



## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

53<sup>rd</sup> Session

(Virtual)

4 - 8 July and 13 July 2022

### NATIONAL REGISTRATIONS OF PESTICIDES

(Prepared by the Electronic Working Group chaired by Germany and co-chaired by Australia)

#### BACKGROUND

1. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) is the subsidiary body of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) having competence on the establishment of maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pesticides in food and feed moving in international trade. The terms of reference also includes the preparation of schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR).<sup>1</sup>
2. The *Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues* provide the framework for the establishment of Codex MRLs for pesticides. The Principles address the roles of CCPR as risk management body and JMPR as risk assessment body and describe the process by which, each year, CCPR in cooperation with the JMPR Secretariat, agrees on a schedule of JMPR evaluations for the following year and considers prioritization of pesticides for future scheduling. This process is known as the *CCPR schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR* and constitutes the first step in the establishment of Codex MRLs (CXLs) for pesticides by CCPR.<sup>2</sup>
3. The Codex schedules and priority lists are composed of new compounds evaluations, new uses and other evaluations, and periodic reviews for compounds that have not been reviewed toxicologically for more than 15 years and/or not having a significant review of the CXL for 15 years (the so-called "old" compounds).
4. Table 2 in the schedules and priority lists relate to the periodic review process. Table 2A lists compounds for periodic review by JMPR. Table 2B lists compounds that have been last evaluated 15 years ago or more but not yet scheduled for period review. Pesticides listed in Table 2B should be considered for scheduling for periodic review when concerns, including public health concerns, are identified and nominated for inclusion in Table 2A. Compounds listed in Tables 2A and 2B are the so-called "old compounds" or "compounds subject to periodic review".
5. The nomination requirements for scheduling of compounds in the schedules and priority lists require, amongst other relevant data, the status of national registrations for the pesticide. The schedules and priority lists seek to provide a balance of new compounds, new uses, other evaluations and periodic reviews.
6. The "old" compounds subject to periodic review add a considerable workload to the schedules and priority lists for evaluation by JMPR vis-à-vis the growing demand for evaluation of new compounds, new uses, other evaluations and the need to keep the balance between these evaluations (i.e. evaluations of "new" versus "old" compounds).
7. CCPR has long debated how to balance the evaluation of "new" and "old" compounds vis-à-vis public health concerns related to "old" compounds and the growing request for evaluation of "new" compounds and their related additional uses and other evaluations. For the unsupported pesticides subject to periodic review, CCPR has emphasized the need for all Codex members to review the compounds in Tables 2A and 2B for which support was either unknown or not provided by the manufacturer. In addition, a new table on "current national registrations for compounds listed in Tables 2A and 2B" currently lists the "orphan" compounds for which support has been withdrawn or was not known with a view to seeking Codex member input on whether or not a national registration is in place.

<sup>1</sup> Codex Procedural Manual, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition, Section V: Subsidiary Bodies, Terms of Reference of CCPR  
Available for downloading from the Codex website: <https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/publications/pt/>

<sup>2</sup> Codex Procedural Manual, 27<sup>th</sup> Edition, Section IV: Risk Analysis, Risk Analysis applied by CCPR

