema debe leerse junto con los temas del programa relacionados con los compuestos no apoyados y la base de datos de registros nacionales.

28. Se puede acceder a los calendarios y listas de prioridades del Codex en materia de evaluación de plaguicidas por la JMPR a través del siguiente enlace que está disponible en inglés solamente:

Apéndice A:

https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/codexalimentarius/doc/Appendix_A_Schedules_Priority_Lists_CCPR56_Agenda_Item_9.xlsx

APÉNDICE I
ORIGINAL LANGUAGE ONLY

Comments submitted in reply to CL 2024/89-PR
(For information)

CANADA

Canada's Comments on the Establishment of the CCPR Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides for Evaluation/Re-evaluation by JMPR

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Canada would like to thank Australia for the preparation of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides as well as the work done to incorporate the requests from members and sponsors.

A. SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS 2025-2026

Canada understands that the 2025 CCPR Schedule of JMPR Evaluations is closed and provided for reference.

Canada offers the following comments to the revised Priority Lists of 2026-2027 and beyond.

B. FINALISING THE 2026 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Canada notes that there are only 3 new compounds on the list, however, proof of registration was provided for only 2 of the 3 compounds. As per the "Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues", Canada agrees that evidence of registration is required to confirm a place on the List.

Canada also acknowledges that there are 7 periodic review compounds nominated for review, for which manufacturer support is still pending for one compound.

The list of new uses and other evaluations (30) is extensive and Canada supports the EWG's recommendation to limit the number to a maximum of 20 and potentially deferring the remaining 10 compounds to 2027 new uses.

C. PRIORITY LISTS 2027 AND BEYOND – TABLE 1

Canada recognizes that there are 4 new compound nominations for future scheduling, 1 nominated for 2027, 2 for 2028 and 1 for 2031.

While the number of nominated new uses and other evaluations, 7 for 2027 and 2 for 2028, are within JMPR's capacity, priority must be granted to the 20 reserve compounds nominated for 2026, provided the authorized GAPs are available.

To reduce the number of new uses for the same compound being reviewed at different Meetings, Canada continues to encourage sponsors to maximize the number of uses requested within one nomination/petition, especially when the authorized GAP is available.

D. PRIORITY LISTS 2027 AND BEYOND – TABLE 2A

Canada acknowledges the long list of compounds that meet the 15-year rule, but notes that the majority are awaiting advice on supported commodities. For the predictability of JMPR's future workload, Canada continues to encourage all sponsors as well as member countries, via the National Registration Database, identify the uses that are most critical for consideration in the upcoming periodic reviews.

E. TABLE 2B

The number of compounds on list 2B is also quite extensive. Canada acknowledges the work being conducted on the National Registration Database and hopes that this initiative will encourage sponsors and member countries to provide advice on supporting data packages and/or indication of support that would allow a triage and prioritization of the listed compounds.

F. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

There are no compounds in the CCPR Pesticide List, or in Tables 2A and 2B, for which Canada would like to lodge a public health concern.

EGYPT

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the electronic working group for their efforts in preparing the document **"REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION/RE-EVALUATION BY THE JOINT FAO/WHO EXPERT MEETINGS ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES (JMPR)."**

- In light of the inclusion of **Cypermethrin (118)** in the **new compounds** schedule for **2026**, we kindly request the consideration of conducting a study to establish maximum residue limits (MRLs) for this pesticide in dates, in addition to cumin . Dates are a widely consumed food across the Middle East and play a crucial role in the economic life of date-growing regions. Often regarded as an almost ideal food, dates provide a wide range of essential nutrients and offer potential health benefits. Over the past 40 years, global date production has increased by **2.9 times**, highlighting their growing significance in international trade
- **Cypermethrin**, a synthetic pyrethroid insecticide, is widely used in large-scale commercial agriculture, including in date palm orchards. It has been previously assessed by JMPR, and the **CXLs** derived from these assessments, as adopted by the CAC, serve as international recommendations. However, **dates remain an exception**, as they lack specific Codex Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) despite previous CAC implementations (2009, 2010, 2015).
- Given the increasing demand for dates and the need to ensure compliance with global food safety standards, we seek clarification on whether **any supportive studies or data** are available to assess the magnitude of **Cypermethrin residue (sum of isomers) in dates** in the near future. Additionally, we would like to inquire whether there is any **tendency to derive an MRL proposal for Cypermethrin in dates**, considering its **toxicological impact and consumer risk assessment**.
- **Also Persistence and Cypermethrin Behavior in Date Palms:**

- Pyrethroid pesticides, including Cypermethrin, have been observed to exhibit **variable degradation rates** depending on climatic conditions and crop characteristics.
- The **lipophilic nature** of Cypermethrin raises concerns about potential accumulation in date fruits, especially since dates have a high **sugar and moisture content**, which may influence residue dynamics.

