

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

E

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

REP25/PR

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Forty-eighth Session

10-14 November 2025

**REPORT OF THE 56th SESSION OF THE
CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES**

Santiago, Chile

8-13 September 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary and Status of Work	page vi
List of Abbreviations	page ix
List of CRDs	page x
Report of the 56th Session of CCPR	page 1

	Paragraphs
INTRODUCTION	1
OPENING OF THE SESSION	2 - 4
DIVISION OF COMPETENCE	5
ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (Agenda item 1)	6
APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEURS (Agenda item 2)	7 - 8
MATTERS REFERRED TO CCPR BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda item 3)	9 - 18
• Survey on monitoring the use and impact of Codex texts	10
- Publication of the revised <i>Classification of food and feed</i> (CXA 4-1989)	11 - 12
- Codex <i>Procedural Manual</i> : Review of inconsistencies in language and superseded content in Section 4.8 (Risk analysis principles by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues)	13 - 15
- Correction to the definition of “fat” in the <i>Classification of food and feed</i> (CXA 4-1989)	16 - 17
Conclusion	18
MATTERS ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda item 4a)	19 - 29
- FAO	20 - 27
- WHO	28
Conclusion	29
MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (Agenda item 4b)	30 - 32
- Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture	
Conclusion	33
REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATION ARISING FROM THE 2024 JMPR MEETING (Agenda item 5a)	34 - 74
General statement	34 - 35
General considerations	36 - 74
- Developments in dietary exposure methodology for pesticide residues in foods	37 - 45
- Consideration on recommendation of group maximum residue limits for pulses	46 - 48
- Extrapolation of recommendations for tomato and pepper to eggplants (subgroup)	49 - 54
- Transition from commodity of meat to commodity of muscle and fat	55 - 59
- Interpretation of use-patterns for targeted applications	60 - 63
- Update of the pesticide residues in food: guidance document for WHO JMPR monographers and reviewers	64
- Strategy and timing for JMPR re-evaluation of dithiocarbamates	65 - 67
- Linear and non-linear toxicokinetics guide progress update	68 - 69
- Data on pesticide metabolites that are also commodity chemicals	70 - 72
- Efficiency of JMPR resources	73 - 74

	Paragraphs
REPORT ON RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC CONCERNS RAISED BY CCPR ARISING FROM THE 2024 JMPR MEETING (Agenda item 5b)	75
MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS (MRLS) FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED (AT STEPS 7 AND 4) (Agenda Item 6.1)	76 - 217
General remarks	76 - 80
Consideration of compounds	
CHLORMEQUAT (015)	81 - 83
CHLORPYRIFOS (017)	84 - 86
DIMETHOATE (027) / OMETHOATE (055)	87 - 90
ETHOXYQUIN (035)	91 - 95
FOLPET (041)	96 - 100
PIPERONYL-BUTOXIDE (062)	101 - 103
PYRETHRINS (063)	104 - 107
CARBENDAZIM (072)	108 - 110
CHLORPYRIFOS-METHYL (090)	111 - 114
MALEIC HYDRAZIDE (102)	115 - 117
PHOSMET (103)	118 - 124
IPRODIONE (111)	125 - 127
PERMETHRIN (120)	128 - 130
PROCHLORAZ (142)	131 - 137
CARBOSULFAN (145)	138
LAMBDA-CYHALOTHRIN (146)	139
METHOPRENE (147)	140 - 141
PROPICONAZOLE (160)	142 - 143
BUPROFEZIN (173)	144 - 147
HEXYTHIAZOX (176)	148 - 151
ETOFENPROX (184)	152 - 156
TEBUCONAZOLE (189)	157 - 158
FENPYROXIMATE (193)	159 - 162
TEBUFENOZIDE (196)	163 - 164
FIPRONIL (202)	165 - 169
SPINOSAD (203)	170 - 171
NOVALURON (217)	172 - 174
AZOXYSTROBIN (229)	175 - 177
CLOTHIANIDIN (238) / THIAMETHOXAM (245)	178 - 179

	Paragraphs
CYPROCONAZOLE (239)	180 - 181
FLUBENDIAMIDE (242)	182 - 184
ACETAMIPRID (246)	185
CYANOTRANILIPROLE (263)	186 - 188
FLUPYRADIFURONE (285)	189 - 190
ACIBENZOLAR-S-METHYL (288)	191 - 192
PHOSPHONIC ACID (301) / FOSETYL-ALUMINIUM (302)	193 - 194
PYDIFLUMETOFEN (309)	195 - 198
TETRANILIPROLE (324)	199 - 201
FLUAZINAM (306) / ACYNONAPYR (333)	202
CARFENTRAZONE-ETHYL (338)	203
CYCLOBUTRIFLURAM (339)	204 - 206
FENPROPIDIN (340)	207 - 209
FLORPYRAUXIFEN-BENZYL (341)	210 - 212
FLUOXAPIPROLIN (342)	213 - 214
Other matters	
LINDANE (048)	215
Concern form: acetamiprid	216
General conclusion	217
CXLs FOR MILK AND MILK FAT (Agenda item 6.2)	218 - 222
MRLs FOR OKRA (Agenda item 6.3)	223 - 227
GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING THE PURITY AND STABILITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS AND RELATED STOCK SOLUTIONS OF PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (AT STEP 7) (Agenda item 7)	228 - 234
MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW (Agenda Item 8.1)	235 - 254
- Report of the EWG on the management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review	236 - 238
Conclusion	239
- Consideration of outstanding and future work for the EWG following the recommendation from the priority list	240 - 248
- General considerations	242 - 248
- Folpet (41) and prochloraz (142)	250 - 254
- Discussion on unsupported commodities	251 - 253
Conclusion	254
NATIONAL REGISTRATION OF PESTICIDES (Agenda item 8.2)	255 - 262

	Paragraphs
ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR (Agenda item 9)	263 - 279
- 2026 Schedule for JMPR evaluations	265 - 271
- Priority lists for 2027 and beyond	272 - 277
- Nominations for Parallel Review	278
Conclusion	279
ENHANCEMENT OF OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF CCPR AND JMPR (Agenda item 10)	280 - 293
COORDINATION OF WORK BETWEEN THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES AND THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS: JOINT CCPR/CCRVDF WORKING GROUP ON COMPOUNDS WITH DUAL USE – STATUS OF WORK (Agenda item 11)	294 - 301
OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda item 12)	302
DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 13)	303 - 306

LIST OF APPENDICES

Pages

APPENDIX I	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	32 - 42
APPENDIX II	PART 1: EDITORIAL AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 4.8 OF THE RISK ANALYSIS PRINCIPLES APPLIED BY THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES OF THE PROCEDURAL MANUAL	43 - 52
APPENDIX II	PART 2: CORRECTION TO THE DEFINITION OF “FAT” IN THE <i>CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD AND FEED</i> (CXA 4-1989).....	53
APPENDIX III	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES RECOMMENDED FOR ADOPTION AT STEP 5/8	54 - 64
Appendix IV	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES RECOMMENDED FOR REVOCATION	65 - 75
APPENDIX V	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES WITHDRAWN BY CCPR	76 - 77
APPENDIX VI	MRLs FOR PESTICIDES RETAINED AT STEP 7 AND AT STEP 4	78 - 79
APPENDIX VII	GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING THE STABILITY AND PURITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS AND RELATED STOCK SOLUTIONS OF PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (FOR ADOPTION AT STEP 8)	80 - 88
APPENDIX VIII	PRIORITY LIST OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR	89 - 92

SUMMARY AND STATUS OF WORK

Responsible Party	Purpose	Text/Topic	Code	Step(s)	Para(s). App.
CCEXEC89 CAC48	Critical Review Adoption	MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) proposed for adoption by CCPR	---	5/8	App. III Para. 217(i)(a)
CCEXEC89 CAC48	Critical Review Revocation	CXLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) proposed for revocation by CCPR	---	---	App. IV Para. 217 (i)(b) and 239 (i)
CCEXEC89 CAC48	Critical Review Discontinuation	MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) that were withdrawn (discontinued) from the Step Procedure by CCPR	---	4 7	App. V Para. 217(ii)(a)
JMPR (2025 or future sessions) Members CCPR57 (or future sessions)	Consideration Action	MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) retained by CCPR, awaiting further assessment from JMR	-	4 7	App. VI Para. 217(ii)(b) and 239(ii)
		Revise the residue definition for acephate (95) to include methamidophos (100) when conducting the periodic review of acephate (95)	-	-	239(iii)
CCEXEC89 CAC48	Adoption	Editorial amendments to Section 4.8 of the Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues in the Codex <i>Procedural Manual</i>	-	-	App. II, Part 1 Para. 18 (vi)
		Correction to the definition for “fat” in the <i>Classification of food and feed</i> (CXA 4-1989)	-	-	App. II, Part 2 Para. 18 (vi)
CCEXEC89 CAC48	Adoption	Guidelines on monitoring the purity and stability of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage	-	8	App. VII Para. 234
EWG (Chile with the assistance of Australia, Costa Rica, India and Kenya) CCPR57	Discussion consideration action	Examine carbaryl (008), methyl bromide (052), disulfoton (074), flumethrin (195) and etoxyquin (035) using the internal management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review approach	-	-	Para. 254(i – ii)

Responsible Party	Purpose	Text/Topic	Code	Step(s)	Para(s). App.
	Review	Management of unsupported compounds with public health concern scheduled for periodic review (internal CCPR approach)	-	-	Para. 255(iii)
CCEXEC89 CAC48 EWG (Australia) CCPR57	Critical Review Approval Discussion Comments Consideration Action	Priority list of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR			Appendix VIII Para. 279(i - ii)
Codex Secretariat, Australia, China and EU CCPR57	Proposal Discussion	Transition from commodity of meat to commodity of muscle and fat: Addition of suffix / note in the database to those CXLs for commodities Group of Muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals) (MM 0095) and Group of Avian Muscle (PM 0110) derived under the old classification to clarify that that the CXL applied to the old commodity description	-	-	Para. 57 – 58 and 59(ii)
Codex Secretariat / CCPR Secretariat / CAC48	Action Information	Ensure note <i>“for monitoring and regulatory purposes, whole milk is to be analyzed, and the result compared to the MRL for whole milk”</i> to the CXLs for milk fats (FM 0183) in the Codex database for MRLs for pesticides in all cases where CXLs are established for fat-soluble pesticides in both milks (ML 0106) and milk fats (FM 0183) is inserted	-	-	Para. 222(ii – iii)
Codex Secretariat CCPR57	Review Discussion	Review the wording and application of the “F” suffice for outdated content and consistency of application and update	-	-	Para. 222(v)
Members CCPR57	Review Discussion	Review of data availability for okra, martynia and roselle / Establish possible timelines for the evaluation and reconsideration of the provisional application of the CXLs for pepper subgroup (VO 0051)			Para. 227(iv)

Responsible Party	Purpose	Text/Topic	Code	Step(s)	Para(s). App.
JMPR Secretariat / JMPR2025 CCPR57	Consideration Action	Concerns raised on the GECDE methodology / following steps	-	-	Para. 44(ii), (iii) and 45 (i – iv)
		Study the feasibility of including the exposure calculations for the metabolites of tetraniliprole, prochloraz and other compounds, as applicable via the TTC approach in the JMPR report			Para. 133, 200 and 218 (iii)
		Insert note for “monitoring and regulatory purposes, whole milk is to be analyzed, and the result compared to the MRL for whole milk” alongside the MRL for milk fats in all cases where MRLs were established for both milk fats and milks for fat soluble pesticides	-	-	Para. 222(iv)
		Ensure guidance on data submission is up to date, available and accessible Communicate gaps in dossiers submitted in response to calls for data to promote high quality dossier submission Provide input to the priority WG on reasons why work scheduled could not proceed			Para. 292(i), (iii)
CAC48	Request	Reiterate to FAO and WHO and their governing bodies the critical importance of JMPR to support science-based establishment of pesticide MRLs in a timely and efficient manner and to ensure that JMPR has adequate resources to undertake its work	-	-	Para. 291(iii)
	Information	Endorsed the scheduling of a virtual session of the joint EWG that precedes a virtual joint session of CCPR and CCRVDF	-	-	Para. 302

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACRONYM	FULL NAME
ADI	Acceptable Daily Intake
AfRD	Acute Reference Dose
CAC	Codex Alimentarius Commission
CCEXEC	Executive Committee
CCPR	Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues
CCRVDF	Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods
CIPAC	Joint Collaborative International Pesticides Analytical Council
CL	Circular Letter
CRD	Conference Room Document
CXA	Codex Miscellaneous Text
CXG	Codex Guideline
CXL(s)	Codex Maximum Residue Limit(s) for Pesticide (as adopted by CAC)
EFSA	European Food Safety Authority
EU	European Union
EWG	Electronic Working Group
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
GAP	Good Agricultural Practice (in the use of pesticides)
GECDE	Global estimate of chronic dietary exposure
GPC	Global Pulse Confederation
HBGV(s)	Health Based Guidance Value(s)
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICAMA	Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management
IEDI	International Estimated Daily Intake
INC	International Dried Fruits and Nuts Council
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
ISWG	in-session Working Group
JECFA	Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives
JMPM	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pest Management
JMPR	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues
JMPS	FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specification
LOQ	Limit of Quantification
MARA	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China
MRL(s)	Maximum Residue Limit(s)
NAM	New Approach Methodologies
NRD	National Registration Database
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
RM	Reference materials
ToR(s)	Term(s) of Reference
TTC	Threshold of Toxicological Concern
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America
VWG	Virtual Working Group
WG	Working Group
WHO	World Health Organization

LIST OF CRDs

CRD No.	Agenda Item	Submitted by
1	All agenda items	European Union Division of competence and voting rights between EU and its Member States
2	9	Australia as Chair of the EWG on Priorities (Revised Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR)
3 Rev.1	7	India supported by Canada and Singapore as chair and co-chairs of the VWG on the Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage Revised Guidelines
4	7	India supported by Canada and Singapore as chair and co-chairs of the ISWG on the Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage Revised Guidelines
10 Rev.1	6.1, 6.2	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
11	3, 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 10 and 11	Kenya
12	3, 4(a), 4(b), 7, 8.1, 10 and 11	Rwanda
13 Rev.1	5(a) and 6.1	USA
14	5(a)	CropLife International
15	3, 5(a), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9, 10 and 11	Thailand
16	3 and 5(a)	Brazil
17	5(a)	Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay
18 Rev.1	5(a), 5(b), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 8.2, 10 and 11	European Union (EU)
19	5(a), 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9 and 10	India
20	3, 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 5(b), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9, 10 and 11	Uganda
21	6.1, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9 and 10	United Arab Emirates (UAE)
22	6.1 and 8.1	Uruguay supported by Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay and Peru
23	6.2, 6.3, 10 and 11	Uruguay
24	5(a) and 6.1	Australia
25 Rev.1	5(a), 6.1, 7 and 9	Republic of Korea
26	5(a), 6.3 and 9	Global Pulse Confederation (GPC)
27	4(a), 5(a), 6.1, 8.1 and 9	Morocco
28	3, 6.2, 7 and 8.1	Nigeria
29	1, 3, 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9, 10 and 11	United Republic of Tanzania
30	5(a)	Japan
31	6.3, 7, 8.2 and 11	Senegal
32	6.1, 6.2, 8.2, 9, 10 and 11	Indonesia
33	5(a), 5(b), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9, 10 and 11	Mexico

CRD No.	Agenda Item	Submitted by
34	5(a), 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1 and 10	Agrocare Latinoamérica
35	6.1, 8.1, 8.2, 10 and 11	El Salvador
36	6.2, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 10 and 11	Ecuador
37	5(a)	Institute of Food Technologists (IFT)
38	1, 3, 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9, 10 and 11	East African Community (EAC)
39	3, 4(a), 4(b), 5(a), 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9, 10 and 11	Burundi
40	6.1	National Health Federation (NHF)
41	6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 9, 10 and 11	International Union of Food Science and Technology (IUFoST)
42	6.1	Malaysia
43	3, 4(b), 5(a), 6.1, 6.3, 7, 8.1, 8.2, 10 and 11	Ghana

INTRODUCTION

1. The 56th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) was held in Santiago, Chile, from 8-13 September 2025 at the kind invitation of the Governments of Chile and China. The Session was chaired by Dr Weili Shan and co-chaired by Mr Eduardo Aylwin. Dr Lifang Duan served as the Vice-Chairperson. The Session was attended by delegates from 48 Member countries, one Member Organization, and nine Observer Organizations. The List of Participants is attached as Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Ms Ignacia Fernandez, Minister of Agriculture of Chile, opened the meeting, welcomed participants, and noted that multilateral cooperation and the use of scientific evidence were integral to achieve Codex's mandate of protecting consumer health while facilitating the fair trade of food. The Minister emphasized that promoting the trade competitiveness of the rural small-holder and indigenous agriculture sector would improve food security and quality of life, and highlighted Chile's commitment to and participation and leadership in the work of CCPR, as well as sustained efforts to incorporate Codex texts into its national legislation.
3. Mr Wenbo Pan, Chief Agronomist, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (MARA) of the People's Republic of China also addressed the Committee and welcomed participants. In highlighting China's continued contributions to CCPR, the Chief Agronomist noted that this was China's first time to co-host a CCPR session, and thanked Chile for collaborating closely with China in preparing for CCPR56. The Chief Agronomist also emphasized the importance of collaboration, as well as the use of science and technology to regulate pesticide use.
4. The Committee was also addressed by the following:
 - Ms Maya Takagi, Regional Programme Leader, FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean;
 - Dr Giovanni Escalante, Pan American Health Organization (PAHO)/WHO Country Representative for Chile;
 - Mr Allan Azegele, Chairperson of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC);
 - Dr Weili Shan, CCPR Chair and Deputy Director General of the Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA) of the People's Republic of China; and
 - Dr Sarah Cahill, Codex Secretary.