8. CCPR has made lots of progress in the past years to improve the administration and management of the schedules and priority lists to prevent situations where the evaluation workload exceeds available JMPR resources while keeping the balance between new compounds, new uses, other evaluations, and periodic reviews.
9. As part of these efforts, CCPR agreed to seek documented evidence of national registrations and approved uses for compounds subject to periodic review. In view of the magnitude of this task, CCPR supported the development of a database of national registrations for compounds listed in Tables 2A and 2B to aggregate the information on national registration provided by Codex members. Such information will be expanded and updated as necessary to inform the prioritization process of CCPR for nomination of compounds for the establishment of the schedules and priority lists and will provide a useful reference to Codex members interested in supporting compounds subject to periodic reviews.
10. The identification of compounds for which Codex members reported no registered use pattern will greatly assist CCPR in decreasing the list of compounds awaiting scheduling for evaluation by JMPR (in particular periodic reviews) and will therefore allow better management of the schedules and priority lists while keeping the balance between the different evaluations.
11. In order to facilitate the aggregation of information into a single database of those compounds subject to periodic review being hosted by the Codex Secretariat, it is essential that Codex members submit information in a standard format by using a standard excel spreadsheet/worksheet. In this regard, CCPR50 (2018) noted comments that the information in the excel worksheet should be simplified in order not to create unnecessary burden on Codex members. In addition, the excel spreadsheet should fit the purposes of the database i.e. to provide Codex members with a data source to facilitate support of commodities no longer supported in a periodic review and to determine the global registration status of unsupported compounds.
12. The database should be updated as additional compounds are listed for periodic review and/or there are changes to national registration. The frequency of updates; the appropriate number of compounds to be added to the database; the criteria for selecting/prioritizing compounds for inclusion in the database; and the further broadening of the database to include all compounds listed on the CCPR pesticide list should be determined. These points should take into account that this exercise could be resource-intensive for Codex members, the country leading the work as well as the Codex Secretariat as host of the database and could face the challenge that changes in the registration status may occur during the interval year(s).<sup>3</sup>
13. Further improvements were discussed during CCPR51 (2019) where it was agreed to provide an improved National Registration Database with about 20 compounds and to compile the data from all respondents. The compiled data should be compiled in view of the needs for the establishment of the Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR.<sup>4</sup>
14. During second half of 2019 a revised National Registration Database was set up based on a proposal made by the Netherlands in the framework of comments in reply to a circular letter CL 2018/50-PR<sup>5</sup>. The results of the responses are summarized in Table 1. Overall 14 Members filled the new version of the National Registration Database. An Excel-table containing all answers and a short overview is available.
15. Beginning 2020 an additional topic was opened in the EWG working through the Codex online platform following the limited response asking for the challenges with two responses by email.
16. Following consideration of CX/PR 21/52/18 during CCPR52 (2021)<sup>6</sup> it was decided to provide an improved National Registration Database with about 20 compounds every year from Tables 2A and 2B for which data are requested, to compile and analyse the data from all respondent and to report back on the findings to CCPR53.
17. The Codex Secretariat distributed CL 2021/97-PR<sup>5</sup> to all Codex Members with a revised list of commodities and active substances.

---

<sup>3</sup> [REP15/PR47](#), paras. 158-176, [REP16/PR48](#), paras. 164-180, [REP17/PR49](#), paras. 174-177, [REP18/PR50](#), paras. 154-157

<sup>4</sup> [REP19/PR51](#), paras. 216-233

<sup>5</sup> Circular letters are available from the Codex website at:

<https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/resources/circular-letters/en/> or from the dedicated CCPR website:

<https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/committees/committee/related-circular-letters/en/?committee=CCPR>

<sup>6</sup> [REP21/PR52](#), paras 236 – 239

**RESULTS**

18. The new database took into account the latest version of agreed classification and use an overall amount of 25 active substances.
19. Overall 32 Members send responses to the CL 2021/97-PR. A compilation is added as Appendix 1 to this report. The answers were distributed across the regions are given in the following table.

Region	Number of responses
North America	1
Latin- and South America	5
Europe	19
Africa	2
Asia	4
Oceania	1
Sum	32

All regions of the world are covered but compared to the number of Member Countries of CCPR a greater participation would have been desirable.

20. The number of nominations and the spread of uses is given in the following table.

Active substance	Number of Member Countries indicating a use	Spread of uses
Diazinon	11	2 - 33
Ethoxyquin	0	0
Methidathion	4	2 - 15
Quintozene	3	6 - 12
Aldicarb	0	0
Metalaxyl	24	1 - 54
Metalaxyl-M	26	1 - 52
Prochloraz	16	2 - 27
Fipronil	10	2 - 63
Hydrogen phosphide (N) (Al, Ca, Mg and/or ZN salt, indicate as Al, Ca, Mg or Zn)	23	1 - 127
Pirimicarb	21	2 - 80
Dithiocarbamates (metiram (m), maneb (n), mancozeb (c), propineb (p), thiram (h), ziram (z))	27	1 - 60
Fenbutatin oxide	6	1 - 10
Guazatine	3	3 - 28
Permethrin	9	4 - 36
Captan	28	1 - 34
2,4-D	31	1 - 36
Fenthion	3	1
Folpet	23	2 - 23
Parathion-methyl	2	12, 63
Piperonyl butoxide	10	2 - 28
Maleic hydrazide	18	1 - 4
Tebufenozide	18	1 - 17
Amitraz	8	2 - 11
Clethodim	31	1 - 38
Below the 25th percentile (> 9)	9 (> 9)	
Above the 75th percentile (< 23)	6 (< 23)	

This table can only provide some indications since the entries gives only an indication of uses since entries are more or less aggregated.