- **Regarding to table 2 B,** especially what is mentioned related to Chlorpropham , We would like to clarify that the previous proposal was related to potatoes, not wheat. Therefore, we kindly request the correction of this information accordingly.

European Union

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on Priorities chaired by Australia for the preparation of CL 2024/89-PR and its appendices, as well as the work done to incorporate the requests from members and sponsors.

GENERAL COMMENTS

1) The EU would like to refer to their comment to Circular Letter CL 2024/43-PR of 17 May 2024. The EU notes that the late submission/incomplete submission of dossiers is a recurring problem for JMPR, as noted by JMPR in its 2024 summary report under section 10 on efficiency of JMPR resources: ”As highlighted at several past JMPRs (2015, 2018, 2019 and 2023), sponsors have been strongly encouraged to submit chemical dossiers that comply with the quality and scope specified in the CCPR Risk Analysis Principles. The current meeting received several dossiers for new and periodic review compounds which lacked critical residue and toxicology data to establish health-based guidance values, residue definitions for compliance and/or dietary risk assessments (e.g. chlorpyrifos [periodic review], acynonapyr [new compound]). In another case, the dossier for a new compound (cyclobutrifluram) included a very limited use pattern where this use did not give rise to detectable pesticide residues (whole banana).”

   The EU notes that out of the seven substances assessed under periodic review by JMPR in 2024, data submitted was insufficient to establish toxicological reference values for four substances (chlorpyrifos, maleic hydrazide, ethoxyquin, permethrin). For chlorpyrifos, the EU recalls that it was agreed at CCPR53 in 2022 to maintain scheduling chlorpyrifos for periodic review because an Observer confirmed its commitment to provide the necessary data for the periodic review of chlorpyrifos[1]. This was not the case. The EU therefore proposes that chlorpyrifos is moved to table 5 of unsupported compounds. The EU also kindly requests a clarification on the status of chlorpyrifos-methyl, which was intended to be reviewed at the same time as chlorpyrifos and for which CCPR53 in 2022 agreed to retain all the CXLs under the 4-year rule. As no data were received and no support was announced, CXLs should be revoked.

[1] CCPR53 report, paragraph 219. https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-718-53%252FREPORT%252FFINAL%252520REPORT%252FREP22_PR53e.pdf

The EU would like CCPR to urgently look for solutions and efficient mechanisms for the JMPR's recurring problem which is crucial for the way to solve the long backlog of evaluations. For example, a tool could be developed to provide sponsors well in advance with information on i) when a commitment for developing a dossier needs to be provided, and ii) with the submission date for the dossier. Based on the submitted dossiers, the work programme for JMPR could be discussed/agreed. In addition, EU notes that especially problematic is the data submission for substances under periodic review and therefore suggests developing an efficient procedure which would for example preclude that existing Codex MRLs are maintained in the Codex system and aims to avoid that the compounds are rescheduled at each JMPR Meeting.

2) The EU would like to refer to their comment to Circular Letters CL 2024/43-PR of 17 May 2024 CL 2023/26 PR of 16 May 2023 and invites the CCPR to consider adding more substances into periodic review in order to ensure that there are enough substances to evaluate.

   The EU notes that although ten substances have been listed for periodic review in 2025, for several compounds it is not clear whether these will be reviewed in 2025. The EU notes that as the experience from previous years has shown that although there are always several compounds scheduled for a periodic review in that specific year, the review is often postponed or not possible to finish for several reasons for one or more years. Out of the ten substances listed, seven had actually been postponed before (2-phenylphenol, fenbutatin oxide, malathion, pirimicarb, hydrogen phosphide, clethodim, guazatine).

   Therefore, one option could be to list a higher number of substances e.g., 20, in order to ensure that there will be a stock of substances from which a minimum of five substances[2] could be effectively reviewed each year. In programming more substances at the onset, a continuous flow of periodic reviews will be ensured for the coming years.

   In addition, substances with unclear support should get a reserve status in Table 2A (Priority lists of periodic reviews – 2024 & beyond) and Table 2B (Periodic review list (compounds listed under 15-year rule but not yet scheduled or listed). Those with a reserve status will be re-evaluated once the data will become available or the reserve status should be deleted, and the compound should be deleted from the Codex List of pesticides at the latest after 25 years after the last evaluation.

3) The EU would like to note that regarding new uses related to eggplants based on the previously discussed extrapolation from peppers, six are scheduled for 2025 and one for 2026. While the EU does not object, the EU would like to highlight that given the limited resources of JMPR, evaluations for periodic review should be prioritised.

A. FINALISING THE 2025 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Paragraphs 7 and 8

The EU would like to suggest that it would be useful to list explicitly the substances from the 2024 periodic review schedule for which no support was given and for which JMPR did not proceed, i.e., chlorpyrifos, maleic hydrazide, ethoxyquin, permethrin. JMPR 2024 could not conclude due to missing data, mainly toxicological data, but depending on the outcome of a toxicological assessment, it might be necessary to update also the residue assessment. These substances therefore need to be added in the 2025 periodic review schedule (except maleic hydrazide which has been added to the 2026 list). In addition, Regarding the 2025 periodic review schedule, it would be useful to flag clearly for which substances the indication of support is still pending. This would make it clearer to see for which active substances decisions need to be made.