Division of Competence

5. CCPR noted the division of competence between the European Union (EU) and its Member States, according to paragraph 5, Rule II of the Rules of Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC).

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda item 1)¹

6. CCPR adopted the Provisional Agenda as its agenda for the session and agreed to establish an in-Session Working Group (ISWG) open to all Members and Observers, chaired by India, and co-chaired by Canada and Singapore, working in English, to review the Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage (Agenda Item 7), as presented in CRD03 Rev.1, and to prepare a proposal for consideration by the plenary.

APPOINTMENT OF RAPORTEURS (Agenda item 2)

7. CCPR appointed Yau Ho-pan, Michael (China), Julian Cudmore (United Kingdom (UK)) and Sara McGrath (United States of America (USA)) to act as rapporteurs for this Session.
8. The Chairperson thanked China, UK, and the USA for their support to the CCPR's core work to establish maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pesticides. The Chairperson acknowledged the valuable assistance of rapporteurs to ensure that the discussions and decisions taken by CCPR in this regard were accurately reflected in the report of its session.

MATTERS REFERRED TO CCPR BY CAC AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES (Agenda item 3)²

9. The Codex Secretariat presented the issues in the document that were for information only, the matters for action arising from the 34th session of the Codex Committee on General Principles (CCGP34), and a correction to the definition of "fat" in the *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989).

¹ CX/PR 25/56/1

² CX/PR 25/56/2; CX/PR 25/56/2-Add.1

Survey on monitoring the use and impact of Codex texts

10. CCPR56 noted that the results of the 2024 survey would be made available shortly, and that Members would be surveyed on their use of Codex MRLs (CXLs) for pesticide residues in the 2025 survey. The Codex Secretariat therefore encouraged Members to respond actively to the 2025 survey once it is issued.

Publication of the revised *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989)

11. CCPR56 noted that the revised *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989) had been published on the Codex webpage in English, French and Spanish, that the Codex Secretariat would be reviewing possible reclassification of the document from the "Miscellaneous" category (CXA) to the "Guidelines" category (CXG) and that further work would be undertaken to improve the accessibility of this text.
12. The Codex Secretariat informed CCPR that consequential to completing the revision to CXA 4-1989, a project had been initiated to update the Codex database on pesticide residues in food to remap all the CXLs/MRLs to the revised classification. This work would be undertaken with external support and in collaboration with the CCPR Secretariat. During the remapping process, some issues were expected to be identified, which would be referred to future sessions of CCPR. The Codex Secretariat also informed CCPR that the technology of the database would be enhanced so that it could be updated in a timelier manner and thanked Australia and Canada for the resources provided to enable these initiatives to be undertaken.

Codex *Procedural Manual*: Review of inconsistencies in language and superseded content in Section 4.8 (Risk analysis principles by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues)

13. The Codex Secretariat informed CCPR that at the request of CCGP33, a circular letter CL 2024/27-GP had been issued to solicit proposals on inconsistencies in language and superseded content in the Codex *Procedural Manual*. CCGP34, following its consideration of the comments received in reply to CL 2024/27-GP, requested CCPR to consider the comments related to Section 4.8 "Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues" in the *Procedural Manual*, noting the need for this section to be clear and consistent with Section 2.
14. CCPR considered the amendments proposed in CX/PR 25/56/2-Add.1 Appendix I. In response to suggestions to amend paragraph 169 using an alternative text, the FAO JMPR Secretariat explained that the amendment proposed originally was reflective of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR's) work in evaluating the environmental fate of pesticide residues, which was limited only to studies in soil, water, and water-sediment systems. However, Members agreed that the proposed additions to paragraph 169, as well as to paragraph 218(f) to include reference to a fifth table recently used with regard to scheduling and priority lists, were substantive amendments requiring more time for consideration.
15. CCPR agreed to forward all other proposed amendments to CAC48 for adoption, with a refinement to the proposed language in paragraphs 220, 224(a), and 245(b) to improve clarity and noted that Members were welcome to submit proposals for more substantive improvements to the risk analysis principles to future sessions of CCPR.

Correction to the definition of "fat" in the *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989)

16. The Codex Secretariat recalled that CAC45 (2022), at the recommendation of CCPR53 (2022), adopted technical amendments to harmonise the definitions for edible tissues of animal origin (including for fat), for pesticide and veterinary drug residue uses. Therefore, the descriptors for fat had been aligned between the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Food (CCRVDF) and CCPR. However, some words had been inadvertently omitted in the CCPR descriptor for "fat" in CXA 4-1989, which would need to be corrected to ensure consistency with the decision taken at CCPR53 and adopted at CAC45.
17. CCPR agreed to forward the correction in CX/PR 25/56/2-Add.1 Appendix II to CAC48 for adoption.

Conclusion

18. CCPR56:
 - (i) noted the matters for information referred by CAC, CCEXEC, and other subsidiary bodies of the Commission;
 - (ii) noted that other recommendations arising from CAC and/or CCEXEC regarding the provision of scientific advice to CCPR, management of unsupported compounds, and coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF would be considered under the relevant agenda items (i.e. Agenda items 5a, 8.1, and 11, respectively);
 - (iii) encouraged:
 - (a) more Members to take leadership roles in committee working groups; and
 - (b) Members and Observers to provide input to the monitoring framework for the Codex Strategic Plan 2026 – 2031;

- (iv) noted with appreciation that work was underway to remap the CXLs/MRLs in the Codex database and their willingness to address any questions that arose in the process of undertaking that work;
- (v) noted that further efforts would be made to improve the accessibility of the *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989) and this may involve the reclassification of the document from the "Miscellaneous" category (CXA) to the "Guidelines" category (CXG) after CAC48 as a more appropriate categorisation; and
- (vi) agreed to forward the amendments to Section 4.8 (Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues) in the *Codex Procedural Manual* (Appendix II Part 1) and the correction to the definition for "fat" in the *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989) to CAC48 for adoption (Appendix II Part 2).

MATTERS ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda item 4a)³

19. The Representatives of FAO and WHO introduced the item and highlighted key normative and capacity building activities carried out by both organizations relevant to the work of CCPR since its 55th Session (June 2024).

FAO

Activities of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management (JMPM)

20. CCPR was informed that the 17th JMPM, held in October 2024, recommended updates to several guidelines, including those on risk communication, empty pesticide containers, pesticide resistance monitoring, minor pesticide use, and online pesticide sales. JMPM endorsed new guidance documents on pesticide phase-out, illegal trade, online sales, and data requirements for registration.
21. CCPR noted that FAO and WHO were reviewing the Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management to address Indigenous Peoples' rights to free, prior, and informed consent, as highlighted by the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. CCPR further noted that a new guidance on aerial pesticide application was published and available online⁴.

Activities of the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Specification (JMPS)

22. CCPR was informed that the 23rd JMPS was held in June 2024 in the Netherlands, where 38 pesticide specifications were evaluated. Consensus was reached on revising the operational manual for chemical pesticides, drafting a new manual for microbial pesticides, and updating data requirements for formulation specifications. Following the meeting, the 19th Joint Collaborative International Pesticides Analytical Council (CIPAC)/FAO/WHO Open Meeting and the 68th Technical Meeting reviewed 15 analytical methods for 17 pesticides and impurities.
23. CCPR also noted that the newly published *Manual on Development and Use of FAO and WHO Specifications for Microbial Pesticides*⁵ provided practical guidance for establishing microbial pesticide specifications and improving biopesticide quality control to reduce risks of pesticide to health and the environment.

Food safety implications from the use of environmental inhibitors in agrifood systems

24. CCPR was informed that FAO had published a report under its Food Safety Foresight Programme, titled "Food safety implications from the use of environmental inhibitors in agrifood systems"⁶. The report:
 - examined the food safety implications of environmental inhibitors used in agrifood systems to improve production efficiency and reduce environmental impacts such as greenhouse gas emissions and nitrogen loss;
 - noted that while environmental inhibitors offered sustainability benefits, their unintended presence in food could pose health risks and disrupt trade, especially in the absence of harmonized MRLs, clear definitions, and sufficient safety data; and
 - reviewed various synthetic and biological inhibitors, outlined regulatory approaches in selected countries, and identified knowledge gaps.
25. CCPR was further informed that a related FAO webinar was held on 9 May 2024, and ongoing work would continue to provide guidance on assessing food safety risks associated with these substances.
26. A Member expressed support and appreciation to FAO for its work on environmental inhibitors and indicated its commitment to support future work in this area.

International Workshop on Feed Risk Assessment – Chemical Safety

³ CX/PR 25/56/3

⁴ <https://www.fao.org/pest-and-pesticide-management/guidelines-standards/faowho-joint-meeting-on-pesticide-management-jmpm/guidelines-tools/en/>

⁵ <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc9840en>

⁶ <https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/68ec6807>

27. CCPR was informed of the International Workshop on Feed Risk Assessment – Chemical Safety, held in March 2025 in the Netherlands, to review advancements and challenges in assessing chemical contaminants in animal feed. The workshop highlighted the progress made since 2013, including improved transfer models and harmonized feeding regimes. The workshop noted that gaps remain in international frameworks and there was a lack of toxicity data. The FAO Representative indicated that FAO would continue supporting these efforts and planned to launch a manual on feed risk assessment at the Global Forum for Animal Feed and Feed Regulators in October 2025.

WHO

28. The WHO Representative informed CCPR56 of the WHO-Nanyang Technological University (NTU) Workshop on New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) for Food Safety, held in Singapore in June 2025, which gathered over 80 experts from five WHO regions and highlighted the potential of NAMs to advance food safety while supporting the 3Rs principles of Replacement, Reduction, and Refinement of animal testing. Key recommendations included fostering validation and capacity building, integrating NAMs into the work of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) and JMPR, and establishing a global network on NAMs, with WHO, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and partners leading next steps on guidance, training, and verification frameworks.

Conclusion

29. CCPR56:
- (i) noted the report provided by FAO and WHO;
 - (ii) expressed its appreciation to FAO and WHO for their efforts in providing technical support to Members; and
 - (iii) encouraged Members and Observers to actively engage in and contribute to the activities of FAO and WHO.

MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (Agenda item 4b)⁷

Joint FAO/IAEA Centre of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture

30. The Representative of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre introduced the item by video recording, recalling that the Centre, through its Food Safety and Control Section as well as the Food Safety and Control Laboratory, was supporting several Member countries in a range of activities relevant to CCPR and Codex in general.
31. The Representative informed CCPR of several capacity building projects that among others, contributed towards addressing a critical gap in food safety and control systems among Member countries and the need to establish or contribute to the setting of national, regional and international (Codex) standards and guidelines. The Representative noted that the projects also helped identify gaps and thus potentially new areas of Codex work. For instance, during a regional training on testing of chemical hazards (including pesticides) in the Asia-Pacific region, held in Doha, State of Qatar in 2024, 17 Member countries noted that there was an absence of MRLs for certain products in the region. Examples include ethion and acetamiprid in chili peppers as well as azoxystrobin in pomegranate.
32. The Representative reported that Member countries engaged in such projects have also received support to build capacity in generating reliable scientific/residue data for a range of chemical hazards including pesticides. In this respect, the Representative informed CCPR of an Africa regional training held in Accra, Ghana in May 2025, on good laboratory practices and supervised field trials for pesticides with a focus on afidopyropen in okra and chilli pepper (see also Agenda item 6.3). The Representative reported that the African region, represented by relevant institutions in Ghana, Kenya and Senegal, was keen on conducting comprehensive supervised field trials on the pesticide in both products and noted that the IAEA was exploring mechanisms for supporting such initiatives.

Conclusion

33. CCPR56:
- (i) noted the information provided;
 - (ii) commended the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre for their capacity building and other activities concerning the safety of pesticides, and chemicals in general, in food and feed, using nuclear and related techniques, to strengthen capacities in developing countries; and
 - (iii) encouraged further cooperation between Codex Members and the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre in this regard.

⁷ CX/PR 25/56/4

REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATION ARISING FROM THE 2024 JMPR MEETING (Agenda Item 5a)⁸**General Statement**

34. The JMPR Secretariat expressed their sincere apologies for the delay in the publication of the 2024 JMPR report, which impacted on the timing of CCPR56 session. The delay was due to unresolved disagreements among experts on the global estimate of chronic dietary exposure (GECDE) method. The JMPR Secretariat reassured CCPR that FAO and WHO were working together to strengthen the governance of JMPR so that in the future, differences could be addressed transparently while allowing JMPR's work to proceed without delay.

Conclusion

35. CCPR56 noted the information, in particular the ongoing efforts to strengthen the governance of JMPR.

General Considerations

36. The FAO and WHO JMPR Secretariats introduced the item, summarised key points of discussion on general considerations arising from the 2024 JMPR Meeting and provided clarifications as appropriate.

1. Developments in dietary exposure methodology for pesticide residues in foods

37. The WHO JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that in 2024, JMPR evaluated the performance of the GECDE by comparing its estimates with those derived from individual consumption data, which was considered the reference approach. As a consensus was not reached, the discussion would continue at the next JMPR meeting to consider the technical and practical aspects related to the dissenting opinion provided in Annex 10 of the 2024 JMPR report and reply to the concerns expressed by CCPR56.
38. The WHO JMPR Secretariat confirmed that the three estimates based on International Estimated Daily Intake (IEDI), GECDE-mean, and GECDE-high approaches would continue to be reported, with explanatory narratives in the JMPR report to support CCPR in interpreting potential differences.. The JMPR Secretariat would also prepare more detailed reports on the benchmarking work and provide additional explanatory material on the methods and their application.
39. The FAO JMPR Secretariat noted that a step-by-step approach would be followed: firstly, to develop governance tools to resolve difference in opinions among experts, followed by consideration of and addressing technical concerns raised by CCPR and providing transparent information on the appropriate use of each modelling approach for JMPR's risk assessment of pesticide residues. He emphasized that there was a need to validate the model with more pesticides and plant commodities, improve access to the model and allow time for familiarization with the model before any possible implementation of GECDE.
40. Members acknowledged that JMPR would continue to use the IEDI approach while the GECDE model was further explored and that more detailed information would be provided on each of the three models (IEDI, GECDE-mean and GECDE-high) to assist CCPR to make informed risk management decisions.
41. Members, referring also to their written submissions to the session (see list of CRDs on page ix to this report), reiterated concerns previously raised at CCPR55 and provided the following additional comments and observations:
- It was of critical importance to ensure that any changes to the JMPR methodology were made transparently. This would allow CCPR and other stakeholders to fully understand the proposed approach and its implications for risk management.
 - There was a need for clearer justification for the shift from IEDI to GECDE, including consideration of the global representativeness of the data used.
 - Members stressed that any decision to adopt this new methodology should be carefully considered by CCPR and be supported by evidence demonstrating its necessity to achieve the agreed appropriate level of protection (ALOP), noting that any decision on ALOP was of a risk management nature.
 - Members requested detailed information on the dietary surveys used, including methodologies and participant numbers, particularly when higher percentiles were applied, to ensure the robustness of the data. Concerns were raised that consumption data from only 46 countries were used in the GECDE model, which may not adequately represent global dietary exposure. JMPR was encouraged to improve data coverage and assess data quality to meet the needs of exposure studies. All proposed conservative levels under GECDE should be thoroughly

⁸ Report of the 2024 JMPR Meeting, Section 2

FAO: <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/efc0acf8-8114-4f18-b746-b1d90bf2ae23/content>

WHO: [https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-meeting-on-pesticide-residues-\(jmpmr\)](https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-meeting-on-pesticide-residues-(jmpmr))

evaluated. In addition, a Member requested that the circular letter mentioned in the CCPR55 report to further broaden the data available for GECDE calculation should be circulated.