Two active substances have no nominations, aldicarb and ethoxyquini. Additional 7 active substances have less than nine nominations and being below within the 25 percentile while 6 active substances nominations above the 75th percentile. The importance of an active substance can be seen by the number of nominations but also on the number of uses reported. From this point of view phosphane and its salts are rather important (23 nominations, up to 127 uses). A summary of the results is given in Appendix 2.

21. More over a couple of comments were provided. The comments are summarized in Appendix 3. Some noted mistakes in the table. These are connected cherries, subgroup of Fruiting vegetables, Cucurbits – Melons, Pumpkins and Winter Squashes (includes all commodities in this subgroup) and tea. In addition, zineb was missing.
22. The majority of comments indicate, that members have problems to fill the database. Thus amendment of the instructions is an item for improvement. This will include some sentences on uses and commodities not to be filled in. For the moment, all groups and subgroups of the revised Codex classification including the representative crops are included. The handling could be improved by deleting the representative crops and those commodities that are not directly exposed by plant protection products, i. e. Class D and Class E. In this respect a complete list of the revised Codex Classification is desirable.
23. A few comments were provided where the described problem cannot be solved within the framework of the NRD. This is on the one hand the comment from the United States of America from last year and on the other hand discrepancies between national and Codex classification
24. Last but not least two Members were of the opinion that for dithiocarbamates an phosphane and its salts a column for each single substance would have been more appropriate. From the point of view of MRL setting this might not be the case but since we are speaking about uses this is a very justified proposal.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

25. CCPR is invited
  - (i) consider the information provided in the paper and provide comments, as needed, on the general approach to the development of the database for national registration of pesticides including a view whether a sufficient number of responses is available to support the periodic review of unsupported compounds with no public health concern which are no longer be supported by the manufacturer (see also Agenda Item 11).
  - (ii) consider whether a smaller number of entries in columns A and B in the database as indicated in paragraph 22 may help to fill the database.
  - (iii) provide any further suggestion to help filling the database.
26. The list of appendices are presented below. All appendices are available in English or original language only.

**APPENDIX I****Compilation of all National Registration Database provided**

[http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/codexalimentarius/doc/20220530\\_Appendix\\_I\\_all\\_responses\\_to\\_CL2022-97PR-NRD\\_Database\\_Exercise\\_2022.xlsx](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/codexalimentarius/doc/20220530_Appendix_I_all_responses_to_CL2022-97PR-NRD_Database_Exercise_2022.xlsx)

**APPENDIX II****Summary of the compiled databases**

[http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/codexalimentarius/doc/20220602\\_Appendix\\_II\\_statistics\\_on\\_CL2022-97PR-NRD\\_Database\\_Exercise\\_2022.xlsx](http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/codexalimentarius/doc/20220602_Appendix_II_statistics_on_CL2022-97PR-NRD_Database_Exercise_2022.xlsx)

**APPENDIX III****Compilation of comments in reply to CL 2021/97-PR**

Country	Comments	responses																		
Australia	Zineb was added in column N "dithiocarbamates"	The ADI is also valid for zineb but no MRL is based on trials for zineb																		
Costa Rica	<p>Costa Rica thanks Germany for the valuable effort in preparing this database. We have filled the requested data table with the information from our records. Please find attached the Excel table with Costa Rica data.</p> <p>However, we could not record the registration of several products, since the crop was not in the Excel table, then we indicate the missing crops and pesticides for which there is registered use for our country.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Code</th> <th>Crop</th> <th>Scientific Name</th> <th>Active substance for which a registered label exists</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="10">VP 0526</td> <td rowspan="10">Bean</td> <td rowspan="10"><i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i></td> <td>Parathion-methyl</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Clethodim</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Diazinon</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quintozene</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aluminium Phosphide</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Metiram</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maneb</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mancozeb</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Propineb</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Thiram</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ziram</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Code	Crop	Scientific Name	Active substance for which a registered label exists	VP 0526	Bean	<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i>	Parathion-methyl	Clethodim	Diazinon	Quintozene	Aluminium Phosphide	Metiram	Maneb	Mancozeb	Propineb	Thiram	Ziram	<p>Groups and subgroups to which the commodities in the table belong to are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– beans with pods (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i>) subgroup 014A</li> <li>– garlic subgroup 009A</li> <li>– watermelon subgroup 011B</li> <li>– plantain (FI 0357) subgroup 006B</li> <li>– Palm nut (SO 0696) subgroup 023D, palm oil crude OC 0696 group 067</li> <li>– peanut subgroup 023D</li> <li>– oats (GC 0647) subgroup 020B, oat, forage (green) (now AS0647) subgroup 051A</li> </ul> <p>Additional uses were added in the statistics as appropriate.</p> <p>Crops where commodities are not used as food or feed are not included in the classification. Nevertheless, they give additional information on the importance of active substances. It might be useful to add at the end a line to summarize overall uses in these crops.</p>
Code	Crop	Scientific Name	Active substance for which a registered label exists																	
VP 0526	Bean	<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i>	Parathion-methyl																	
			Clethodim																	
			Diazinon																	
			Quintozene																	
			Aluminium Phosphide																	
			Metiram																	
			Maneb																	
			Mancozeb																	
			Propineb																	
			Thiram																	
Ziram																				