The EU notes that chlorpyrifos-methyl and phosmet had been scheduled for periodic review but disappeared from the list. However, they should either be kept listed for review or, if there is no support, they should be deleted and moved into the table of unsupported compounds.

The EU notes that four substances (pirimicarb, hydrogen phosphide, clethodim, guazatine) are scheduled for periodic review in 2025 under the four-year rule based on the decision of CCPR52 in 2021. This means also that no prolongation is possible and periodic review is strongly recommended for these substances. If late or incomplete dossiers are provided and consequently a periodic review does not take place, these substances should be deleted and moved into the table of unsupported compounds. at CCPR56.

[2] Report of the 49th session of the Codex Committee on Residues

In addition, the EU notes that for carbendazim, scheduled for periodic review in 2025, the toxicological evaluation for carbendazim was conducted more than 25 years ago, and the 2023 JMPR withdrew its health-based guidance values. If no suitable data are submitted to JMPR for assessment in 2025, then the compound and all related CXLs should be deleted from the Codex Database.

Finally, the EU would like to propose that if agreed by CCPR56, the active substances belonging to the class of dithiocarbamates need to be included in the work programme. According to the proposal of JMPR, the toxicological evaluations should be performed in three phases, starting with mancozeb, metiram and ETU in phase 1, propineb and PTU in phase 2 and ziram and thiram in phase 3. The residue evaluation should be performed at the same time as phase 3 of the toxicological assessment. Hence, for these substances for which it is very important to perform a periodic review, it is necessary to include the substances in the schedule for periodic review as agreed and to strictly follow the agreed schedule.

F. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

Paragraph 14

The EU intends to submit concern forms for acetamiprid and for carbosulfan, which is scheduled for periodic review in 2027.

KENYA

B. FINALISING THE 2025 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

General Comment: Kenya appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the 2026 proposed schedule and makes the following comments on 2026 CCPR Schedule of JMPR Evaluations as presented in the various '2026' worksheets.

1) '2026 new cpd'

Comment: Kenya agrees with the EWG's work in developing this list and supports the evaluation of the proposed compounds by JMPR.

Rationale: Once registered, the compounds will be useful in managing weeds, insect pests and diseases for the target commodities which are grown in the country.

2) '2026 new use – other'

Comment: Kenya agrees with the EWG's work in developing this list and supports the evaluation of the proposed compounds by JMPR.

Rationale: Most of the listed compounds are registered in the country and therefore their evaluation will enable registration for additional commodities.

3) '2026 periodrev'

Comment: Kenya agrees with the EWG's work in developing this list and supports the evaluation of the proposed compounds by JMPR.

Rationale: The compounds have met the '15-year rule' and are thus due for evaluation.

C. PRIORITY LISTS 2027 AND BEYOND – TABLE 1

General Comment: Kenya appreciates the opportunity to submit comments on the priority lists for 2027 and beyond and makes the following comments on the various '2027' worksheets.

1) 'Table 1 – 2027 & beyond—new cpds

Comment: Kenya takes note and appreciates the work done by the EWG regarding the new compounds proposed for evaluation in 2027 and beyond.

2) 'Table 1 – 2027 & beyond - new use - other'

Comment: Kenya takes note and appreciates the work done by the EWG regarding the new use compounds proposed for evaluation in 2027 and beyond and further recommends the addition of the 10 compounds from the '2026 new use – other' reserve list.

SAUDI ARABIA

Saudi Arabia would like to express its appreciation to the Chair of the CCPR Electronic Working Group on Priorities for their efforts and dedication. We are pleased to present the following comments on the CL Request for comments regarding the establishment of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation/re-evaluation by JMPR.

In the provided excel sheets, several comments and suggestions have been made regarding pesticide residues and their evaluation by JMPR in the upcoming reviews. The insecticide "Flupyradifurone" was selected to be considered for evaluation in 2026. However, due to its ability to generate multiple metabolites, including "Difluoroacetic acid (DFA)"—a compound identified as being three times more potent than "Flupyradifurone" itself (JMPR, 2015)—it is recommended that "DFA" be evaluated alongside the parent compound as an independent and potent metabolite. Since "DFA" may accumulate at high levels in essential and widely consumed commodities such as dates, a significant Saudi national product, its assessment is considered crucial. Additionally, it has been proposed that a new column for "Significant Metabolite" be added following the "RESIDUE" column to enhance the accuracy and reliability of the evaluation.