- More information was needed regarding the GECDE, including the model used, data sources, assumptions, outputs, and the impact on Codex MRLs. Validation of the methodology should ensure adequate regional representation.
- If the comparison between IEDI and GECDE aimed to assess conservatism, this must be carefully reviewed. The correlation between GECDE and the use of individual data, particularly with GECDE-high, was found to be low and insufficient. The analysis covered only three pesticides, but a significant number of acceptable daily intake (ADI) exceedances were included in the 2024 JMPR report, suggesting that current conclusions may not be representative.
- Further validation was needed for plant-based foods, as previous work focused primarily on animal products.
- Members requested more detailed disclosures from JMPR regarding the calculations used, to enable risk managers to assess the appropriateness of the model.
- Additional case studies were needed to illustrate the differences among the three models, their resulting exposures, and the implications for MRLs. This would support informed decision-making regarding potential model transitions.
- Specific details on the GECDE-mean and GECDE-high approaches for assessing chronic exposure should be provided to facilitate informed risk management decisions.
- It remained unclear whether any work had been done to identify compounds that may pose shorter-than-lifetime exposure concerns. Such compounds may require a high calculation based on their toxicological profiles, and not all compounds may present this level of risk.
- Clarification was needed regarding the consistency between the conclusions in point 2.1 of the JMPR report and the content presented in Annex 10.
- Before implementing the GECDE model, amendments to the *Codex Procedural Manual* would be required.

42. A Member Organization proposed establishing a dedicated electronic working group (EWG) to coordinate risk management and assessment and to develop an implementation plan. However, this proposal was not discussed.
43. In response to a query on how the JMPR Secretariat's future workplan proposals and other information related to the exposure methodology could be communicated to CCPR, the JMPR and Codex Secretariats suggested that tools such as webinars and information-sharing platforms could facilitate interaction among Codex Members, CCPR, and JMPR. The Codex Secretariat offered to host webinars or virtual meetings to enable informal, ongoing exchanges, noting that JMPR feedback would be formally presented at CCPR57 for consideration.

Conclusion

44. CCPR56:
- (i) noted the additional information to that included in the 2024 JMPR report, provided by the JMPR Secretariat, regarding the JMPR discussions on the developments in dietary exposure methodology for pesticide residues in foods;
 - (ii) reiterated concerns raised at CCPR55 regarding JMPR's dietary exposure assessment recommendations and discussed additional topics that require further consideration by CCPR and JMPR. These issues pertain to the:
 - (a) transparency of the GECDE methodology;
 - (b) accessibility of the proposed model;
 - (c) characterization of the conservatism of the IEDI and GECDE methodologies;
 - (d) representativeness and quality of the consumption data; and
 - (e) implementation of changes to the risk assessment principles in the *Codex Procedural Manual* and other FAO/WHO guidance documents.
 - (iii) noted that further consultation between CCPR and JMPR was needed before recommendations could be made by JMPR on whether it was appropriate to implement changes to the dietary exposure assessment approach, and that the JMPR Secretariat acknowledged that the concerns raised by CCPR56 would be conveyed to JMPR; and

- (iv) noted that JMPR will continue to use the current IEDI dietary risk assessment method and will also present the results of the calculations carried out with the GECDE-mean and GECDE-high methodologies and provide explanations to support the interpretation of the different outcomes.
45. To advance deliberations on JMPR's dietary exposure assessment methods, CCPR56 requested FAO and WHO to take the following next steps:
- (i) Address and respond to comments and concerns raised at CCPR55 and CCPR56 and those submitted in writing in CRDs to CCPR56;
 - (ii) Ensure transparency by giving access to the models and data used for the risk assessment;
 - (iii) Provide technical information on the dissenting viewpoint provided in Annex 10 of the JMPR 2024 Report. JMPR is encouraged to deliberate further to resolve these dissenting viewpoints on technical issues; and
 - (iv) Develop a workplan that outlines clear milestones in relation to future sessions of CCPR and JMPR. As proposed by JMPR, the workplan may include other mechanisms, such as workshops and webinars, to facilitate information exchange between risk assessors and risk managers.

2. Consideration on recommendation of group maximum residue limits for pulses

46. The JMPR Secretariat reported that the 2023 JMPR had received data for the use of acetamiprid on various pulses. Significant differences in residue levels following good agricultural practice (GAP) treatment were identified between the genera of *Phaseolus* or *Vigna* and soya beans. and field trials on the individual *Phaseolus* and *Vigna* crops were not sufficient to make a recommendation for their subgroups.
47. As a follow-up evaluation, a preliminary data analysis for a limited number of active substances from field trials on various *Phaseolus* or *Vigna* genera and soya beans was done. A statistically significant difference in residue levels between these species was confirmed for the whole dataset, but not in samples close to harvest, which typically drive the residue level. The 2024 JMPR re-evaluated the 2023 data for acetamiprid on pulses (see Section 5.1) based on the whole dataset submitted. For future applications, it would be desirable to obtain field trial data for both *Phaseolus* and *Vigna* genera.

Conclusion

48. CCPR noted the JMPR's consideration on the recommendation of group MRLs for the subgroup of dry bean and subgroup of dry pea. The recommended MRL was considered under Agenda item 6.1.
3. Extrapolation of recommendations for tomato and pepper to eggplants (subgroup)
49. The JMPR Secretariat provided background to this exercise and recalled that CCPR55 had requested JMPR to review the procedures for extrapolation from pepper and tomato to eggplants as developed by the Global Pulse Confederation (GPC).
50. The JMPR Secretariat reported that JMPR had appreciated the work done by the Observer to identify candidate compounds for extrapolation of existing JMPR recommendations for residues in tomato and pepper to eggplant. In examining the submission by the Observer, JMPR had agreed that it provided an efficient approach to evaluate potential extrapolations from existing CXLs to additional commodities. The JMPR meeting encouraged continued exploration of similar opportunities. The JMPR meeting noted that their evaluation required the time of JMPR experts (approximately one evaluation of additional MRLs) that would otherwise be allocated to other JMPR work. Therefore, the JMPR meeting recommended that all submissions be coordinated through the CCPR Working Group on Priorities. With regard to conclusions for specific extrapolations made by the Observer, the JMPR meeting noted several outcomes that would not be in agreement with current JMPR procedures. As a result, the JMPR meeting emphasized that recommendations under the mandate of the JMPR (e.g. toxicological health-based guidance values, maximum residue level recommendations, and dietary risk assessments) should be made to CCPR only by the JMPR.
51. Members who spoke expressed appreciation to JMPR for their review of the approach and noted the usefulness of the exercise that should be encouraged to find more efficient ways to recommend MRLs for minor crops while acknowledging that such information is reviewed by JMPR as an independent scientific body.
52. An Observer noted that they would continue to make similar submissions to JMPR to support CXLs for minor crops and noting the concerns about the resource capacity of JMPR, that such submissions would be limited to compounds already scheduled for evaluation by JMPR.
53. A Member expressed appreciation to the Observer from GPC and requested training to assist countries to contribute to this process of making submissions to JMPR.

Conclusion

54. CCPR56:

- (i) thanked JMPR for its consideration of the work approach and reviewing the specific MRLs proposal regarding the extrapolation of existing CXLs from tomato and pepper to eggplants;
- (ii) noted that JMPR agreed that this stepwise approach, with appropriate modification, may be suitable for identifying candidate active ingredients, where the extrapolation of existing CXLs to additional commodities, such as a minor crop, may be considered;
- (iii) welcomed the further exploration of this approach on finding the appropriate candidate, active ingredient and related commodities to support the establishment of MRLs for minor crops; and
- (iv) agreed that given limited expert resources of JMPR, all submissions regarding the candidate, active ingredient and related information should be coordinated through the working group on Codex schedules and priority lists.

4. Transition from commodity of meat to commodity of muscle and fat

55. The JMPR Secretariat recalled that according to the revised *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989) which includes the revised Class B on primary food commodities of animal origin, the revised Class B incorporates new definitions for the terms "meat", "muscle", "fat" and "edible offal" to facilitate harmonization of MRLs between CCPR and CCRVDF. It was agreed to update commodity definitions according to the new classification, and there would be a continued step wise approach to the update according to the new classification in future.
56. A Member noted that this update would mean that the transition period would cover approximately 25 years, which is the duration of the cycle of periodic review.
57. For commodities Group of Muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals) (MM 0095) and Group of Avian Muscle (PM 0110), the descriptions were changed while the codes remained unchanged. CCPR agreed that this might create confusion and issues with the monitoring and enforcement of MRLs for these commodities. Therefore, a note or a suffix should be added in the database to those CXLs derived under the old classification to clarify that the CXL applied to the old commodity description.
58. CCPR noted that this consideration would likely arise also within the project to update the database to remap all the CXLs/MRLs to the revised classification (see Agenda item 3) and that a proposal could be submitted to CCPR57 for consideration. CCPR noted the willingness of Australia, China and the European Union to assist in this regard.

Conclusion

59. CCPR56:

- (i) noted the update from JMPR; and
- (ii) proposed that CCPR57 would consider the addition of a note / suffix to CXLs derived under the old classification as stated in paragraph 58.

5. Interpretation of use patterns for targeted applications

60. The JMPR Secretariat reported that the 2023 and 2024 meetings received information on registered uses and supervised field trials for insecticide bait-spray products, where the end-use product is applied to a small area of the crop.
61. The JMPR Secretariat explained that JMPR made residue recommendations on the basis of supervised residue trials whose use pattern matches, approximates, or could be adjusted to the critical GAP. The directed application of a product to a portion of the crop raised questions about the resulting distribution of residues across a treated area and the collection of representative samples from fields, orchards, etc. JMPR noted that the spot treatments inherent in precision agriculture would raise these same questions for other end-use products. It was noted that sampling of commodities for pesticide residue levels should be fit for purpose for deriving MRLs (reflecting potential for direct treatment of the commodity) as well as residue levels reflecting blending of harvested commodities at the field level. The JMPR recommended that regulatory authorities and others (e.g. OECD) that establish guidelines for conducting field trials should consider these issues during guideline updates.
62. A Member supported the views of JMPR and noted that it was timely for OECD and other organizations to have good practices for residue trials that reflect the different application and precision techniques.

Conclusion

63. CCPR56 acknowledged the ongoing efforts of JMPR to enhance and refine its assessment methods to align more closely with real-world field practices, ensuring more scientifically robust evaluation outcomes.

6. Update of the pesticide residues in food: guidance document for WHO JMPR monographers and reviewers

64. CCPR56 noted that proposed draft updates to the guidance document for WHO monographers and reviewers on procedures, scientific and style was ongoing and that a final draft would eventually replace the current WHO guidance on the WHO website after the 2025 JMPR.

7. Strategy and timing for JMPR re-evaluation of dithiocarbamates

65. The JMPR Secretariat reported that a plan was analysed for the re-evaluation of dithiocarbamates and three phases were presented in the reports for this evaluation. Depending on the priority and workloads of JMPR, all the activities within a given phase might not be completed at a single JMPR meeting, therefore subsequent phases would be addressed at subsequent JMPR meetings. Phase one was expected to require the full annual resources normally allocated to the periodic evaluation program, while phases two and three together would require similar levels of resources. The JMPR Secretariat indicated that JMPR would continue within the available resources to undertake the re-evaluation as per the outlined plan and progress would be reported to CCPR57.
66. It was also clarified by the FAO JMPR Secretariat that since total residue methods were used, the residue evaluation of all compounds would occur simultaneously with phase three of the plan or in the following years.

Conclusion

67. CCPR56 noted the update and looked forward to further updates in forthcoming sessions of CCPR.

8. Linear and non-linear toxicokinetics guide progress update

68. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that there was a draft guidance, but that further refinement was needed. It was envisaged that the 2026 JMPR would continue to work on the guidance.

Conclusion

69. CCPR56 noted the update provided.

9. Data on pesticide metabolites that are also commodity chemicals

70. The JMPR Secretariat reported that JMPR considers the dietary risk not only of the pesticide active ingredient, but also its metabolites and degradation products. A systematic approach for assessing the risk from such metabolites and degradation products had been developed. For low molecular weight and less-specific metabolites and degradation products, sponsors of pesticides on the agenda of JMPR should investigate the availability of and submit such information relevant to the dietary risk assessment,
71. The JMPR Secretariat further emphasized that while the completeness of the data was important, the quality of the data was equally important.

Conclusion

72. CCPR56:

- (i) emphasized the importance of submission of such metabolites and degradation data, particularly for those also used as commodity chemicals to ensure rigorous and science-based dietary assessment; and
- (ii) encouraged sponsors to submit such data or information to enhance the accuracy of dietary risk assessment.

10. Efficiency of JMPR resources

73. The JMPR Secretariat informed the Committee that JMPR has consistently urged sponsors to submit complete, high-quality chemical dossiers in line with CCPR Risk Analysis Principles, yet many recent submissions—such as those for chlorpyrifos and acynonapyr—have lacked essential residue and toxicology data needed to establish health-based guidance values, residue definitions, and dietary risk assessments. In a new case, a dossier presented a very limited use pattern that did not result in detectable pesticide residues, complicating the evaluation process. Additionally, sponsors often submit large dossiers for additional uses in subsequent years, requiring JMPR to revisit residue definitions and straining its capacity. To improve efficiency and focus, JMPR will prioritize dossiers that include multiple registered uses with expected measurable residues and that fully address all required data outlined in the call for submissions.

Conclusion

74. CCPR agreed that JMPR could prioritise the dossiers and further consider this matter under Agenda item 10.

REPORT ON RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC CONCERNS RAISED BY CCPR ARISING FROM THE 2024 JMPR MEETING (Agenda Item 5b)⁹

75. CCPR56 noted that there were no specific concerns raised by CCPR55 for the consideration of the 2024 JMPR meeting.

MRLs FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED (at Steps 7 and 4) (Agenda Item 6.1)¹⁰

General Remarks

76. The EU advised CCPR that CXLs which were adopted by CAC47 (2024), for which the EU had not expressed reservations, had now been established in EU legislation.
77. The EU further explained that it was an EU policy to propose a European Commission Regulation for the inclusion of CXLs into EU legislation provided that:
- the EU sets MRLs for the commodity under consideration; and
 - the current EU MRL is lower than the CXL.
78. CCPR noted that the EU would express reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRLs in the following situations, and that Switzerland would be supporting all EU reservations as their residue risk assessment approach and policies were the same as that of the EU:
- the proposed CXL is not safe for European consumers (including an assessment of whether the Codex residue definition ensures an equivalent level of protection); and/or
 - toxicological data are not available at EU level or are available but not yet assessed at EU level; and/or
 - the proposed CXLs are not sufficiently supported by data as per the FAO manual or other agreed requirements; and/or
 - the residue definition set by JMPR is not compatible with the residue definition set at EU level; and/or
 - the CXL is not acceptable to the EU with respect to areas such as supporting data, extrapolations, as well as environmental issues of global nature in accordance with World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules.
79. The EU suggested that making the dietary burden calculations and threshold of toxicological concern (TTC) calculations accessible in the JMPR report would be beneficial, possibly in electronic format through a link in the JMPR report.
80. The USA reminded CCPR that global environmental issues are beyond the mandate of CCPR, as CCPR's primary focus is on protection of consumer health and facilitation of global trade.

Consideration of compounds

015 Chlormequat

81. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of avian, edible offal of; group of eggs; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of mammalian fats (except milk fat); and group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); due to the EU observation that the result of the feeding study was rounded to a higher MRL than required.
82. The JMPR Secretariat explained that the 2024 JMPR did not re-evaluate these commodities and the proposed MRLs were primarily intended to align with the revised new classification of food and feed.
83. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservation of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 81; and
 - revoke the associated CXLs.

017 Chlorpyrifos

84. The CCPR Secretariat noted that chlorpyrifos had been scheduled for periodic review in 2024, but JMPR could not complete its evaluation due to insufficient data and lack of support from a sponsor.

⁹ Report of the 2024 JMPR Meeting, Section 3

FAO: <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/efc0acf8-8114-4f18-b746-b1d90bf2ae23/content>

WHO: [https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-meeting-on-pesticide-residues-\(jmpr\)](https://www.who.int/groups/joint-fao-who-meeting-on-pesticide-residues-(jmpr))

¹⁰ CL 2025/35-PR; CX/PR 25/56/5; CX/PR 25/56/5-Add.1 (Comments of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Peru, Thailand, Uruguay, Comité européen des fabricants de sucre (CEFS), CropLife International)

85. A Member Organisation expressed regret that the dossier submitted to JMPR was insufficient for toxicological evaluation and re-iterated the importance of submitting complete and good quality dossiers for the efficient use of JMPR resources. It was further noted that, since all CXLs had been revoked and there was insufficient data for re-evaluation, the compound could be deleted from the database.
86. CCPR56 agreed to remove this compound from the Codex database and from the schedules and priority list.