Country	Comments			responses	
	VA 0381	Garlic	<i>Allium sativum</i>	Mancozeb Captan	
VC 0432	Watermelon	<i>Citrullus Vulgaris</i>	Captan Folpet Diazinon Metiram mancozeb Propineb Metalaxyl-M Metalaxyl Permethrin		
FI 0354	Plantain	<i>Musa x paradisiaca L., var. sapientum (L.) Kuntze</i>	Diazinon Maneb Thiram Mancozeb		
OC 0696	Palm nut	<i>Elaeis guineensis</i>	Fipronil Mancozeb 2,4-D		
SO 0697	Peanut	<i>Arachis hypogaea</i>	Mancozeb		
AF 0647	Oat	<i>Avena sativa</i>	Mancozeb		
Further					
1. Authorized uses are available for Clethodim, Diazinon, Parathion-methyl, Permethrin, Metalaxyl, Magnesium Phosphide, Propineb, Maneb and Mancozeb for tobacco.					
2. There are authorized uses for Ornamental plants of the active substances: Captan, Amitraz, Diazinon, Quintozene, Mancozeb, Propineb, Parathion Methyl, 2,4-D, Maneb and Fipronil.					
3. There are authorized uses for Ferns ( <i>Rumohra adiantiformis</i> ) for the pesticides Folpet, Prochloraz, Mancozeb and 2,4-D.					
4. There is a record of Aluminium Phosphide, for abaca ( <i>Musa textiles</i> ), non-edible plant.					
5. Authorized uses are available for Fipronil and Mancozeb for <i>Dracaena</i> .					

Country	Comments	responses
Egypt	N.B. Phosphine (PH3) is used as a fumigation gas	Phosphane is used as a fumigant in stores and thus an active substance in plant protection. The salts also release phosphane as active substance.
Uruguay	<b>Fipronil and Parathion methyl</b> Methyl parathion will be banned next March 2022. At the moment, Fipronil and Parathion methyl pesticides are registered in our country, but restricted to Aptitude - Use as an Hormiguicide. Therefore, they are not directly applied to crops, but rather to the soil. Due to the type of pests they control, the crops associated or affected to them are those that are added to the table.	The term hormiguicide is seldom used. The inclusion of the uses is welcomed. In a next version some text in the instructions will be added.
USA	<i>USA Delegation Notes:</i> (1) USA data is based off of query of Global MRL.com's MRL/tolerance database. This query included the following specifications: -excluded import tolerances -excluded pending/expiring tolerances -excluded proposed tolerances (2) GlobalMRL.com US tolerance is based on US commodity definitions. The translation of these US commodities to Codex definitions makes use of an index field developed by GlobalMRL.com. (3) Confirmatory information regarding US tolerances available in the US Code of Federal Regulations: <a href="http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=ce6b35933d1a4d99340db70463253650&amp;mc=true&amp;tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title4/40cfr180_main_02.tpl">http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=ce6b35933d1a4d99340db70463253650&amp;mc=true&amp;tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title4/40cfr180_main_02.tpl</a> or <a href="http://www.globalmrl.com">www.globalmrl.com</a> . <b>Does not include tolerances with regional registration, time-limited tolerances, or tolerances for inadvertent residues. Some of these tolerances may not have an associated registration.</b> (4) Active US pesticide registration information is available at <a href="https://iaspub.epa.gov/apex/pesticides/f?p=PPLS:1">https://iaspub.epa.gov/apex/pesticides/f?p=PPLS:1</a> and can be reviewed by the U.S. Delegation for confirmatory information on specific U.S. registrations.	Same comment as provided in 2021.
Brazil	Several comments concerning authorisation without label	Not part of the exercise
Norway	a) Metalaxyl-M is also used for seed treatment for vegetables in Norway (no residues)  b) Authorized use of 2,4-D-EHE in Norway (same AS as 2,4-D)? For 2,4-D (2,4-D-EHE) also authorized use in Norway for rye, ryewheat and oat. c) FS0244 cherry sour supposed to be FS0244 cherry sweet (error in cell B25)?	a) That's correct, but according to my understanding it is not the aim to provide results of evaluation. Indicates that more text is necessary in the instructions. b) Yes c) Typo, second entry should read FS 0244 cherry, sweet