In the case of "Carbaryl," which has been selected for periodic evaluation in 2026, it is suggested that "Dates and Rice" be included as supported commodities due to their relatively high consumption rates. Previous national monitoring programs have detected "Carbaryl" residues in these food items, further supporting their inclusion. For the pesticide residue "Buprofezin," scheduled for periodic evaluation in 2027, the addition of "Dates, Rice, Potatoes, Spices, Roots, and Rhizomes" has been recommended, as these commodities also demonstrate relatively high consumption rates and have previously shown the presence of "Buprofezin" residues in national monitoring programs.

Regarding the pesticide residue "Diphenylamine," which is scheduled for periodic evaluation in 2026, it has been proposed that "Dates" be included in the list of commodities due to their significant consumption in Saudi Arabia and their detection in past national monitoring programs.

Furthermore, the evaluation of the pesticide residue "Carbosulfan" has been advised to extend beyond the parent pesticide itself to include its major metabolite, "Carbofuran." As "Carbofuran" is an independent pesticide that arises as a major metabolite of "Carbosulfan," evaluating both compounds is considered appropriate. Additionally, it has been suggested that "Abamectin" be included for consideration due to its presence in major food commodities such as Rice and Dates. Since JMPR established an ADI value of 0.001 mg/kg bw/day for "Abamectin" in 2015, the potential long-term neurological effects linked to its intake and exposure warrant further assessment (JMPR, 2015).

Saudi Arabia appreciates the opportunity to contribute to this important process and remains committed to supporting efforts that enhance food safety and consumer protection.

INDUSTRY TASK FORCE II ON 2-4-D RESEARCH DATA

The Industry Task Force II on 2,4-D Research Data requests the 2,4-D periodic review be postponed from 2026 to 2027. It is noted that the 2,4-D periodic review was scheduled for 2027 in the June version of the priority list (CRD02), therefore the Task Force were working towards and budgeted for this later timeline for provision of the required documentation. The 2,4-D periodic review will be a large data package and the intention is to support all commodities covered by current Codex MRLs. To allow sufficient time to compile good quality toxicology and residue dossiers, we would like to return the scheduled evaluation to 2027.

IUFoST

IUFoST strongly supports Codex's scientific and risk-based approach to pesticide residue evaluation and is pleased to recommend further improvement:

- IUFoST underscores the need for continuous monitoring of pesticides that have been in use for extended periods, i.e. Long-Term Exposure to Pesticide Residues.
    - E.g. for Table 2B: The "15-year rule" for periodic reviews is a valuable approach but should be complemented by dynamic re-evaluation mechanisms that allow for early reassessment when significant health concerns arise.
- IUFoST emphasizes that the selection of pesticides for new evaluations, re-evaluations, and periodic reviews must be based on the latest scientific evidence. The priority lists should be periodically reviewed using a transparent, science-based risk assessment framework to ensure that compounds posing the highest potential health risks are prioritized and promptly addressed through a data-driven risk prioritization approach. Moreover, data informing on the possible trade impediments posed by crops treated with pesticides registered in certain regions and not others or with different MRLs, set by different food regulators, should also be considered for prioritization. Such incidences should be better documented with reference to recent encounters of discrepancies in regulatory decisions, resulting in food / crop being unduly detained at points of entry.
- IUFoST supports the requirement for national registration evidence for pesticides to be considered for evaluation. However, harmonization of data standards across different regulatory agencies is necessary to ensure consistency and reliability.

- In order to ensure a larger inclusiveness of the international food standard setting process pertaining to setting Pesticide MRLs, IUFoST recommends enhancing investments in capacity-building initiatives for developing countries to improve regulatory capabilities in pesticide risk assessment.

IUFoST remains committed to collaborating with Codex, JMPR, and international regulatory bodies to strengthen the scientific integrity of pesticide risk assessment and consumer health protection.

DREXEL CHEMICAL COMPANY

Ahead of the CCPR meeting in May 2025, we are writing to you to formally request that the MRLs for the active substance maleic hydrazide be retained to allow the completion of the JMPR evaluation.

While Maleic Hydrazide was called for a JMPR Periodic Re-evaluation in 2024, this process has not been completed. With some open points identified in the evaluation, we would note that these points are currently being addressed by the applicant Drexel Chemical Company.

As the applicant is fully committed to providing the necessary additional data, we formally request that the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues retain the existing Codex MRLs for maleic hydrazide under the 4-year rule of CCPR/CAC, thus allowing adequate time for the outstanding information to be submitted and assessed to support the full JMPR evaluation.

In response to the Circular letter Request for comments on the establishment of Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation / re-evaluation by JMPR, the applicant would also like to nominate maleic hydrazide to be on the periodic review priority list for 2026 as new data are expected to be available by May 2025 to allow for the JMPR assessment, which commenced in 2024, to continue.

With a commitment to support Global Trade and ensure dietary safety, Drexel Chemical Company respectfully asks that the existing Codex MRLs be maintained whilst the necessary additional information is fully evaluated. Considering the major consequences for growers across the globe, we would very much appreciate CCPR's consideration in this matter.