027 Dimethoate/055 Omethoate

87. The CCPR Secretariat recalled the sponsor's commitment at CCPR55 to provide toxicological data for JMPR review in 2024.
88. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR did not receive sufficiently robust toxicological data from the sponsor for this compound.
89. The Observer for CropLife International, on behalf of the sponsor, indicated that additional toxicological data had already been submitted for review by the next JMPR.
90. CCPR56 agreed to retain the proposed MRLs for orange, dried pulp; and oranges, sweet, sour, at Step 4, pending data submission from the sponsor and the outcome of the 2026 JMPR review.

035 Ethoxyquin

91. The CCPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR was not able to complete the periodic review of this compound because insufficient toxicological data were submitted.
92. Concerns were expressed that the immediate revocation of CXLs of this compound could disrupt trade with countries that adopt Codex standards. Considering that no public health concern was identified and more contemporary human health risk assessments have been completed by the USA in 2019, it was suggested that the CXLs could be retained and the compound could be transferred to the EWG on unsupported compounds to facilitate further deliberation. A Member noted that it might be beneficial to coordinate the discussion with CCRVDF where this compound has also been considered to better understand its application in the global food supply chain.
93. In response to a proposal to revoke the CXL for ethoxyquin in pears while transferring the compound to the EWG on unsupported compounds, the CCPR Secretariat recalled that CCPR54 agreed to retain all CXLs for this compound under the 4-year rule, awaiting the JMPR review of additional data from data sponsor, and that two more years remained for consideration.
94. A Member Organisation noted that, while no public health concern form had been submitted, the lack of up-to-date toxicological information of ethoxyquin meant that the CXL for ethoxyquin could not be confirmed as safe.
95. CCPR56 agreed to retain all CXLs for ethoxyquin until the 4-year rule expired and that the CXLs would be considered at a future session of CCPR (see Agenda item 8.1).

041 Folpet

96. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for: bananas; barley; group of avian muscle; group of avian fats; group of avian, edible offal of; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); group of milks; wheat; and wine grapes, due to the wider residue definition for plant and animal commodities for enforcement in the EU, which includes phthalamide and pending the outcome of an ongoing EU assessment of an import tolerance for banana.
97. Some Members expressed concern over the proposed revocation of the CXLs as this would result in significant problems for international trade and requested that this be considered by the EWG on unsupported compounds while waiting submission from the data sponsor. On behalf of the data sponsor, the Observer for IUPAC informed CCPR that the sponsor would submit additional data for apple, table grape and potatoes.
98. The revocation of CXLs related to other uses was further considered under Agenda Item 8.1 and noting that these uses did not fall within the scope of unsupported compounds with no public health concern, the only option remaining was to revoke the CXLs in accordance with the JMPR recommendation.
99. A Member noted that the MRL for wine grapes at 15 mg/kg proposed in the 2024 JMPR report did not appear in the Codex database, recommended that this error be corrected, and indicated that a distinction between table grape and wine grapes was now required in the database due to the new recommendation for wine grapes. It was further noted there was an existing CXL for grapes, dried (=currants, raisins and sultanas) that would also need to be retained. CCPR56 updated the database accordingly.

100. CCPR56 agreed to:

- advance the MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservation of EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 96;
- retain the CXLs for apple; grape; grapes, dried (=currants, raisins and sultans); and potato under the 4-year rule, noting that the current CXL for grapes was now for grapes (except wine grapes); and
- revoke all other CXLs as recommended by the 2024 JMPR.

062 Piperonyl butoxide

101. CCPR recalled the decision of CCPR55 to maintain CXLs of piperonyl butoxide pending confirmation of the submission of a full data package for periodic review, and if there was no commitment for data at CCPR56, that this compound and all related CXLs would be deleted from the Codex database.
102. The Observer for International Dried Fruits and Nuts Council (INC), on behalf of the data sponsor, indicated that the sponsor had made a commitment to submit data for this compound and the EWG Chair on priorities confirmed that this compound has been listed on the 2027 priority list.
103. CCPR56 agreed to retain the CXLs of this compound, pending data submission from the sponsor and the JMPR review.

063 Pyrethrins

104. CCPR recalled the decision of CCPR55 to retain the CXLs for this compound for one year awaiting data submission from the data sponsor.
105. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that no additional data had been received.
106. The EWG Chair on priorities advised CCPR that a commitment to submit data had been received from the data sponsor.
107. CCPR56 therefore agreed to retain the CXLs for this compound, pending data submission from the sponsor and the JMPR review in 2027.

072 Carbendazim

108. CCPR recalled the decision of CCPR55 to retain the CXLs for this compound for one year awaiting data submission from the data sponsor.
109. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR has not received any additional data.
110. CCPR56 agreed to revoke all CXLs, with subsequent removal of this compound from the Codex database.

090 Chlorpyrifos-methyl

111. CCPR noted that this compound was on the periodic review list for 2024. Nevertheless, it was not mentioned in the 2024 JMPR report and JMPR's advice was sought on the status of this compound.
112. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the toxicological and residue re-evaluation was not performed due to the absence of data submitted for this compound.
113. CCPR considered a proposal for this compound to be transferred to the EWG on the Management of unsupported compounds without public health concern for further discussion. CCPR recalled that all CXLs for this compound had been retained under the 4-year rule as agreed in CCPR53 (2022), awaiting the periodic re-evaluation by the JMPR in 2024, and that one -year remained in which to identify data. There was no commitment to provide data identified by CCPR56, hence it was considered an unsupported compound. However, based on further discussions under Agenda item 8.1 (paragraph 248), it was noted that a concern form had been submitted for this compound in 2020¹¹ indicating that it did not meet the definition of an unsupported compound without public health concern. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed receipt of the concern form in 2021 and considered that additional data was required. Therefore, CCPR had decided to prioritise chlorpyrifos-methyl for periodic review by 2024 JMPR, for which data had not been provided.
114. CCPR56 agreed to revoke all CXLs for this compound and to remove the compound from the Codex database.

102 Maleic hydrazide

115. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the submitted toxicological data was insufficient to conduct a re-evaluation and no recommendations were made.

¹¹ CX/PR 21/52/19-Add.1

116. The EWG Chair on priorities advised CCPR that a data sponsor requested retaining all CXLs under the 4-year rule, awaiting the submission of additional data for JMPR review in 2026. There was support for retaining the CXLs under the 4-year rule and CCPR was advised that data was already available at an EU level and would be submitted by the sponsor.
117. CCPR56 agreed to retain all CXLs under the 4-year rule awaiting data submission from sponsors and the outcome of the 2026 JMPR.

103 Phosmet

118. The EU and Switzerland expressed their reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for cranberries and potatoes, citing health risks identified for their consumers.
119. Several Members expressed opposition to the advancement of the proposed MRL for blueberries due to an acute risk identified by JMPR.
120. Some Members requested that several CXLs proposed for revocation be retained to allow time for further data to be submitted for consideration by JMPR. Noting the commitment of the Observer for CropLife International to provide both toxicology and residue data to support citrus fruit, cotton seed, pome fruit and tree nuts, CCPR agreed to retain the CXLs for these four commodities under the 4-year rule.
121. A Member expressed concern over the revocation of the CXL for peach and requested to transfer this to the EWG on unsupported compounds awaiting additional data.
122. In response to a proposal to retain the existing CXL for peach, it was noted that the CXL may present a public health concern as the health-based guidance values (HBGV) had been lowered. Some Members highlighted that in cases where the HBGV had been lowered, JMPR should screen the existing CXLs and inform CCPR whether these CXLs would lead to exceedances of the HBGV to assist CCPR to decide if the CXLs should be retained under the 4-year rule.
123. The JMPR Secretariat agreed to consider how screening of CXLs recommended for revocation by the JMPR could be undertaken in a resource efficient manner. The JMPR agreed to present risk assessments specifically for the retained CXLs for phosmet for CCPR57.
124. CCPR56 agreed to:
- advance the proposed MRLs for cranberry and potato to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservation of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 118, and to revoke the associated CXLs;
 - revoke all other CXLs as recommended by the 2024 JMPR;
 - withdraw the proposed MRL for blueberries; and
 - retain the CXLs for citrus fruits; pome fruits; tree nuts; and cotton seeds under the 4-year rule while awaiting data submission from sponsors and JMPR evaluation.

111 Iprodione

125. CCPR recalled the decision of CCPR55 to retain the proposed MRL for potato, culls, at Step 4 awaiting additional information from the data sponsor.
126. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that they had discussed this commodity with the data sponsor and clarified that although the commodity is used as an animal feed it is not an internationally traded commodity. Therefore, the JMPR advised that there was no need for an MRL recommendation, and median residue and high residue levels would be estimated for animal burden calculation.
127. CCPR56 agreed to withdraw the proposed MRL for potato, culls.

120 Permethrin

128. The CCPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR could not complete the periodic review of this compound because insufficient toxicological data was submitted.
129. The EWG Chair on priorities advised CCPR that additional data had been submitted for this compound and supported retaining all CXLs pending the completion of the JMPR review. The JMPR Secretariat agreed that the assessment of this compound would be continued at the next JMPR.
130. CCPR56 agreed to retain all CXLs while awaiting JMPR review.

142 Prochloraz

131. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for avocado; barley; group of avian, edible offal of; group of avian fat; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal, mammalian; group of eggs;

group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of muscle (from mammalian other than marine mammals); oats; rye; triticale; and wheat, as the EU considers that the TTC approach should only be used for minor metabolites and BTS 44595 was a major prochloraz metabolite in ruminant tissues and the predominant metabolite in many crops, including cereal grains. The EU also identified an acute risk for avocado for EU consumers.

132. Colombia expressed a reservation on the advancement of the proposed MRL for avocado as they identified a potential health concern associated with avocado based on the JMPR evaluation.
133. In response to a request that the exposure assessments using the TTC approach be published for better transparency, the JMPR Secretariat advised that JMPR would study the feasibility of including such information in the report and would provide an update to CCPR57.
134. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that while it was standard practice to use the TTC approach to assess only minor metabolites, in this case the major metabolite BTS 44595 was not covered by the toxicological reference values of the active substance and therefore the TTC approach was applied.
135. Several countries proposed retaining some of the CXLs proposed for revocation, including the CXLs for assorted tropical and subtropical fruits – inedible peel, given the active registration for banana, pineapple, mango and papaya in their countries; cereal grains (in particular rice); citrus fruits; and mushrooms, and requested to transfer these CXL to the EWG on unsupported compounds while awaiting data. Following discussions in Agenda Item 8.1 (see paragraph 250), it was noted that it was not within the terms of reference (ToR) of the EWG on unsupported compounds to consider these CXLs.
136. The Observer for CropLife International, on behalf of the data sponsor, confirmed that no new data would be provided to JMPR.
137. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
 - advance all proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of Colombia, EU, and Switzerland as indicated in paragraphs 132 and 131, respectively; and
 - revoke all other CXLs.

Carbosulfan (145)

138. CCPR agreed to withdraw the proposed MRLs for mangoes and eggplants noting that the compound had been removed from the priority list for periodic review following confirmation that the data sponsor had withdrawn support for this compound (Agenda item 9, paragraph 278,).

146 Lambda-cyhalothrin

139. CCPR56 noted the outcome of the 2024 JMPR that no revision to the previous established ADI and acute reference dose (ARfD) was required according to the JMPR's evaluation of the new toxicology.

147 Methoprene

140. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of avian, edible offal of; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); and tree nuts, due to the lack of toxicological data evaluated at EU level.
141. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
 - advance the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 140; and
 - revoke the associated CXLs.

160 Propiconazole

142. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of avian, edible offal of; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals) based on the lack of data on the magnitude and toxicity of metabolites expected in plant and animal products that need to be considered in the dietary risk assessment. The EU and Switzerland informed CCPR that in the EU assessment the toxicological data were found insufficient to conclude on the genotoxicity potential and the general toxicity of some of the metabolites.

143. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:

- advance the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 142;
- revoke the associated CXLs; and
- withdraw the proposed MRL for rice, polished at Step 4.

173 Buprofezin

144. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that JMPR could not conclude on the residue definition for risk assessment in rice due to pending information on supervised field trials in which buprofezin sulfoxide was analysed, and therefore no MRLs were recommended. CCPR noted the request of the Republic of Korea for JMPR to reconsider the residue definition with a view to excluding buprofezin sulfoxide, as this metabolite is a photo-degradation product formed only under aqueous photolysis and is unlikely to occur under actual cultivation practices, given that the application is made at a late growth stage and sunlight does not reach the paddy water under a fully developed canopy, thereby reducing the likelihood of photolysis.
145. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of avian, edible offal; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); group of mammalian fats (except milk fats), as an increase of the existing limit of quantitation (LOQ) for products of animal origin was unnecessary based on the technical development of analytical methods.
146. The JMPR Secretariat explained that the 2024 JMPR only reconfirmed the previous JMPR recommendations for animal commodities. The proposed MRLs regarding animal commodities which elicited reservations from the EU and Switzerland were primarily intended to align with the revised *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989).
147. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs for animal commodities to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 145; and
 - revoke the associated CXLs.

176 Hexythiazox

148. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRL for cane berries subgroup, as the assessment of the same GAP in an import tolerance application led to a lower MRL of 3 mg/kg in the EU. The EU informed CCPR that once the JMPR evaluation was available this reservation could be revised based on further analysis of the data used by JMPR.
149. It was noted that the formation of the cyclohexylamine metabolite should be considered in potential future evaluations of uses on leafy crops.
150. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the monograph would be published soon.
151. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 148; and
 - revoke the associated CXLs.

184 Etofenprox

152. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRL for group of eggs as according to the rounding rules included in Section 5.3 of the FAO Manual, based on the OECD standards, the MRL should be set at 0.07 mg/kg and not rounded up to 0.1 mg/kg.
153. The EU and Switzerland further noted that the proposed MRLs for group of avian, edible offal; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; and group of eggs, are based on metabolism studies, and informed that a feeding study is available and a feeding study is the preferred basis for deriving MRL proposals for animal products.
154. The JMPR Secretariat advised that the MRL for group of egg was established with aim to cover possible worst case and with a view to facilitate international trade. The JMPR Secretariat further advised that the MRL for group of eggs could be revisited if data from a new feeding study was submitted for JMPR review.

155. The JMPR Secretariat further clarified that some recommendations for animal commodities were primarily intended to align with the revised *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989).
156. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 152; and
 - revoke the associated CXLs.

189 Tebuconazole

157. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRL for cumin seed pending the outcome of an ongoing evaluation in the EU.
158. CCPR56 agreed to advance the proposed MRL to Step 5/8 for adoption as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 157.

193 Fenpyroximate

159. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for apple; cucumber; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); subgroup of mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids); subgroup of oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids); tomatoes; and cherry tomatoes, pending outcome of the ongoing periodic review in the EU.
160. Several Members expressed concern over the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of edible offal (mammalian); beans with pods (subgroup); and eggplants (subgroup) as acute dietary exposure concerns were identified by the 2021 JMPR and reconfirmed by the 2024 JMPR.
161. CCPR noted the following:
- the CXL for stone fruit (group) should be revoked as recommended by the 2017 JMPR;
 - the CXL for eggplants, retained under the 4-year rule by CCPR53, should be revoked as no new data was provided;
 - the CXL for apple, dried, retained under the 4-year rule by CCPR53, has now been replaced by a new recommendation by the JMPR and should be revoked;
 - the CXL for summer squash, retained under the 4-year rule by CCPR53, should be revoked and a new CXL for summer squash should be established based on extrapolation of the data from evaluation of cucumber; and
 - the CXLs for melons (except watermelon); pear should be revoked as new data was not evaluated by the 2024 JMPR.
162. CCPR56 agreed to:
- advance the proposed MRLs for apple; and apple, dried, to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 159, and revoke the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR;
 - advance the proposed MRL for cucumber and the MRL for summer squash (extrapolated from cucumber) to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 159, and revoke the associated CXL for summer squash, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR;
 - advance all other proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 159, and revoke the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2024 JMPR;
 - revoke the CXLs for stone fruits; melon (except watermelon); and pears; and
 - withdraw the proposed MRLs for beans with pods (subgroup); eggplants (subgroup); and group of edible offal (mammalian) and revoke the associated CXLs.

196 Tebufenozide

163. The EU requested confirmation from JMPR that the proposed MRL for the group of avian fats should not have an asterisk in the Codex database. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that this asterisk should be removed.
164. CCPR56 agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, and revoke the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR.