Country	Comments	responses
	d) Also authorized use of cletodim in parsley root, turnip-rooted celery, parsips and turnips.	d) As indicated in the instructions, it is not the aim to have a detailed overview on all authorised uses. Otherwise handling of table becomes more complicated.
Thailand	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. diazinon, metalaxyl, fipronil, amitraz has registered with durian</li> <li>2. fipronil has registered with rambutan and salak</li> <li>3. diazinon has registered with coconut.</li> </ol>	Uses added in the statistics. Mentioned commodities belong to subgroups 006C, 006F and group 22.
Canada	<p>"Canada's Comments on the national registrations of pesticides (National Registration Database of pesticides for periodic review by JMPPR)</p> <p>Canada thanks the Chair of the EWG on the National Registration Database for this opportunity to provide information on the Canadian registration status of 20 pesticides selected from Tables 2A and 2B. Canada agrees that the maximum number of pesticides for which the registration status is being sought should not exceed 20 pesticides.</p> <p>While Canada did not encounter any major difficulties in populating the spreadsheet, Canada notes that the instructions on how to populate the spreadsheet for crop groups/subgroups warrants further clarification.</p> <p>For example, when a pesticide is registered for apple and pear only (not the crop group), Canada only noted "Y" for apple and pear, however, if the pesticide was registered for the pome fruits crop group, Canada noted "Y" for Pome fruits, as well as apple and pear. Canada was uncertain as to whether this complied with the instructions.</p> <p>In those cases where the pesticide was registered on a crop, which is not a representative crop, such as ginseng or rhubarb, Canada noted "Y" for the subgroup of root vegetables (includes all commodities in this subgroup) or the subgroup of stems and petioles (includes all commodities in this subgroup), respectively, even though the registered uses are for one crop within the crop subgroup.</p>	I agree that the instruction can have some more text for clarity.
Czech Republic	Hops not found, metalaxyl-M and folpet are used in hops	Hops, dried are covered by Group 079 Group Letter Code MU, MU1100. Uses added in Appendix 2
Finland	Finland indicates emergency authorisations	Not part of the exercise
France, Portugal, Spain	Countries included single crops in the database after Y in case of (sub)groups	Indication that more text for the instructions is necessary
Netherlands	Information on the mistake concerning cherries	Typo, second entry should read FS 0244 cherry, sweet
Slovenia	Zinc phosphide - Use only against vole on the field - not relevant for MRL	That's correct, but according to my understanding it is not the aim to provide results of evaluation. Indicates that more text is necessary in the instructions.