APÉNDICE II
ORIGINAL LANGUAGE ONLY

Comments submitted in reply to CL 2025/44-PR
(For information)

BRAZIL

Brazil would like to express its appreciation to Australia for the valuable work undertaken in coordinating the development of the CCPR Priority List of Pesticides for Evaluation.

After careful review of the Circular Letter CL 2025/44-PR and the attached priority list, Brazil informs that, at this stage, we have no comments to provide.

Brazil remains committed to supporting the work of the CCPR and looks forward to continuing constructive collaboration with Members and Observers.

CANADA

Canada's Comments on the Establishment of the CCPR Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides for Evaluation/Re-evaluation by JMPR

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

Canada would like to thank Australia for the preparation of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides as well as the work done to incorporate the requests from members and sponsors.

B. SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS 2025-2026

Canada understands that the 2025 CCPR Schedule of JMPR Evaluations is closed and provided for reference.

Canada offers the following comments to the revised Priority Lists of 2026-2027 and beyond.

B. FINALISING THE 2026 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Canada notes that there are only 2 new compounds on the list, and that proof of registration was provided for these.

Canada also acknowledges that there are 7 periodic review compounds nominated for review, for which support has been confirmed for 2 compounds and confirmation of support is pending for the remaining 5 compounds.

The list of new uses and other evaluations (27) is extensive and Canada supports the EWG's recommendation to limit the number to a maximum of 20 and potentially deferring the remaining 7 compounds to 2027.

C. PRIORITY LISTS 2027 AND BEYOND – TABLE 1

Canada recognizes that there are no new compound nominations for 2027, 2029 and 2030, yet there are 3 nominated for 2028 and 1 for 2031.

While the number of nominated new uses and other evaluations, 15 for 2027 and 5 for 2028, are within JMPR's capacity, priority must be granted to the 7 reserve compounds nominated for 2026, provided the authorized GAPs are available.

To reduce the number of new uses for the same compound being reviewed at different Meetings, Canada continues to encourage sponsors to maximize the number of uses requested within one nomination/petition, especially when the authorized GAP is available.

D. PRIORITY LISTS 2027 AND BEYOND – TABLE 2A

Canada appreciates the addition of new columns in Tables 2A and 2B, *Last Tox Evaluation* and *Number of countries with uses as identified in the National Registration Database (NRD)*, as these help inform when the JMPR last completed a comprehensive assessment, as well as the importance of these compounds based on the registration status in several countries.

Nevertheless, Canada acknowledges the long list of compounds on Table 2A, but notes that several are still awaiting advice on supported commodities. For the predictability of JMPR's future workload, Canada encourages all sponsors as well as member countries to continue populating the National Registration Database, to identify those uses that are most critical for consideration in the upcoming periodic reviews.

E. TABLE 2B

The number of compounds on list 2B is also quite extensive. Canada acknowledges the work completed thus far on the National Registration Database and continues to encourage sponsors and member countries to provide advice on supporting data packages and/or indication of support that would allow a triage and prioritization of the listed compounds.

F. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

There are no compounds in the CCPR Pesticide List, or in Tables 2A and 2B, for which Canada would like to lodge a public health concern.

EGYPT

Regarding **CL 2025/44-PR** on the establishment of schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation/re-evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)**,** We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the joint JMPR for their efforts in preparing the document

Building on the valuable work reflected in the document, Egypt wishes to draw attention to specific considerations regarding the following:

- In light of the inclusion of **Cypermethrin (118)** in the **new compounds** schedule for **2026**, we kindly request the consideration of conducting a study to establish maximum residue limits (MRLs) for this pesticide in dates, in addition to cumin . Dates are a widely consumed food across the Middle East and play a crucial role in the economic life of date-growing regions. Often regarded as an almost ideal food, dates provide a wide range of essential nutrients and offer potential health benefits. Over the past 40 years, global date production has increased by **2.9 times**, highlighting their growing significance in international trade

- **Cypermethrin**, a synthetic pyrethroid insecticide, is widely used in large-scale commercial agriculture, including in date palm orchards. It has been previously assessed by JMPR, and the **CXLs** derived from these assessments, as adopted by the CAC, serve as international recommendations. However, **dates remain an exception**, as they lack specific Codex Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) despite previous CAC implementations (2009, 2010, 2015).

- Given the increasing demand for dates and the need to ensure compliance with global food safety standards, we seek clarification on whether **any supportive studies or data** are available to assess the magnitude of **Cypermethrin residue (sum of isomers) in dates** in the near future. Additionally, we would like to inquire whether there is any **tendency to derive an MRL proposal for Cypermethrin in dates**, considering its **toxicological impact and consumer risk assessment**.