202 Fipronil

165. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for banana; barley, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks, subgroup of; cotton seed; dry beans, subgroup of (except soya beans); dry peas, subgroup of; group of avian, edible offal of; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); leafy vegetables, group of; maize cereals, subgroup of; onion, bulb; potato; rice, husked; root and tuber vegetables, group of (except potato and sugar beet); soya bean (dry); sugar beet; sugar cane; sunflower seeds, subgroup of; tomato, subgroup of; wheat, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks, subgroup of, as a chronic risk has been identified for EU consumers.
166. Considering that additional data would not be provided for basil and group of legume vegetables, and that the long-term dietary exposure was likely to pose a public health concern, a Member supported the revocation of the existing CXLs for these commodities.
167. The commodity code for soya bean hulls was corrected to AL 3538 in the Codex database.
168. CCPR noted that the proposed MRLs in the JMPR report represent commodity groups such as barley, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks and leafy vegetables (subgroup) and that related CXLs for single commodities such as barley and basil should be revoked.
169. CCPR56 agreed to:
- advance all the MRLs as recommended by the 2024 JMPR to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 165;
 - revoke the associated CXLs; and
 - withdraw the proposed MRLs at Step 4.

203 Spinosad

170. CCPR made the following corrections in the database:
- Update of the date of evaluation for the MRL for cattle milk to 2024;
 - Insertion of the note “The MRL accommodates external animal treatment” for the entry for cattle milk fat and cattle meat; and
 - Inclusion of MRLs for the Group of avian, edible offal of (PO 0111); Group of milk fats (except cattle milk fat) (FM 0106); and Group of milks (except cattle milk) (ML 0106).
171. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption; and
 - revoke the associated CXLs.

217 Novaluron

172. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of avian, edible offal of; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of tree nuts; muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); and poultry muscle, due to the lack of toxicological data evaluated at EU level.
173. CCPR was informed that the EU identified data gaps on neurotoxicity and immunotoxicity and possible endocrine disruptor properties for this compound in 2022. Given that the last toxicological review by JMPR for this compound was 20 years ago, it was suggested to prioritize this compound for periodic review.
174. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 172; and
 - revoke the CXLs for animal commodities to align with the update to CXA 4-1989.

229 Azoxystrobin

175. In response to a clarification on this compound and 239 cyproconazole, the JMPR Secretariat confirmed that the updated dietary burden calculation for these compounds had been performed in the JMPR 2024 assessment and the details would be provided in the next JMPR report.

176. CCPR updated the database to include the proposed MRLs for group of milk fats and group of milks which were included in the 2024 JMPR report, to align with the revised CXA 4-1989.
177. CCPR56 agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, and revoke all associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR.

238 Clothianidin / 245 Thiamethoxam

178. The Islamic Republic of Iran recalled that at CCPR55, it had committed to providing data for clothianidin on pistachio for evaluation by JMPR, and informed CCPR that although clothianidin was no longer registered for use on pistachio in the Islamic Republic of Iran, they requested to retain the MRLs as clothianidin residues could arise from the registered use of thiamethoxam. Iran further committed to submit residue data of thiamethoxam for review by the 2027 JMPR. Although the use of clothianidin in pistachio is now banned in the Islamic Republic of Iran, since it is the metabolite of thiamethoxam, the submitted data will consist of thiamethoxam and relevant metabolites, including clothianidin.
179. CCPR56 noted the clarification provided by Iran and that this would be considered under Agenda item 9.

239 Cyproconazole

180. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of avian muscle; group of avian fats; group of avian, edible offal of; and group of eggs, noting that for products of animal origin, an updated dietary burden calculation is needed since the methodology has changed since 2021.
181. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland, as indicated in paragraph 180; and
 - revoke all associated CXLs.

242 Flubendiamide

182. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of edible offal (mammalian); group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals) as a new dietary burden calculation should be performed to derive the MRL proposals.
183. The JMPR Secretariat explained that the addition of a new commodity had minimal impact on the dietary burden calculations for livestock. As a result, the JMPR confirmed the previous recommendations.
184. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 182; and
 - revoke all associated CXLs.

246 Acetamiprid

185. CCPR56 agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR.

263 Cyantraniliprole

186. CCPR recalled the decision of CCPR55 to retain the proposed MRLs for table olives and olives used for oil production at Step 4, while awaiting JMPR's conclusion.
187. JMPR clarified that the MRLs for table olives and olives used for oil production were recommended at 1 mg/kg, rather than 3 mg/kg, as the level of pesticides applied in the trials were twice the levels authorized for use.
188. CCPR56 agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for table olives and olives used for oil production to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2023 JMPR.

285 Flupyradifurone

189. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of avian edible offal of; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal, mammalian; group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; and group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals) as the Codex MRL proposals were not compatible with the EU residue definition for enforcement.
190. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:

- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 189; and
- revoke all associated CXLs.

288 Acibenzolar-S-methyl

191. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for cardoon; celery; fennel, bulb; apple; rhubarb; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of edible offal (mammalian); group of milks; group of avian edible offal of; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; and group of eggs, pending the outcome of the revision of existing EU MRLs given the availability of new toxicological data.
192. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 191; and
 - revoke all associated CXLs.

301 Phosphonic acid / 302 Fosetyl-aluminium

193. CCPR noted that more critical GAPs had been authorized in the EU for oranges and mandarins, leading to a higher MRL of 100 mg/kg instead of 50 mg/kg and encouraged the submission of data by the sponsor to JMPR.
194. CCPR56 agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption and revoke all associated CXLs as recommended by the 2024 JMPR.

309 Pydiflumetofen

195. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for lettuce, head; coffee bean; cotton seed; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of avian edible offal; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); mango; pitaya (dragon fruit); subgroup of cane berries; stem brassicas (subgroup); underground immature beans and peas (subgroup), pending the outcome of the ongoing approval process at EU level. In addition, an acute consumer risk associated with lettuce, head was identified for European consumers.
196. Several Members opposed the advancement of the proposed MRLs for lettuce, leaf due to short-term exposure exceedances of the ARfD.
197. CCPR updated the database to include the proposed MRLs for stem brassicas subgroup and immature beans and peas subgroup from the 2021 JMPR and confirmed by the 2024 JMPR.
198. CCPR56 agreed to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 195;
 - revoke all associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR; and
 - withdraw the proposed MRLs for lettuce, leaf.

324 Tetraniliprole

199. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRLs for group of avian edible offal; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of milks; group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); rice, husked; subgroup of barley, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks; subgroup of wheat, similar grains, and pseudocereals without husks, due to the lack of toxicological data evaluated at EU level. The EU informed CCPR that the EU evaluated the information included in the 2021 JMPR monograph and such information was insufficient to confirm the toxicological assessment and safety for EU consumers.
200. In response to this request, the JMPR Secretariat advised that JMPR would study the feasibility of including the exposure calculations for the metabolites via the TTC approach in the report and would update CCPR57.
201. CCPR56 agreed, as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, to:
- advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland, as indicated in paragraph 199; and
 - revoke all associated CXLs.

306 Fluazinam / 333 Acynonapyr

202. CCPR56 noted that JMPR established an ADI and ARfD but did not have sufficient time to conduct a residue evaluation, and that JMPR would continue the assessment at the next JMPR.

338 Carfentrazone-ethyl

203. CCPR56 noted that JMPR was unable to reach a conclusion on the residue definition for this compound, and that more data was required to support continued evaluation and assessment.

339 Cyclobutrifluram

204. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRL for banana based on the lack of available toxicological data at the EU level, and that the residue trials may not reflect the most critical situation due to the timing of the application and harvest.
205. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that this issue had been addressed in the agenda item under general considerations and undetectable residues (less than LOQ) from trials with 2X rate.
206. CCPR56 agreed to advance the proposed MRL for banana to Step 5/8 for adoption as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 204,.

340 Fenpropidin

207. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations to the advancement of the proposed MRL for banana due to an acute risk for their consumers.
208. The EU informed JMPR that more critical GAPs for sugar beets, barley, triticale and wheat are authorized in the EU, and the EU encouraged the data sponsor to submit the appropriate data to JMPR.
209. CCPR56 agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 207.

341 Florpyrauxifen-benzyl

210. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRL for group of edible offal (mammalian) as the CXL was not compatible with the EU residue definition for enforcement.
211. The EU further noted that residues exceeding the LOQ were identified in the JMPR report. However, because the JMPR report did not provide the specific concentrations for the three analytes, the EU was unable to determine an EU MRL. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the information on the concentration of the metabolites will be included in the JMPR monograph and this would be published soon.
212. CCPR56 agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, noting the reservations of EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 210.

342 Fluoxapiprolin

213. The EU and Switzerland expressed reservations on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for cherry tomato; grapes; group of avian edible offal; group of avian fats; group of avian muscle; group of edible offal (mammalian); group of eggs; group of mammalian fats (except milk fats); group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals); group of milks; onion, bulb; potato; and tomato, pending the outcome of the toxicological evaluation and approval process at EU level.
214. CCPR56 agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs to Step 5/8 for adoption as recommended by the 2024 JMPR, noting the reservations of the EU and Switzerland as indicated in paragraph 213.

Other matters**048 Lindane**

215. CCPR56 noted that the official name change for Lindane to gamma-hexachlorocyclohexane by ISO would be reflected in the Codex database with a note to explain that the former name of the compound was Lindane.

Concern forms

216. CCPR56 was advised that a Member Organisation submitted a public health concern form for acetamiprid for all commodities with existing CXLs, and this was presented in CX/PR 25/56/5-Add.1 Appendix II. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that this would be submitted to JMPR for consideration.

General conclusion

217. CCPR56:

- (i) agreed to forward to CAC48 (2025):
 - (a) MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix III); and
 - (b) CXLs for revocation (Appendix IV)
- (ii) noted that:
 - (a) MRLs in the Step Procedure have been withdrawn (discontinuation of work) (Appendix V) and that CAC would be informed accordingly; and
 - (b) MRLs retained at Steps 4 and 7 are attached in Appendix VI (for information)
- (iii) requested JMPR to provide further information as indicated in paragraph 200; and
- (iv) noted the corrections made to the Codex database.

CXLs FOR MILK AND MILK FAT (Agenda Item 6.2)¹²

218. The Codex Secretariat introduced the item recalling that this issue, which had also been brought to the attention of CCPR55 (2024), related to the outstanding implementation of CCPR40's decision¹³ regarding fat soluble pesticides to insert a note alongside the MRL for milk in all cases where MRLs were established for both milk fat and milk to explain that for regulation and monitoring purposes, the whole milk should be analysed and the result compared with the MRL for whole milk.
219. In order to implement this decision, the Codex Secretariat had reviewed the compounds in the Codex database for MRLs for pesticides, for which CXLs had been established for both milks (ML 0106) and milk fats (FM 0183). 31 fat-soluble pesticides were identified to which this note could be applied. The Codex Secretariat noted that further fat-soluble pesticides might be added pending the outcome of CCPR56, and indicated that the note would only apply when a compound had MRLs established for both milks and milk fats, would be inserted against the MRL for milks (ML 0106), and would apply in all situations regardless of whether the MRLs for milks and milk fats were the same or different. The Codex Secretariat reiterated that this was not a substantive issue but rather an implementation of a pre-existing decision, and that CCPR56 was only invited to confirm the appropriate approach to implement the decision.

Discussion

220. A Member Organization, also referring to its written comments, highlighted that milks could have different fat contents ranging from 1% to 20%, whereas studies were usually based on cattle milk, which has a fat content of 4%, and considered that it may be necessary to modify the note for clarity. However, noting that the proposed language was already reflected in Section 4.8 of the Codex *Procedural Manual* (paragraphs 183 to 185), the Member Organization agreed that while the decision should be implemented, they might propose a modification to the note at a future session of CCPR. The Member Organization also noted that the suffix F associated with CXLs for milks (ML 0106) needed to be reviewed with regard to outdated content and consistency of application.
221. CCPR agreed with a proposal to attach the note to milk fats (FM 0183) rather than milks (ML 0106) as it directly related to the approach for monitoring the CXL for milk fat, noting that this would provide greater clarity for implementation.

Conclusion

222. CCPR56:

- (i) confirmed the 31 fat-soluble pesticides (CX/PR 25/56/6, paragraph 5) currently included in the database to which the note applied;
- (ii) requested the CCPR Secretariat to insert the note "for monitoring and regulatory purposes, whole milk is to be analysed, and the result compared to the MRL for whole milk" to the CXLs for milk fats (FM 0183) in the Codex database for MRLs for pesticides in all cases where CXLs are established for fat-soluble pesticides in both milks (ML 0106) and milk fats (FM 0183), including those recommended for adoption at future sessions of CCPR;
- (iii) noted that for the purposes of transparency, CAC would be informed accordingly;

¹² CX/PR 25/56/6

¹³ ALINORM 08/31/24, paras. 161-162

- (iv) reiterated its request to JMPR to insert this note alongside the MRL for milk fats in all cases where MRLs were established for both milk fats and milks for fat-soluble pesticides; and
- (v) noted that the Codex Secretariat would review the wording and application of the “F” suffix for outdated content and consistency of application and update by CCPR57.

MRLs FOR OKRA (Agenda Item 6.3)¹⁴

223. The Codex Secretariat introduced the item and recalled that CCPR54 agreed to apply the CXLs for the peppers subgroup (VO 0051) to okra, martynia and roselle on a provisional basis and this was dependent on commitments for data generation for submission to JMPR for evaluation. In this context, the aim at CCPR56 was to review the status of data availability and to consider a timeline for this work.
224. CCPR56 noted the following ongoing data collection efforts:
- GPC recalled its previous update provided to CCPR55 that the Minor Use Foundation (MUF) had identified three candidate compounds as described in CRD26 and work had commenced on one compound in several countries, which was expected to be completed in 2026. These countries provided an update as follows:
 - Honduras indicated that comparative trials had been initiated with regard to okra and peppers.
 - Ghana indicated that trials were underway to gather residue data and results were expected by the next session of CCPR.
 - Kenya indicated that data generation was underway for okra and chili, and the results would be submitted once finalized. GPC noted that the compounds would also need to be registered and included in the priority list before the actual evaluation could take place.
 - India indicated that studies were underway for one compound in okra and chili as per the same GAP in different agro-climatic conditions (CRD19). Results were expected by the next session of CCPR.
225. A Member indicated its support to maintain the extension of the CXLs for the peppers subgroup (VO 0051) to okra, martynia and roselle on a provisional basis, noting that this could reduce the potential negative trade impact that would result from not having MRLs for these minor use crops.
226. CCPR expressed its appreciation for the efforts underway to generate data and noted that the submission of data would need to follow established procedures.

Conclusion

227. CCPR56:
- (i) noted the extensive efforts underway and commitment to generate the necessary data;
 - (ii) recalled that data would need to be submitted once available through the established procedures;
 - (iii) noted that as trials were still underway to generate data, it was premature to establish timelines; and
 - (iv) agreed that the situation regarding data availability should be reviewed again at CCPR57 with a view to establish timelines for the evaluation and reconsideration of the provisional application of the CXLs for the pepper subgroup (VO 0051) to okra, martynia and roselle.

GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING THE PURITY AND STABILITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS AND RELATED STOCK SOLUTIONS OF PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (AT STEP 7) (Agenda Item 7)¹⁵

228. India, as Chair of the EWG established by CCPR55, the Virtual Working Group (VWG) convened prior to CCPR56, and the ISWG convened by CCPR56, speaking also on behalf of the co-chairs Canada, Iran (Islamic Republic of) and Singapore, introduced the item and recalled the background of the work, mandate of the EWG, work process, key points of discussions, and revisions made by the EWG, VWG, and ISWG.
229. The EWG/VWG/ISWG Chair explained that, to facilitate discussion, the VWG and ISWG had further revised the guidelines based on written comments submitted to the session in reply to CL 2025/38-PR including CRDs, and comments made by Members participating in the VWG and ISWG. The revised guidelines were presented in CRD04 for consideration by CCPR56.

¹⁴ CX/PR 25/56/7

¹⁵ CL 2025/38-PR; CX/PR 25/56/8; CX/PR 25/56/8-Add.1 (Comments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, European Union, Ghana, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Peru, Singapore, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United States of America, Uruguay, AgroCare Latinoamérica)

230. The EWG/VWG/ISWG Chair recalled the decision of CCPR55 to expand the scope of the guidelines to cover mixed pesticide standard solutions which had been addressed in the revised guidelines and highlighted the major key points considered during the revision of the guidelines by the ISWG, in particular:
- inclusion of one additional method (Method 3.3) in Approach 3 in accordance with ISO 33405 for verification of stability of mixed pesticide standard solutions of reference materials (RMs) procured from reference material providers (RMPs); and
 - clarification that Method 3.1 and 3.2 of Approach 3 for verification of stability of mixed pesticide standard solutions of RMs during prolonged storage were applicable to mixed pesticide standard solutions of RMs purchased from RMPs as well as mixed pesticide standard solutions of RMs prepared by laboratories using individual RMs procured by the laboratories from the RMPs.
231. CCPR was invited to consider the advancement of the guidelines in the Step Procedure and agreed to use CRD04 as the basis for discussions.