Country	Comments	responses
Sweden	Column L: we don't understand the instruction on PH3. In Sweden there has to be a registered label if there is an authorised use	The activity of the salts is connected to the release of phosphane and in the meantime phosphane is registered in some countries as a fumigant.
Chile	<p>The Chilean delegation appreciates the effort of the EWG to move forward with the improvements to the National Registration Database.</p> <p>Here are some comments regarding the experience of entering Chile's background information in the latest version of the database:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incorporating the column with the food/food group allows to homogenize the responses of the countries, however, at the time of entering the data it was complex to associate the national records to match it with column B.</li> <li>2. It is possible that this situation occurs because not all Codex members have aligned their records with the same terminology of the food classification, and also because there is currently no updated and compiled version of the classification available for consultation.</li> <li>3. It would be more practical to enter the information requested in columns L and M (<i>N is meant</i>) in separated columns.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I agree that it is difficult to compare national classifications with Codex classification. It might be, that it is easier to do one single crop level but with this other disadvantages may arise.</li> <li>2. I can support the which to have a consolidated version of the classification once all parts have been discussed.</li> <li>3. Something to be discussed since at the end we only one MRL. But it is correct that uses are different .</li> </ol>
China	<p>Thank you for your effort of the EWG to improvement to the National Registration Database. There are some suggestions regarding to the experience of entering China registration information in the latest version of the database:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of specific content in the sheet "instructions".</li> <li>2. The column B represents the "crop/crop of type for which a registered label exists" In the sheet "NRD" , it is unsuitable for the "Processing products" were listed in the column B.</li> <li>3. It would be better to enter the information requested in the separated column. such as column L and columns N.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. agreed that instructions could have more explanations</li> <li>2. When I understand the comment correctly, all non-primary food and feed commodities should be deleted. It will shorten the table.</li> <li>3. see point above</li> </ol>
THIE	<p>We would like to make a note on two crop code – code combinations in the excel file of Circular Letter CL2021/97-PR:</p> <p>For reasons of clarity an adjustment is proposed for line 286 of the excel file (sheet NRD): the current crop explanation for DT 0171 is given as "Group of Teas (Tea and Herb teas)". We recommend to change this to "Group of Teas (Tea and Herb teas), includes all commodities in this Group" in line with the actual current Codex Classification definition for this code.</p> <p>Even more importantly, in line 287 of the excel file the current crop definition for DT 1114 is given as "Group of Teas (Tea and Herbal teas), (includes all commodities in this Group)" which is not in line with the current Codex Classification definition. DT 1114 only refers to tea (<i>Camellia sinensis</i>). Therefore, the entry should be aligned to the correct Codex Classification expression, i.e. "Subgroup of Tea, Green, Black (black, fermented and dried) <i>Camellia sinensis</i> (L.) O Kuntze, several cultivars; syn: <i>C. thea</i> Link; <i>C. theifera</i> Griff.; <i>Thea sinensis</i> L.; <i>T. bohea</i> L. ; <i>T. viridis</i> L."</p>	Agreed that a there is a mistake to be corrected as explained.

Country	Comments	responses
Germany	For the Subgroup of Fruiting vegetables, Cucurbits – Melons, Pumpkins and Winter Squashes (includes all commodities in this subgroup) code VC2040 is missing. (line 95)	To be added

**APPENDIX IV**  
**List of Participants<sup>7</sup>**

<b>Country/Observer</b>	<b>Name</b>
Chair	Karsten Hohgardt (Germany)
Co-Chair	Karina Budd (Australia)
Argentina	Gabriela Catalani
Canada	Monique Thomas
Chile	Jorge Carvajal
Chile	Paulina Chávez
Chile	Rodrigo Sotomayor
Chile	Roxana Vera
China	Lifen WU
Costa Rica	Ivania Morera Rodríguez
Costa Rica	Alejandro Rojas León
Costa Rica	Amanda Lasso Cruz
Costa Rica	Tatiana Vasquez
Ecuador	Jakeline Arias
Egypt	Mariam Barsoum Onsy
European Commission	Siret SURVA
Germany	Monika Schumacher
India	NCCP India
India	Ruchita Pal
India	Dr. K. K. Sharma
India	Dr. Vandana Tripathy
India	Dr. Shobhita Kalra
India	Dr. Ruchi Gupta
India	Dr. T.P.Rajendran
India	Dr. Kaushik Banerjee
Iran	Roya Noorbakhsh
Iraq	Mudher Mohammed Abdulhadi Al-Ani
Japan	Tomoyuki KAWAI
Mexico	Tania Daniela Fosado Sori
New Zealand	Warren Hughes
Republic of Korea	Hwang Kiseon
Republic of Korea	Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA) Codex contact point
Republic of Korea	Kiseon Hwang
Republic of Korea	Eun Young Lee
Republic of Korea	Jung Yong hyun
Republic of Korea	Choe Won Jo
Republic of Korea	Lee Jung Mi
Republic of Korea	Park Yu-min
Republic of Korea	Im Moo-Hyeog
Saudi Arabia	Saif M. AL-Mutairi
Saudi Arabia	Nimah Baqadir

<sup>7</sup> Please contact the focal point of the Member Country or Observer Organization for the details of the delegates. The list of Codex contact points for members and observers are available from the Codex website at: <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/>

<b>Country/Observer</b>	<b>Name</b>
South Africa	Aluwani Madzivhandila
Sweden	Niklas Montell
Thailand	Chutima Sornsumrarn
Thailand	Namaporn Attaviroj (Ms)
United States	Aaron Niman
United States	David Miller
United States	Alexander Domesle
United States	Marie Maratos Bhat
Uruquay	Q.F. Susana Franch
CropLife International	Wibke Meyer
THIE	Cordelia Kraft