- **Also Persistence and Cypermethrin Behaviour in Date Palms:**

- Pyrethroid pesticides, including Cypermethrin, have been observed to exhibit variable degradation rates depending on climatic conditions and crop characteristics.

- The **lipophilic nature** of Cypermethrin raises concerns about potential accumulation in date fruits, especially since dates have a high **sugar and moisture content**, which may influence residue dynamics.

European Union

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on Priorities chaired by Australia for the preparation of CL 2025/44-PR and its appendices, as well as the work done to incorporate the requests from members and sponsors.

GENERAL COMMENTS

1) The EU would like to refer to their comment to Circular Letter CL 2024/43-PR of 17 May 2024. The EU notes that the late submission/incomplete submission of dossiers is a recurring problem for JMPR, as noted by JMPR in its 2024 summary report under section 10 on efficiency of JMPR resources: ”As highlighted at several past JMPRs (2015, 2018, 2019 and 2023), sponsors have been strongly encouraged to submit chemical dossiers that comply with the quality and scope specified in the CCPR Risk Analysis Principles. The current meeting received several dossiers for new and periodic review compounds which lacked critical residue and toxicology data to establish health-based guidance values, residue definitions for compliance and/or dietary risk assessments (e.g. periodic review of chlorpyrifos, permethrin and ethoxyquin). In another case, the dossier for a new compound (cyclobutrifluram) included a very limited use pattern where this use did not give rise to detectable pesticide residues (whole banana).”

The EU notes that out of the seven substances assessed under periodic review by JMPR in 2024, data submitted was insufficient to establish toxicological reference values for four substances (chlorpyrifos, maleic hydrazide, ethoxyquin, permethrin). For chlorpyrifos, the EU recalls that it was agreed at CCPR53 in 2022 to maintain scheduling chlorpyrifos for periodic review because an Observer confirmed its commitment to provide the necessary data for the periodic review of chlorpyrifos[1]. This was not the case. The EU therefore proposes that chlorpyrifos is moved to table 5 of unsupported compounds. The EU also kindly requests a clarification on the status of chlorpyrifos-methyl, which was intended to be reviewed at the same time as chlorpyrifos and for which CCPR53 in 2022 agreed to retain all the CXLs under the 4-year rule. As no data were received and no support was announced, CXLs should be revoked.

The EU would like CCPR to urgently look for solutions and efficient mechanisms for the JMPR's recurring problem which is crucial for the way to solve the long backlog of evaluations. For example, a tool could be developed to provide sponsors well in advance with information on i) when a commitment for developing a dossier needs to be provided, and ii) with the submission date for the dossier. Based on the submitted dossiers, the work programme for JMPR could be discussed/agreed. In addition, EU notes that especially problematic is the data submission for substances under periodic review and therefore suggests developing an efficient procedure which would for example preclude that existing Codex MRLs are maintained in the Codex system and aims to avoid that the compounds are rescheduled at each JMPR Meeting.

2) The EU would like to refer to their comment to Circular Letters CL 2024/43-PR of 17 May 2024 CL 2023/26 PR of 16 May 2023 and invites the CCPR to consider adding more substances into periodic review in order to ensure that there are enough substances to evaluate.

   The EU notes that although ten substances have been listed for periodic review in 2025, for several compounds it is not clear whether these will be reviewed in 2025. The EU notes that as the experience from previous years has shown that although there are always several compounds scheduled for a periodic review in that specific year, the review is often postponed or not possible to finish for several reasons for one or more years. Out of the ten substances listed, seven had actually been postponed before (2-phenylphenol, fenbutatin oxide, malathion, pirimicarb, hydrogen phosphide, clethodim, guazatine).

   Therefore, one option could be to list a higher number of substances e.g., 20, in order to ensure that there will be a stock of substances from which a minimum of five substances2 could be effectively reviewed each year. In programming more substances at the onset, a continuous flow of periodic reviews will be ensured for the coming years.

   In addition, substances with unclear support should get a reserve status in Table 2A (Priority lists of periodic reviews – 2024 & beyond) and Table 2B (Periodic review list (compounds listed under 15-year rule but not yet scheduled or listed). Those with a reserve status will be re-evaluated once the data will become available or the reserve status should be deleted, and the compound should be deleted from the Codex List of pesticides at the latest after 25 years after the last evaluation. In particular, substances for which an incomplete dossier has been submitted should only be put back on the agenda with a new date stamp once the data is declared complete.

3) The EU would like to note that regarding new uses related to eggplants based on the previously discussed extrapolation from peppers, six are scheduled for 2025 and one for 2026. While the EU does not object, the EU would like to highlight that given the limited resources of JMPR, evaluations for periodic review should be prioritised.

A. SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS

Paragraphs 1 and 3 – periodic reviews in 2024 and 2025

The EU would like to suggest that it would be useful to list explicitly the substances from the 2024 periodic review schedule for which no support was given and for which JMPR did not proceed, i.e., chlorpyrifos, maleic hydrazide, ethoxyquin, permethrin. JMPR 2024 could not conclude due to missing data, mainly toxicological data, but depending on the outcome of a toxicological assessment, it might be necessary to update also the residue assessment. These substances therefore need to be added in the 2025 periodic review schedule (except maleic hydrazide which has been added to the 2026 list). In addition, Regarding the 2025 periodic review schedule, it would be useful to flag clearly for which substances the indication of support is still pending. This would make it clearer to see for which active substances decisions need to be made.

---

1 CCPR53 report, paragraph 219. https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/sh-proxy/en/?lnk=1&url=https%253A%252F%252Fworkspace.fao.org%252Fsites%252Fcodex%252FMeetings%252FCX-718-53%252FREPORT%252FFINAL%252520REPORT%252FREP22_PR53e.pdf

2 Report of the 49th session of the Codex Committee on Residues

The EU notes that chlorpyrifos-methyl had been scheduled for periodic review but disappeared from the list. However, it should either be kept listed for review or, if there is no support, it should be deleted and moved into the table of unsupported compounds.

The EU notes that four substances (pirimicarb, hydrogen phosphide, clethodim, guazatine) were scheduled for periodic review in 2025 under the four-year rule based on the decision of CCPR52 in 2021. This means also that no prolongation is possible and periodic review is strongly recommended for these substances. If late or incomplete dossiers are provided and consequently a periodic review does not take place, these substances should be deleted and moved into the table of unsupported compounds at the following CCPR meeting (CCPR57), and that all CXLs and/or Codex MRL proposals at step 4 (for guazatine) should be revoked/withdrawn

The EU notes that among the 7 substances of table 2A proposed for periodic review in 2026, it is indicated by the EWG that, for 5 substances, as of 23 May 2025, no indication of support, or commitment for data, has been provided. See general comments, point 2.

In addition, the EU notes that for carbendazim, scheduled for periodic review in 2025, the toxicological evaluation was conducted more than 25 years ago, and the 2023 JMPR withdrew its health-based guidance values. If no suitable data are submitted to JMPR for assessment in 2025, then the compound and all related CXLs should be deleted from the Codex Database as agreed by CCPR55.

Finally, the EU notes that although the nomination of new uses was initially combined with new or periodic evaluations, the 2025 priority list for new compound evaluations contains two substances for which the MRLs are below the LOQ (1-Octanol, XDE-747 (Haviza)), under the reserve status. For efficient use of JMPR resources, these compounds should retain this status until uses are authorised where residues occur in food, or until the JMPR backlog is solved.

C. FINALISING THE PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2026

Paragraph 11

The '2026 periodrev' worksheet lists seven compounds in the proposed 2026 Schedule of Periodic Reviews. Support has been confirmed for only two compounds, indoxacarb (216) and maleic hydrazide (102). In case no support is submitted for the substances carbaryl (008), methyl bromide (52), disulfoton (74), pirimiphos-methyl (86) and flumethrin (195) revocation of CXLs should be considered at CCPR57.

D. PRIORITY LISTS 2027 AND BEYOND – TABLE 1

Paragraph 14

No new compounds have been nominated for JMPR evaluation in 2027. The EU proposes to use the capacity for periodic reviews for dithiocarbamates if agreed by CCPR56 (see JMPR Report 2024, point 2.7 Strategy and timing for JMPR re-evaluation of dithiocarbamates).. According to the proposal of JMPR, the toxicological evaluations should be performed in three phases, starting with mancozeb, metiram and ETU in phase 1 (2027), propineb and PTU in phase 2 (2028) and ziram and thiram in phase 3 (2029). The residue evaluation should be performed at the same time as phase 3 of the toxicological assessment.

F. TABLE 2B

Paragraph 20

The EU welcomes the updates made to Table 2B to include the year of the last comprehensive assessment of the compound and the findings of the National Registration of Pesticides working group that are relevant to each compound.

G. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

Paragraph 21

The EU has submitted a concern form for acetamiprid.

ADDITIONAL POINTS

The EU would like to share that typos were found in the worksheet "2027 & beyond-new use-other": For fluopyram (line 21) in column G, it should read "Dragon fruit, pomegranate, guava" instead of "Dragon fruit, pomegranate, dragon fruit",, and in the worksheet "Table 3 record of review": for dinocap (line 127) in column D, it should read "1998R" instead of "199R". Additionally, Table 3 is not always updated in line with Tables 2A and 2B.

India

India's Comments on the Establishment of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation/re-evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) (CL 2025/44-PR)

1) India proposes to submit the monitoring data on the following pesticide-spice combination for inclusion in the priority list of pesticides for evaluation /re-evaluation by JMPR

   i) Imidacloprid on cumin

   ii) Trifloxystrobin on cumin

   Imidacloprid and Trifloxystrobin have approved label claim on cumin in India.