Discussion

232. CCPR noted the support for the revised guidelines in CRD04, made some editorial corrections for purposes of clarity or consistency with earlier decisions and agreed that the guidelines were ready for advancement in the Step Procedure. CCPR further noted that the references in the Annex would be limited to those of international standards of specific relevance to the document (e.g. ISO standards), but that other references relating to background information to support the development of the guidelines would be removed. This was in line with general Codex practice.
233. CCPR considered a proposal to amend the title of Approach 3 “Verification of stability of mixed pesticide standard solutions during prolonged storage” to also refer to individual pesticide reference materials, as the guidance provided under this section was relevant to both mixed pesticide standard solutions and individual / neat standards of pesticide RMs. However, the EWG/VWG/ISWG Chair clarified that Approaches 1 and 2 of the guidelines already addressed the individual / neat standards of pesticide RMs, whereas Approach 3 was specifically added as per the ToRs of the EWG to include the provisions for monitoring the stability and purity of mixed pesticide standard solutions.

Conclusion

234. CCPR56:
- (i) agreed to forward the Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage (Appendix VII) to CAC48 for adoption at Step 8; and
 - (ii) expressed its appreciation to the EWG for the excellent work done.

MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW (Agenda item 8.1)¹⁶

235. The CCPR co-chair noted that several issues were for consideration under this item as follows:
- the recommendations from the EWG on management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review (CX/PR 25/56/9);
 - consideration of outstanding and future work for the EWG following the recommendations from the priority list (Agenda item 9); and
 - issues pertaining to compounds Folpet (41) and Prochloraz (142) (see agenda item 6.1) to determine whether it was appropriate for these compounds to be considered under the management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns for periodic review.

Report of the EWG on the management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review

236. Chile, as Chair of the EWG and the VWG convened prior to CCPR56, speaking also on behalf of the co-Chairs Australia, Ecuador and Kenya, introduced the item, summarized the background and ToRs of the EWG (i.e. to examine amitraz, dinocap/meptyldinocap, methamidophos/acephate, bitertanol, fenthion and parathion-methyl according to the internal management approach (REP23/PR54, Appendix XII)). The EWG/VWG Chair explained the work process, and summarized key points of discussion, conclusions, and recommendations of the EWG and VWG. The EWG/VWG chair recalled that CCPR55 had agreed that if there continued to be no support by submitting a suitable data package, CCPR56 would recommend revocation of the CXs by CAC48.

¹⁶ CL 2025/39-PR, CX/PR 25/56/9; CX/PR 25/56/9-Add.1 (Comments of Brazil, Canada, Chile, Egypt, European Union, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Thailand, Uruguay)

Discussion

237. CCPR noted that there was general support in the VWG for the revocation of the CXLs proposed by the EWG (CX/PR 25/56/9, paragraph 26).
238. Thailand expressed support for the retention of the CXLs for amitraz because the compound was registered and used in their country and the substance did not pose any public health concerns for consumers. However, understanding the decision of CCPR55 that the CXLs would be revoked unless scientific data could be supported by Members and sponsors, Thailand indicated that it would express its reservation if CCPR56 decided to revoke the CXLs. Furthermore, if the CXLs were recommended for revocation, Thailand proposed to retain the compound in the Codex pesticide database to clarify that the revocation was not as a result of safety concerns, and therefore new MRLs could still be set for the compound once scientific data became available.

Conclusion

239. CCPR56 agreed to:
- (i) request CAC48 to revoke all CXLs for fenthion (39), parathion-methyl (59), dinocap (87), amitraz (122) and bitertanol (144) and the CXLs for methamidophos (100) for cottonseed, fodder beet, potato, and sugar (Appendix IV), noting the reservation of Thailand for the reasons explained in paragraph 238;
 - (ii) retain the CXLs for methamidophos (100) for which there was a corresponding acephate (95) CXL, until the JMPR conducted the periodic review of acephate (95); and
 - (iii) recommend that JMPR revise the residue definition for acephate (95) to include methamidophos (100) when conducting the periodic review of acephate (95).

Consideration of outstanding and future work for the EWG following the recommendations from the priority list

240. The CCPR co-chair recalled the following discussions on Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation / re-evaluation by JMPR, several compounds for which there was support to submit data, had been referred for discussion under this item to consider their suitability for entering into the CCPR process for the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern for periodic review (see Agenda item 9, paragraph 279 (iii)).
241. In considering the referrals, CCPR was advised to first consider whether there were any public health concerns associated with the compounds and their suitability to enter the process.

Discussion

General considerations

242. In the consideration of the compounds referred for possible referral to the EWG on management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review, concerns were raised on the ambiguity of the process in REP23/PR54, Appendix XII, in particular around interpretation of paragraphs 5 and 6, in order to determine whether all processes were followed and that compounds qualified for inclusion under the management process.
243. In addition, concerns were also expressed around when a compound could be considered as not having a public health concern especially in the absence of an evaluation by JMPR.
244. The EWG Chair clarified that there was guidance on public health concerns in this respect in the Codex *Procedural Manual* and referred to also in the internal approach. However, concerns were raised that the absence of a concern form nor the absence of such indication from JMPR did not automatically qualify the compounds as not having a public health concern. The WHO JMPR Secretariat noted that the absence of data did not mean the absence of a health concern.
245. It was proposed that should the EWG be re-established, it should consider a review of the process in order to improve its clarity to address the concerns raised.
246. The Codex Secretariat noted that CCPR was still in the pilot phase of the implementation of the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review and that as the process was implemented, issues of clarity could arise, which should be addressed by CCPR. She pointed out that when reviewing the internal process, it should be to ensure clarity of the process and not to reopen the whole text, for example to clarify the process by which Members should communicate concerns (paragraphs 5 and 6 of the process) and to whom this concern should be directed.
247. CCPR then proceeded to consider the four compounds under consideration and agreed to include carbaryl (008); methyl bromide (052); disulfoton (074); and flumethrin (195) in the ToRs of the EWG. Several Members highlighted that the toxicological evaluations for methyl bromide, disulfoton and flumethrin were outdated as the last JMPR evaluations dated from more than 50 years for methyl bromide, and 25 years for disulfoton and flumethrin, raising uncertainties about the safety of the current CXLs (see Agenda item 9).

248. CCPR agreed that chlorpyrifos-methyl did not qualify as having no public health concern as a concern form had previously been submitted to JMPR, but that ethoxyquin could be added to the ToRs of the EWG under the 4-year rule, noting that the 4-year rule was applied in 2023, therefore leaving two years remaining for its consideration by the EWG.

Folpet (41) and prochloraz (142)

249. CCPR recalled that these two compounds had been discussed under Agenda item 6.1 and were referred to this agenda item to determine their suitability to be considered by the EWG on unsupported compounds, i.e. whether they fell within the scope of the EWG.
250. It was noted that in terms of the definition of an unsupported compound in the context of the management process, an unsupported compound was a compound for which there was no sponsor stating support for a toxicological submission to JMPR. In this context, for prochloraz, there was support for the compound, but not for some of the commodities which rendered it outside the scope of the EWG.

Discussion on unsupported commodities

251. Considerations were made on how to address cases where compound uses / commodities fell outside the EWG. Proposals were to either (a) refer the matter to the EWG to explore how CCPR could deal with situations of unsupported commodities. It was noted that such a referral could add to the burden of the EWG and that there were other processes to address this compound, i.e. through the priority list process; or (b) that principles should be developed on how to address cases where there was no support for commodities or the uses of a compound for consideration by a future session of CCPR and that it should be clear that such cases should not be automatically referred to the EWG on unsupported compounds.
252. The Codex Secretariat cautioned against expanding the ToRs of the EWG and adding to its workload. CCPR needed to ensure that work was referred to the EWG as per its original intended role and that CCPR could explore other means to address unsupported commodities of supported compounds.
253. An Observer noted that lack of support for these uses might be due to these being minor crops and that CCPR could explore other approaches to address these uses.

Conclusion

254. CCPR56 agreed to re-establish the EWG on the Management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review to continue implementing the internal approach, chaired by Chile and co-chaired by Australia, Costa Rica, India and Kenya, working in English, with the following ToRs:
- (i) To examine carbaryl (008); methyl bromide (052); disulfoton (074); flumethrin (195), which were unsupported compounds identified under Agenda item 9 (Establishment of Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation/re-evaluation by JMPR);
 - (ii) Additionally, to examine ethoxyquin (035) identified under Agenda item 6.1 (MRLs for pesticides in food and feed (at Steps 7 and 4));
 - (iii) To review the Management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review approach (REP23/PR54, Appendix XII), with the aim of improving clarity on its implementation and scope, taking into account the discussions described in paragraphs 242 and 246 with input from the JMPR and Codex Secretariats as necessary; and
 - (iv) Based on the above considerations to present the outcomes of the actions made for consideration by CCPR57.

NATIONAL REGISTRATIONS OF PESTICIDES (Agenda Item 8.2)¹⁷

255. Chile, as Chair of the EWG, speaking also on behalf of the co-chairs Australia, Ecuador, India, and Kenya, introduced the item, and recalled the background of the work and the mandate of the EWG. The EWG Chair noted that the work on the national registration database (NRD) was transferred to the EWG on unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review in CCPR55 (2024). The EWG Chair explained the work process, summarized key points of discussion, and presented the comments in reply to CL 2025/40-PR and the conclusions of the EWG on advancing work on the NRD.
256. The EWG Chair also explained that work on the NRD under this agenda item was associated with compounds that were placed in Table 2B of the priority list (i.e. pesticides that have been last evaluated 15 years ago or more, but not yet scheduled or listed, 15-year rule), and clarified that the NRD was not a global database of the national registration of pesticides.

¹⁷ CL 2025/40-PR; CX/PR 25/56/10; CX/PR 25/56/10-Add.1 (Comments of Brazil, Canada, Chile, Egypt, European Union, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Thailand, Uruguay)

257. CCPR noted that the EWG simplified its work process by restricting its analysis to include only compounds with the most recent toxicological evaluation by JMPR in 2008 and 2009. Nevertheless, the overall participation in the EWG remained low. The low volume of responses also made it challenging to draw representative conclusions at a global level.
258. The EWG therefore recommended that its work related to the NRD be suspended until it became necessary to support specific requests for information on unsupported compounds without public health concern.

Discussion

259. A Member indicated that in general, across all EWGs, instances of low participation could be partially attributed to the operational dynamics of the Codex online forum. The Member noted that EWG members needed to frequently and proactively log into the forum to check whether new documents or comments were available. In response to the Member's suggestion to implement an automated notification or alert system, the Codex Secretariat explained that this functionality was already available in the Codex online forum, although it might not be immediately or easily visible. Noting the challenges faced by EWG members to activate the automated notification system, the Codex Secretariat indicated that it was exploring how the notifications could be enabled as a default setting.
260. A view was expressed that CCPR should continue developing the NRD through other means, in tandem with related capacity building efforts. However, CCPR noted that this approach had already been explored before without significant success. On the other hand, information in the NRD could be provided as input, as necessary, to support work in the EWG on unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review.
261. CCPR noted that the NRD would only be useful if it was populated with information from multiple countries, that participation in the EWG to develop the NRD has been consistently low and decreasing, and that it would be challenging to keep the NRD up to date.

Conclusion

262. CCPR56 agreed:
- (i) to suspend the NRD-related work, undertaken by the EWG on unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review, until it became necessary to support specific requests for information on unsupported compounds with no public health concern; and
 - (ii) that the EWG would need to progress work more efficiently should it be reactivated in the future.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION/RE-EVALUATION BY JMPR (Agenda Item 9)¹⁸

263. Australia, as Chair of the EWG on the Priority List, introduced the item on Codex schedules and priorities. The schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR were prepared following consultation in the EWG with Members and Observers, a consideration of the comments in reply to CL 2024/89-PR and CL 2025/44-PR, and discussions at CCPR56. The EWG Chair explained that CRD02 had been prepared to facilitate discussion, which contained the schedules and priority lists for 2026, 2027 and beyond.
264. The EWG Chair advised that some amendments had been made to the proposed schedule and priority lists for evaluation by JMPR in 2026, 2027 and beyond to reflect comments made by Members and Observers, including those made in plenary discussions at CCPR56 and in CRDs. This included the addition of extrapolation nominations to be made by the MUF for four compounds which were already included on the '2026 new use – other' list (fluopyram (243), flupyradifurone (285), sulfoxaflor (252) and trifloxystrobin (213)).

2026 Schedule for JMPR Evaluations

265. The EWG Chair noted that, for the proposed schedule for evaluation by JMPR in 2026, which was presented in Appendix A of CRD02, there were two compounds nominated on the "new compound" list, 20 compounds (with two reserve compounds) nominated on the "new use – other" list, and two compounds on the periodic review list with confirmed support.

Discussion

266. Thailand requested that durian be added to the list of commodities for the existing "new use – other" nomination for chlorantraniliprole (230). They also confirmed that the number of available trials was five for Thai eggplant and six for durian. The JMPR Secretariat advised that eggplants were generally considered to be a major crop and therefore six trials

¹⁸ CL 2024/89-PR; CL 2025/44-PR; CX/PR 25/56/11 (including comments of Canada, Egypt, European Union, Kenya, Saudi Arabia, Industry task force II on 2-4-D research data, International Union of Food Science Technologists (IUFOST), Drexel Chemical Company in reply to CL 2024/89-PR and comments of Brazil, Canada, Egypt, the European Union, India, Thailand, United Arab Emirates in reply to CL 2025/44-PR)

might be required. Thailand was encouraged to consider if a sixth trial could be provided or to submit a justification to JMPR in support of their submission with five trials on Thai eggplants.

267. A Member, referring to CRD19, reminded CCPR that azoxystrobin in cumin was included under the schedule for JMPR review in 2024. Noting that it was not included in the JMPR data call, the Member requested JMPR to look into this previous nomination.
268. CCPR supported the inclusion of indoxacarb (216) and maleic hydrazide (102) in the periodic review schedule for 2026 noting that there was confirmed support and commitment for data for each compound. For indoxacarb (216), it was noted that not all commodities with current CXLs were supported, but the additional commodities of coffee, sunflower and strawberries were supported. For maleic hydrazide (102), it was noted that the 2024 JMPR meeting could not complete its assessment (see Agenda item 6.1), but that additional data would be submitted in 2026.
269. The data sponsor for captan (007) requested that it be added to the periodic review schedule for 2026 and confirmed that they would provide data for JMPR to review in 2026. Captan (007) had been included on the periodic review schedule for 2025 at CCPR55 (2024), however JMPR was unable to commence its assessment. CCPR56 agreed to re-list captan (007) in the periodic review schedule for 2026 for transparency, following a request from JMPR. The EWG Chair requested JMPR to advise the EWG in the future about compounds scheduled for review but for which the JMPR review was unable to commence or be completed and to provide reasoning for this to facilitate discussions in the EWG on rescheduling as appropriate (see Agenda item 10, paragraph 292 (iii)).
270. The EWG Chair noted that for four compounds, carbaryl (008), methyl bromide (052), disulfoton (074) and flumethrin (195), which were scheduled for periodic review in 2026, no confirmation of support or commitment for data was provided. CCPR agreed not to include these compounds in the priority schedule for periodic review in 2026 as they were unsupported. Several Members highlighted that the toxicological evaluations for methyl bromide, disulfoton, and flumethrin were outdated as the last JMPR evaluations dates more than 50 years for methyl bromide, and 25 years for disulfoton and flumethrin, raising uncertainties about the safety of the current CXLs (see Agenda item 8.1). Noting that no public health concern forms had been submitted for these compounds, CCPR decided to refer these compounds for consideration by the EWG on unsupported compounds without public health concern under Agenda item 8.1 as potential new work.
271. The schedule for JMPR evaluation in 2026, as presented in CRD02, was supported by CCPR with two amendments:
 - Durian was added to the existing 2026 “new use – other” nomination for chlorantraniliprole (230); and
 - Captan (007) was added to the 2026 periodic review schedule

Priority lists for 2027 and beyond

272. The EWG Chair noted that the tentative priority list for new compounds, new uses and other evaluations, and periodic reviews for 2027 and beyond was provided for awareness in Appendix B of CRD02 but was subject to change prior to CCPR57. CCPR noted that the number of new compound nominations for future years was low, with no new compounds currently nominated for 2027, two for 2028, one for 2029 and one for 2031.
273. For new uses and other evaluations, the EWG Chair indicated that there were 19 nominations for 2027 including three (propylene oxide (250), propiconazole (160), cypermethrin (118)) that were moved from the 2026 schedule as this schedule was over-subscribed, and evidence of registration was pending for the three compounds. The EWG Chair also noted that there were 14 nominations for 2028 and two for 2029.
274. The Islamic Republic of Iran, in referring to CRD10 Rev.1, nominated thiamethoxam (245) and its metabolite clothianidin (238) for pistachio nuts (TN 0675) for inclusion in the priority list for 2027.
275. Noting comments made on the efficiency of JMPR resources in the 2024 JMPR report (general consideration item 2.10) (Agenda item 5(a)), the EWG Chair indicated that from CCPR57 onwards, priority should be given to nominations made for compounds with MRLs applicable to more than one commodity, and that nominations for the same compound should not be made in subsequent years. CCPR agreed that this approach should be followed, unless a justification could be provided in support of the importance of a nomination for a single commodity.
276. Since the number of compounds tentatively scheduled for periodic review in 2026 and 2027 is low, it was suggested that the review of dithiocarbamates could be scheduled according to the process agreed under issue 2.7 of Agenda item 5(a) (see paragraph 65). The sponsor indicated that data could not be submitted for 2026. Further confirmation is needed from the sponsor on the availability of data to schedule the review starting from 2027.
277. CCPR considered Table 2A of the priority list which listed compounds that were tentatively scheduled for periodic review in 2027, 2028 and 2029. The EWG Chair highlighted that permethrin (120) had been included in the periodic review list for 2027 following its inclusion on the periodic review schedule for 2024. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that its review

could not be completed in 2025 but that the toxicological assessment was ongoing in 2025. The data sponsor confirmed their support for permethrin (120) and committed that residue data for some commodities with current CXLs and some new commodities would be available for JMPR review in 2027. Carbosulfan (145) was removed from the priority list for periodic review in 2027 following confirmation from the data sponsor that they had withdrawn support for this compound. The EWG Chair highlighted that it was important for Members and Observers to indicate if there was support for the compounds included in Table 2A and 2B of the priority list.