2) India during CCPR54 in 2023 had proposed to include **Azoxystrobin on Cumin** in the priority list of pesticides for evaluation /re-evaluation by JMPR. The same was included for evaluation in 2024. However, the call for data has not yet been received. The same may again be considered in the upcoming JMPR evaluation. Azoxystrobin has approved label claim on cumin in India.

3) As per the priority list, Metalaxyl on Cardamom is listed for JMPR evaluation in 2026. In India, metalaxyl has approved label claim for use on black pepper which belongs to the same crop subgroup as cardamom (028B Spices, fruit or berry).

4) India on behalf of the original registrant, BASF supports the inclusion of new molecule, Fenmezoditiaz in the Priority List 2026-for new compound evaluations for JMPR evaluation and Codex MRL fixation. As original registrant of Fenmezoditiaz, BASF undertakes to provide all the required data as per JMPR requirements.

Thailand

On behalf of Codex Contact Point of Thailand, we would like to provide our comments in response to Circular Letter CL 2025/44-PR as follows:

1. We confirm the submission of data on chlorantraniliprole in Thai eggplant and would also like to propose the inclusion of chlorantraniliprole in durian for evaluation in 2026.

2. Thailand has submitted data on azoxystrobin in broccoli, Chinese and peppers, chili to JMPR and has recently received confirmation that it is scheduled for evaluation in 2025. However, the Excel sheet on CCPR schedules and priority lists for evaluation by JMPR did not include data on these pesticides. We kindly request that this pesticide be included in the 2025 evaluation schedule.

United Arab Emirates

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (EWG) on Priorities chaired by Australia for the preparation of CL 2025/44-PR and the appendix A, as well as the work done to incorporate the requests and updates from members and sponsors. UAE would like to comment on CL 2025/ 44-PR as follows:

A. Schedules and Priority Lists for 2025:

Paragraph 3.UAE notes that schedules and Priority Lists for 2025 are closed and provided for reference only.

B. Work Process

As member of the EWG, UAE acknowledges the work being undertaken by the chair of the EWG, noting that the platform allows a smooth follow up of the updates on the Priority Lists especially the submission of proof of registration by sponsors.

C. Finalizing the proposed schedules for 2026

UAE noted that the number of new compounds for 2026 is lower than that of 2025 2:6, which offers the opportunity for evaluations of more new uses and other evaluations depending on data submission.

UAE welcomes the evaluation of Fenmezoditiaz on rice which will support the national work on risk assessment for this compound. For pesticides with only one-use request, UAE encourages sponsors to submit more than one use to maximize the number of uses within one petition. For the periodic Review of 2026, UAE supports the deletion of pesticides for which the data package is not available.

D. Priority Lists 2027 and Beyond

Table 1

Noting that there were no nominations for new compounds until currently, the UAE wishes that sponsors could submit requests for MRLs setting to support members that are deferring to codex in their national enforcement regulation.

Table 2A

UAE highlights the importance of the work being undertook on National Registration Database (NRD). Setting MRLs for some of the pesticides included in Table 2A based on the results of NRD is very crucial for importing and exporting countries since those pesticides are of a widely used and considered as effective means of pest control.

Table 2B

UAE noted that the number of pesticides candidates to periodic review (meeting 15-year rule) is quite extensive. UAE

acknowledges the work being conducted on the National Registration Database and hopes that this initiative will encourage sponsors and member countries to provide advice on supporting data packages and/or indication of support that would allow a triage and prioritization of the listed.

Many of the compounds in Table 2B are subject to detection in exported consignments (Methoxyfenozide, Pyraclostrobin, Trifloxystrobin….), recommending MRLs for those pesticides will help the authorities to apply to the best the compliance regulations.

G. Public Health Concerns

UAE is in favour of deleting compounds from the CCPR pesticides list that are no longer supported by a sponsor and for which a public health concern has been identified. The withdrawal of the corresponding CXLs will reduce the number of substances for which a periodic review is needed. There are no compounds in the CCPR Pesticide List, or in Tables 2A and 2B, for which UAE would like to lodge a public health concern.

APÉNDICE III

LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES[1]

Presidente: James Deller, Australia

El GTE tuvo más de 40 participantes de los siguientes miembros y organizaciones observadoras:

Australia	Japan
Belgium	Poland
Brazil	Republic of Korea
Canada	Saudi Arabia
Chile	South Africa
Colombia	Switzerland
Costa Rica	Thailand
CropLife International	Tunisia
France	Uganda
Germany	United Arab Emirates
Guatemala	United Kingdom
India	United States of America
Indonesia	Uruguay
Iran (Islamic republic of)	

[1] Póngase en contacto con el punto focal del Estado miembro u organización observadora para obtener los datos de los delegados.
La lista de puntos de contacto del Codex para los miembros y observadores está disponible en el sitio web del Codex en:
http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/members/en/
http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/about-codex/observers/observers/obs-list/en/