Nominations for Parallel Review

278. The EWG Chair advised CCPR that no nominations had been received for a compound for parallel review.

Conclusion

279. CCPR56 agreed to:

- (i) endorse the priority list of pesticides for evaluation by the 2026 JMPR and submit it to CAC48 for approval (Appendix VIII);
- (ii) re-establish the EWG on schedules and priorities, chaired by Australia, working in English, to provide a report on the schedules and priority lists for consideration at the next meeting of CCPR; and
- (iii) refer carbaryl (008), methyl bromide (052), disulfoton (074) and flumethrin (195) to the EWG on unsupported compounds without public health concern for consideration as potential new work.

ENHANCEMENT OF THE OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF CCPR AND JMPR (Agenda item 10)¹⁹

280. The USA, as Chair of the EWG, and the VWG meeting convened just prior to CCPR, and speaking also on behalf of the co-chairs Costa Rica and Uganda, introduced the item, recalled the background to the work and the mandate of the EWG, explained the work process including the convening of a VWG, and provided a summary of the comments received in reply to CL 2025/45-PR. CCPR noted that the JMPR Secretariat provided an update during the VWG on their ongoing efforts to enhance the capacity of JMPR.
281. The EWG Chair noted that the comments received indicated broad support for the work and outcome of the EWG, with a strong consensus on the importance of enhancing the operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR. Many of the comments echoed themes that have been discussed in previous EWG papers, reflecting continuity in delegates' concerns and priorities. There was support for an additional JMPR meeting although it was also noted that the backlog of work was gradually decreasing. The proposal for more permanent staffing for JMPR was supported as a means of improving stability, continuity, and consistency in scientific and procedural standards, while acknowledging more information on its feasibility was required. However, a means of resourcing these proposals had not been identified. It was noted that an Observer had proposed a transparent fee system as a potential mechanism to support the JMPR work.
282. The EWG chair noted that practical considerations continued to be raised, also in line with discussions in JMPR (see Agenda item 5a) paragraph 73) related to the quality of data submissions, and the need to ensure efficient use of JMPRs existing resources. Among the proposals were capacity building, training and guidance to help data submitters improve the quality of their dossiers; enhancing dossier formats and promoting digital submissions and implementing initiatives to reduce the rate of resubmissions through careful screening of nominations to ensure dossiers were complete. Different approaches were suggested to address the latter such as a two-phase evaluation system, beginning with pre-meeting data verification followed by JMPR's review of data summaries, enhanced pre-meeting preparation, as well as exploring the feasibility of artificial intelligence tools to assist with data processing, screening, and preliminary analysis.
283. The EWG Chair noted that the VWG had provided a useful forum to discuss the outcome of the EWG and the related comments, supplemented with input from the JMPR Secretariat. In this context the EWG/VWG chair presented the recommendations for CCPR's consideration and expressed his view that the EWG had gathered an extensive amount of information and input, provided some clear paths forward and completed its work, and that there would be no need to re-establish it at this session.
284. The WHO JMPR Representative highlighted that WHO was facing significant budget and staffing constraints, with staff reduction, no capacity to hire new personnel and overall limited resources. Nevertheless, the Representative confirmed that Codex remained a core priority and WHO was committed to continue providing scientific advice. The Representative acknowledged with appreciation the major contribution of one donor over the past decade but noting that they would no longer be supporting the scientific advice programme, stressed the importance of more countries providing support. The Representative highlighted that the scientific advice programme relied heavily on voluntary contributions and thanked those that had come forward to date but indicated that the number of donors was limited. Considering the

¹⁹ CL 2025/45-PR; CX/PR 25/56/12; CX/PR 25/56/12-Add.1 (Comments of Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Saudi Arabia, Thailand, CropLife International)

current challenges, the Representative informed CCPR that WHO was exploring alternative support mechanisms, such as in-kind contributions (e.g. hosting meetings); expert secondments from member countries and other innovative staffing solutions and encouraged Members to support such initiatives.

285. The FAO JMPR Representative noted that FAO was actively working to enhance JMPR's capacity, especially to address the backlog in evaluations and confirmed FAO's commitment to support the work of CCPR. Actions taken included the identification of additional experts, improving governance and organizing training workshops to support the development of the next generation of JMPR experts. The Representative further noted that FAO was also facing staff constraints, limiting its capacity for data evaluation and risk assessment, despite internal efforts, and emphasized the importance of Members raising concerns on JMPR's capacity and its significant impact on the setting of MRLs for pesticides, through Codex and FAO governing bodies. The Representative noted that FAO was cautiously considering external funding proposals, especially from non-member sources, in line with its partnership and funding policies.

Discussion

286. Delegates expressed their appreciation for the work initiated at CCPR53 and generally agreed with the EWG recommendations in CCPR56. There was broad support to convene an extraordinary JMPR meeting to address the backlog of evaluations and advance the assessment for new uses of pesticides. Securing adequate resources to support the recruitment of permanent JMPR staff as a means of improving stability, continuity, and consistency in scientific and procedural standards was also supported. However, Members recognized the resource challenges and emphasized the importance of ensuring JMPR was adequately resourced by FAO and WHO as well as other appropriate means. One Member highlighted the challenging budgetary situations that FAO and WHO were facing, noted that the burden of providing financial support could not be wholly placed on FAO and WHO, and indicated that Member support through voluntary contributions was also key. In this context, ongoing prioritization and efficiency efforts were of critical importance.
287. Although a reduction in the backlog of assessments for JMPR had been observed, demand remained strong, and suggestions were made on how to make more efficient use of existing JMPR resources. These included:
- enhanced approaches to the scheduling of compounds or additional uses for JMPR assessment (e.g. deprioritizing assessments for single use compounds to the extent possible (noting in some cases there may only be one crop relevant for trade); grouping assessments for multiple uses of the same compound; accepting nominations for a compound only if there was data on the detection of its residues;
 - information from JMPR to CCPR on reasons why assessments could not be completed, whether it be due to resources or incomplete data, to better inform discussions on priorities and scheduling;
 - ensuring dossiers submitted were complete and were of suitable quality through the provision of new or updated guidance on dossier preparation and data requirements (including on toxicology), clear communication to data providers on data needs, and improving access to such information;
 - reviewing existing analyses to identify some of the key consistent failures of dossiers which could be used as a basis for developing a strategic approach on how data quality might be improved;
 - the strict and consistent application of the 4-year and 25-year rules in accordance with the *Codex Procedural Manual*;
 - removing compounds with outdated evaluations or lack of support;
 - the use of technology such as artificial intelligence to support some specific tasks, such as verification on the completeness of dossiers in a secure and confidential manner;
 - convening JMPR meetings in different modalities including virtually; and
 - mobilizing experts to support the work of JMPR and continuing efforts to build capacity to ensure there was an adequate pool of expertise available to JMPR.
288. With regard to guidance on the requirements for data submission, the JMPR Secretariat recognized that the relevant manual was last updated almost a decade ago and needed revision to reflect recent developments, but to date resources had not been available to support that. However, the JMPR Secretariat was committed to doing so as soon as feasible. A Member, noting that FAO had already established guidelines for the submission of supervised residue trial data for JMPR evaluations, requested that any new guidelines in this regard should be consistent and non-duplicative.
289. The efforts of an Observer to develop guidance for data submitters with the aim of improving the quality and completeness of dossiers were well received.

290. While CCPR recognized the valuable work of the EWG and several delegations were of the view it would be of value for the EWG to continue, there was general agreement that the EWG has completed its ToRs. Without a feasible mechanism to provide funding or human resource support the measures identified, CCPR agreed not to re-establish the EWG at this session. However, depending on developments in the coming year, the EWG could be re-established at a future session as needed.

Conclusion

291. CCPR56:
- (i) reaffirmed the need to enhance the operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR to address concerns related to both JMPR current workload and future demand for compound evaluations;
 - (ii) reiterated the need for a multipronged approach and their support for both the short-term and long-term approaches; and
 - (iii) noted that no mechanism had been identified to provide funding or human resource support to implement short-term measures, and therefore, requested CAC to reiterate to FAO and WHO and their governing bodies the critical importance of JMPR to support science-based establishment of pesticide MRLs in a timely and efficient manner and encourage them to ensure that JMPR has adequate resources to undertake its work.
292. With the goal of enhancing efficiency and maximizing use of existing resources, CCPR56 agreed to:
- (i) request JMPR to ensure guidance on data submission was up to date, available and accessible and to assess and communicate gaps in dossiers submitted in response to calls for data to promote high quality dossier submission;
 - (ii) include prioritization approaches that support JMPR efficiency, as part of its discussions on priorities, in particular within the priorities working group, for example, by prioritizing compounds with multiple uses, or grouping requests for evaluation;
 - (iii) request JMPR to provide input to the priority working group on the reasons why work on scheduled compounds could not proceed to better inform and improve the prioritization approach; and
 - (iv) to apply its procedures consistently in line with the Codex *Procedural Manual*.
293. CCPR56 expressed its appreciation to the chair and co-chairs of the working group for their work and agreed that the EWG had completed its work at this time but could be re-established in the future to support the coordination of enhancement activities as needed.

COORDINATION OF WORK BETWEEN CCPR AND CCRVDF: JOINT CCPR/CCRVDF WORKING GROUP ON COMPOUNDS FOR DUAL USE – STATUS OF WORK (Agenda item 11)²⁰

294. The USA, as Chair of the joint EWG, speaking also on behalf of the co-chairs Brazil and New Zealand, provided background information on the establishment of the joint EWG, its ToRs and work process, and a status update on efforts to coordinate work between CCPR and CCRVDF.
295. CCPR was informed that while the registered participants to the joint EWG had included the global regions that comprised the Codex membership, actual participation within the Codex online forum had been limited. The joint EWG Chair noted that to operate the joint EWG entirely within the Codex online forum and to present the recommendations to CCPR and CCRVDF separately might not be the most effective approach to address all issues in the joint EWG. To address this challenge, the joint EWG recommended convening a joint virtual session of the joint WG, which would precede a possible joint session of CCPR and CCRVDF. The joint EWG Chair reiterated the importance of both CCPR and CCRVDF delegations being engaged in the possible joint virtual session and joint session of CCPR and CCRVDF.

Discussion

296. CCPR generally supported the recommendations of the joint EWG and noted the commitment expressed by Members to engage in the work of the joint EWG and to coordinate with their animal health counterparts. CCPR noted that the virtual joint session of the joint EWG would strengthen collaboration, improve efficiency in addressing dual-use compounds, and help advance harmonised science-based outcomes. CCPR also noted that the work of the joint EWG had important implications on food safety and international trade and should therefore proceed in an efficient manner.
297. A Member indicated that the joint virtual session should be attended by the JECFA and JMPR Secretariats to enable the provision of sound scientific advice for decision making.

²⁰ CX/PR 25/56/13

298. In response to a concern from a Member Organisation on whether the organisation of a joint session of CCPR and CCRVDF was within the procedural provisions in the *Codex Procedural Manual*, the Codex Secretariat explained that most of the provisions related to the organisation of a Codex committee meeting would apply, and that CAC47's endorsement to explore the scheduling of a joint session of CCPR and CCRVDF²¹ could provide a basis to convene the joint session. While some specific aspects unique to a joint session of two Codex committees would need to be explored further and addressed in a transparent manner, the organisation of the joint virtual session was also to pilot a new, innovative approach, which could inform future updates to the *Codex Procedural Manual* as necessary.
299. The Codex Secretariat stressed the importance of transparency in organising the joint session and noted that the discussion of this way of working at CAC provided all Members and Observers with the opportunity to express their views on this topic.
300. New Zealand informed CCPR that it would unfortunately not be able to continue serving the joint EWG as co-chair. CCPR thanked New Zealand for its contributions to the joint EWG.

Conclusion

301. CCPR56:
- (i) indicated their continued support for the joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG;
 - (ii) endorsed scheduling a virtual session of the joint EWG that precedes a virtual joint session of CCPR and CCRVDF, and agreed to inform CAC accordingly;
 - (iii) encouraged Codex Members and Observers to participate in the possible virtual session of the joint EWG and possible virtual joint session of CCPR and CCRVDF; and
 - (iv) encouraged Codex Members and Observers to liaise with their veterinary (animal health) service counterparts to coordinate positions and actively participate in the work of the joint EWG, including providing replies to the circular letters on harmonization of food descriptors and harmonization of MRLs for dual-use compounds when they became available.

OTHER BUSINESS (Agenda Item 12)

302. CCPR56 noted that there were no issues for discussion under other business.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 13)

303. CCPR56 was informed that its 57th Session was tentatively scheduled to be held in the second half of (2026) in Beijing, China, the final arrangements being subject to confirmation by the Host Country and the Codex Secretariats. CCPR56 noted that 2026 would mark 60 years since the first session of CCPR.
304. An Observer organization expressed concern that the delay in publishing the 2024 JMPR report has resulted in postponement of CCPR56, would continue to cause delays in JMPR and CCPR meetings, and by extension the adoption of MRLs in 2026, and possibly 2027. The Observer organization stressed that growers, traders, food companies, and consumers relied on an efficient Codex process to enable the trade of safe food, and when significant delays were introduced through administrative issues, there would be substantial and systemic implications.
305. Noting the substantial delays expected in the normal flow of data submission, JMPR assessment and reporting, the consideration of MRLs by CCPR and adoption of MRLs by CAC, the Observer organization suggested that JMPR could potentially convene a meeting in September or October 2026, noting the fewer new compounds scheduled for full evaluation by JMPR in 2026. The Observer organization urged all parties to work to normalize the sequencing of meetings such that it could revert to the schedule before COVID-19 as rapidly as possible.
306. The FAO and WHO JMPR Secretariats noted this concern and indicated that FAO and WHO would do their best to normalise the scheduling of JMPR to minimise any potential impacts to CCPR and adoption of Codex standards.

²¹ REP24/CAC paragraph 131

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES**

CHAIRPERSON – PRÉSIDENT - PRESIDENTE

Dr Weili Shan
Deputy Director General/Professor
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

CO-CHAIRPERSON – CO-PRÉSIDENT – COPRESIDENTE

Mr Eduardo Aylwin
Asesor
Agencia Chilena para la Inocuidad y Calidad Alimentaria (ACHIPIA)
Santiago

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – VICE-PRÉSIDENTE – VICEPRESIDENTA

Dr Lifang Duan
Division Director/Professor
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

**MEMBERS NATIONS AND MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS
ÉTATS MEMBRES ET ORGANISATIONS MEMBRES
ESTADOS MIEMBROS Y ORGANIZACIONES MIEMBROS**

ALBANIA - ALBANIE

Mr Dritan Palnikaj
Secretary General
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Tirana

Dr Tana Kika
Advisor to the Minister
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Tirana

Mr Martin Mici
Director General, General Directorate of Food Safety,
Veterinary, Plant Protection and Fisheries Policies
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Tirana

Mrs Gejla Shehaj
Advisor to the Minister
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Tirana

AUSTRALIA - AUSTRALIE

Mr James Deller
Director
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Mr Peter Breguet
Senior Manager Trade and Market Access
Grains Australia

Mrs Jenna Garwood
Assistant Director
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Mr Gavin Hall
DTS Regulatory Consultants
on behalf of
Hort Innovation Australia

Mr Daniel Poflowski
Director
Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines
Authority

AUSTRIA - AUTRICHE

Ingo Grosssteiner
Senior Expert
Austrian Agency for Health and Food Safety (AGES)
Vienna

BRAZIL - BRÉSIL - BRASIL

Mr Rogério Pereira Da Silva
Head of Minor Crops Service
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Brasília

Mr Antonio Batista Sanches
Health Regulation Expert
Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency - Anvisa
Brasília

Mr Danilo Tadashi Tagami Kamimura
General Coordinator of Sanitary and Phytosanitary
Issues
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock – MAPA
Brasília

Ms Adriana Torres De Sousa
Manager of Monitoring and Risk Assessment Office
Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency - Anvisa
Brasília

CAMEROON - CAMEROUN - CAMERÚN

Mr Medi MOUNGUI
Deputy Permanent Representative
Ambassade du Cameroun à Rome
Rome

CANADA - CANADÁ

Ms Monique Thomas
Section Head
Pest Management Regulatory Agency
Ottawa

Dr Marcos Álvarez
Executive Director
Pest Management Centre
Ottawa

Mr Matthew Lapointe
Deputy Director
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
Ottawa

Ms Monica Le
Section Head
Pest Management Regulatory Agency
Ottawa

Mr Andrew Sullivan
Supervising Chemist
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Calgary

CHILE - CHILI

Ms Roxana Vera
Jefa del Subdepartamento de Acuerdos Internacionales
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Mr Cristóbal Araya
Profesional del Subdepartamento de Autorización y
Evaluación de Plaguicidas
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Mr Jorge Carvajal
Profesional del Subdepartamento de Acuerdos
Internacionales
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Ms Paulina Chávez
Asesor Técnico del Departamento de Nutrición y
Alimentos
Departamento de Nutrición y Alimentos, Ministerio de
Salud (MINSAL)
Santiago

Ms Tatiana Contreras
Profesional del Subdepartamento de Internacionales
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Ms Claudia Espinoza
Profesional del Subdepartamento de Acuerdos
Internacionales
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Mr David Guerra Maldonado
Profesional del Subdepartamento de Plaguicidas,
Fertilizantes, Bioestimulantes e Inocuidad
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Mr Moisés Leiva
Gerente de Alimentos
Chile Alimentos A.G.
Santiago

Mr Claudio Núñez
Profesional del Subdepartamento de Acuerdos
Internacionales
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Mr Pablo Reyes
Jefe del Subdepartamento de Control de plaguicidas,
Fertilizantes, Bioestimulantes e Inocuidad
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Mr Victor Rivera
Coordinador de Asuntos Internacionales y
Regulatorios
Agencia Chilena para la Inocuidad y Calidad
Alimentaria (ACHIPIA)
Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

Mr Francisco Sánchez
Director de Investigación y Desarrollo - ANASAC Chile
Asociación Gremial de Importadores y Productores de
Fitosanitarios, Fertilizantes y Bioestimulantes para la
Agricultura (IMPPA)

Mr Daniel Schwantes
Profesor Asistente
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

Ms Loreto Tapia
Analista de Inocuidad
Frutas de Chile A.G.

Ms Marcela Triviño
Encargada de Inocuidad
Frutas de Chile A.G.
Santiago

Ms Lucía Valenzuela
Jefa del Subdepartamento de Autorización y
Evaluación de Plaguicidas
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura

Ms Camila Valle Becerra
Profesional del Subdepartamento de Plaguicidas,
Fertilizantes, Bioestimulantes e Inocuidad
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura

Mr Rodrigo Sotomayor
Jefe de División
Subdirección de Gestión Técnica
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)
Ministerio de Agricultura

Mr Nicolás Tobalina Cortés
Punto de Contacto del Codex Chile
Agencia Chilena para la Inocuidad y Calidad
Alimentaria (ACHIPIA)
Ministerio de Agricultura

Ms Constanza Vergara E.
Asesora del Departamento de Aspectos Regulatorios
del Comercio
Subsecretaría de Relaciones Económicas
Internacionales (SUBREI)
Santiago

Ms Patricia Villarreal
Gerente General
Asociación Nacional de Fabricantes e Importadores de
Productos Fitosanitarios Agrícolas A.G. (AFIPA)
Santiago

CHINA - CHINE

Mr Zhihua Zhang
Chief Engineer
China Green Food Development Center (CGFDC)
Beijing

Mrs Fang Gao
Division Director
Center of Agro-product Safety and Quality, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs, P.R.C.
Beijing

Prof Siming Li
Vice-president
Jiangxi Academy of Agricultural Sciences
Nanchang

Ms Pui Shan Liu
Scientific Officer
Centre for Food Safety, Food and Environmental
Hygiene Department, The Government of the Hong
Kong Special Administrative Region
Hong Kong

Mr Youlong Lu
Division Director
Center of Agro-product Safety and Quality, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs, P.R.C.
Beijing

Dr Hoi Yan Fiona Shiu
Chemist
Government Laboratory
Hong Kong

Mr Xuewan Xu
First Level Researcher
Department of Agro-products Quality and Safety,
MARA, P.R.C.
Beijing

Dr Ho Pan Michael Yau
Senior Chemist
Government Laboratory
Hong Kong

Prof Ercheng Zhao
Professor/Deputy Director
Institute of Plant Protection,
Beijing Academy of Agriculture and Forestry Science
Beijing

Prof Guangyan Zhu
Professor
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA), P.R.China
Beijing

COLOMBIA - COLOMBIE

Ms Nataly Bulla Galvis
Segunda Secretaria
Embajada de Colombia en Chile
Santiago de Chile

Mr Sebastián Camilo Guanumen Parra
Embajador
Embajada de Colombia en Chile
Santiago de Chile

Mr Julian Páez Vargas
Consejero
Embajada de Colombia en Chile
Santiago de Chile

COSTA RICA

Mrs Ivania Morera Rodríguez
Laboratorista Químico
Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado
San José

DENMARK - DANEMARK - DINAMARCA

Mrs Mette Christiansen
Senior Scientific Advisor
Danish Veterinary and Food Administration
Glostrup

Mrs Annette Grossmann
Senior Scientific Advisor
Danish Veterinary and Food Administration

Mrs Bodil Hamborg Jensen
Senior Adviser
Technical University of Denmark
Kgs. Lyngby

Mr Marc Leguen De Lacroix
Political Administrator
Council of the European Union

Mrs Trine Thorup Andersen
Scientific Advisor
Danish Veterinary and Food Administration
Glostrup

EL SALVADOR

Mr Manuel Escobar
Técnico Especialista de Reglamentación Técnica
Organismo Salvadoreño de Reglamentación Técnica
San Salvador

ESTONIA - ESTONIE

Mrs Sille Vahter
Chief Specialist
Ministry of Regional Affairs and Agriculture of the
Republic of Estonia
Tallinn

EUROPEAN UNION - UNION EUROPÉENNE - UNIÓN EUROPEA

Dr Gaspar Avendaño Pérez
Policy Officer
European Commission
Brussels

Ms Anne Latrive
Policy Officer
European Commission
Brussels

Ms Ileana Miron
Scientific Expert
European Food Safety Authority
Parma

Mr Miguel Santos
Scientific Expert
European Food Safety Authority
Parma

Ms Maria Tabernero
Policy Officer
European Commission
Brussels

FINLAND - FINLANDE - FINLANDIA

Mrs Tiia Mäkinen-Töykkä
Senior Officer
Finnish Safety and Chemicals Agency (Tukes)

FRANCE - FRANCIA

Ms Florence Gérault
Experte résidus de pesticides
Ministère de l'agriculture et de la souveraineté
alimentaire
Angers

Ms Gaelle Vial
Cheffe de l'Unité résidus et sécurité des aliments
Agence nationale de sécurité sanitaire de
l'alimentation, de l'environnement et du travail
(Anses)
Maisons-Alfort

GERMANY - ALLEMAGNE - ALEMANIA

Ms Monika Schumacher
Desk Officer
Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Regional
Identity
Bonn

Dr Florian Hägele
Laboratory Manager
Chemical and Veterinary Inspection Office Stuttgart
Fellbach

Dr Marina Rusch Food
Chemist
Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food
Safety
Braunschweig

GHANA

Mrs Doreen Afi Gyau Koranteng
Codex Contact Point Manager
Ghana Standards Authority
Accra

Mr Richard Kwame Adu-Acheampong
AG. Executive Director
Quality Control Company Ltd (COCOBOD)
Tema

Dr William Azalekor
Managing Director
Quality Control Company Ltd (Ghana Cocoa Board)
Accra

Dr Paul Osei-Fosu
Head, Food and Agriculture Department
Ghana Standards Authority
Accra

Mr Leslie Owusu-Ansah
Head of Department
Food and Drugs Authority
Accra

GUYANA

Ms Bhavina Pooran
Inspector II
Pesticide and Toxic Chemicals Control Board
Georgetown

HONDURAS

Mr Francisco Matamoros
Jefe de Departamento de Frutas y Hortalizas
SENASA
Tegucigalpa

INDIA - INDE

Dr Poonam Jasrotia
ADG (Plant Protection and Biosafety)
Indian Council of Agricultural Research
New Delhi

Dr Vandana Tripathy
Principal Scientist & Network Coordinator
All India Network Project on Pesticide Residues
ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute
New Delhi

**IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF) -
IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D') -
IRÁN (REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA DEL)**

Dr Roya Noorbakhsh
Head of Risk Assessment Bureau
Expert of Pesticide Residue in food and feed
Iranian National Standard Organization (INSO)

IRELAND - IRLANDE - IRLANDA

Dr Aidan Moody
Senior Inspector
Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine
Dublin

Dr Derek Keenan
Agricultural Inspector
Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine
Dublin

ITALY - ITALIE - ITALIA

Mr Giulio Cardini
Policy Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Food Sovereignty and Forests
Ministero dell'agricoltura, della sovranità alimentare e
delle foreste, MASAF
Rome

JAMAICA - JAMAÏQUE

Dr Raymond Reid
Senior Analytical Chemist
The University of the West Indies
Kingston

JAPAN - JAPON - JAPÓN

Ms Maki Terawaki
Assistant Director
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Tokyo

Dr Kikuko Sakai
Section Chief
Consumer Affairs Agency
Tokyo

Dr Takahiro Watanabe
Section Chief
National Institute of Health Sciences
Kanagawa

Ms Yukie Yamauchi
Deputy Director
Consumer Affairs Agency
Tokyo

KENYA

Dr Allan Azegele
Director of Veterinary Services
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development
Nairobi

Mr Ferdinand Masinde
Director- Food Crops Directorate
Agriculture and Food Authority
Nairobi

Ms Grace Muchemi
General Manager
Pest Control Products Board
Nairobi

Mr Peter Kamuti
Deputy Director Analytical Chemistry Laboratory and
Food Safety
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services
Nairobi

Ms Maryann Kindiki
Manager, National Codex Contact Point
Kenya Bureau of Standards
Nairobi

Mr Patrick Kirimi
Deputy Director, Regulations
Agriculture and Food Authority
Nairobi

MOROCCO - MAROC - MARRUECOS

Mr Mohammed Saiid Azzouzi
Responsable Laboratoire
Morocco FOODEX-EACCE
Larache

Mr Talbi Zakaria
Chef de service TECHNECO COMMERCIALE
Laboratoire Officiel d'Analyses et de Recherches
Chimiques

NETHERLANDS - PAYS-BAS - PAÍSES BAJOS

Mrs Judith Hulst
Senior Policy Officer
Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport
Hague

NEW ZEALAND - NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE - NUEVA ZELANDIA

Ms Ailsa Conn
Senior Advisor, Plant Exports
Ministry for Primary Industries
Wellington

Mr Warren Hughes
Principal Adviser ACVM
Ministry for Primary Industries
Wellington

Ms Sarah Lester
Specialist Adviser
Ministry for Primary Industries
Wellington

Mr Raj Rajasekar
Codex Senior Programme Manager
Ministry for Primary Industries
Wellington

PARAGUAY

Eng Hilce Rocío Ávalos Céspedes
Técnica
SENAVE - Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas
Asunción

Carmen Rosalba Rodas Monges
Técnica del Comité Técnico de Evaluación
Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de Semillas (SENAVE)
Asunción

POLAND - POLOGNE - POLONIA

Mrs Magdalena Kowalska
Chief Expert
Agricultural and Food Quality Inspection
Warsaw

Mrs Anna Janasik
Expert
Agricultural and Food Quality Inspection
Warsaw

QATAR

Mrs Tahani Al-Obaidly
Expert, Food Safety
Ministry of Public Health

Eng Hussin Alyahri
Assistant Director of Animal Resources Department
Ministry of Municipality

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA -
RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE -
REPÚBLICA DE COREA**

Dr Kyoung Mo Kang
Senior Scientific Officer
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Dr Chanhyeok Kwon
Senior Scientific Officer
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Mr Junhyun Kim
Scientific Officer
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Dr Wonjo Choe
Scientific Officer
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Ms Yoon Park
Research Advisor
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Mr Minseok Oh
Scientific Officer
Rural Development Administration

Dr Changjo Kim
Scientific Officer
National Agricultural Products Quality Management Service

Dr Hyoyoung Kim
Scientific Officer
National Agricultural Products Quality Management Service

Dr Mi-young Park, DVM
Veterinary Researcher
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency

Dr Moo-hyeog Im
Professor
Daegu University

SAUDI ARABIA - ARABIE SAOUDITE - ARABIA SAUDITA

Mr Khalid Alzahrani
Head of the International Communication Department for Food Standards
Saudi Food and Drug Authority
Riyadh

SINGAPORE - SINGAPOUR - SINGAPUR

Dr Sheena Wee
Specialist Team Lead
Singapore Food Agency
Singapore

Dr How Chee Ong
Senior Scientist
Singapore Food Agency
Singapore

SOUTH AFRICA - AFRIQUE DU SUD - SUDÁFRICA

Ms Aluwani Madzivhandila
 Assistant Director: Food Control
 Department of Health
 Pretoria

SPAIN - ESPAGNE - ESPAÑA

Dr Álvaro Rol Rúa
 Jefe de Servicio de Residuos de Productos
 Fitosanitarios y Medicamentos Veterinarios en
 Alimentos
 Organismo Autónomo Agencia Española de Seguridad
 Alimentaria y Nutrición (AESAN OA)-Ministerio de
 Consumo
 Madrid

SWEDEN - SUÈDE - SUECIA

Mr Niklas Montell
 Principal Regulatory Officer
 Swedish Food Agency
 Uppsala

SWITZERLAND - SUISSE - SUIZA

Mr Emanuel Hänggi
 Scientific Officer
 Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office FSVO
 Bern

THAILAND - THAÏLANDE - TAILANDIA

Mr Lertchai Lertvut
 Deputy Secretary-General
 Food and Drug Administration,
 Ministry of Public Health
 Nonthaburi

Mr Prachathipat Pongpinyo
 Agricultural Research Officer, Senior Professional Level
 Department of Agriculture,
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 Bangkok

Mrs Wischada Jongmevasna
 Director of Bureau of Quality and Safety of Food
 Department of Medical Sciences
 Ministry of Public Health
 Nontaburi

Ms Namaporn Attaviroj
 Standards Officer, Senior Professional Level
 National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food
 Standards (ACFS)
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 Bangkok

Mrs Kongsadan Inthong
 Food and Drug Technical Officer, Professional Level
 Food and Drug Administration,
 Ministry of Public Health
 Nonthaburi

Mr Witchulada Yungyuen
 Standards Officer, Professional Level
 National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food
 Standards
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 Bangkok

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO -**TRINITÉ-ET-TOBAGO -****TRINIDAD Y TABAGO**

Mr Richard Glasgow
 Pesticides and Toxic Chemical Inspector III
 Ministry of Health; Chemistry/Food and Drugs Division
 Port-of-Spain

UGANDA - OUGANDA

Mr Hakim Baligeya Mufumbiro
 Principal Standards Officer
 Uganda National Bureau of Standards
 Kampala

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES -**ÉMIRATS ARABES UNIS -****EMIRATOS ÁRABES UNIDOS**

Eng Ohoud Alali
 ENG
 ADFS

Eng Sonia Garbi
 ENG
 ADFS

UNITED KINGDOM - ROYAUME-UNI -**REINO UNIDO**

Dr Julian Cudmore
 Residues Team Lead
 Health and Safety Executive
 York

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA - RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE
DE TANZANIE - REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE TANZANÍA**

Mr Oshingi Samballu
 Ag. Director of Pesticide Management
 Tanzania Plant Health and Pesticides Authority
 Arusha

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA -**ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE -****ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA**

Mr Aaron Niman
 Environmental Health Scientist
 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
 Washington, DC

Ms Ire Burgoa
 International Program Specialist
 U.S. Department of Agriculture

Mr Alexander Domesle
Senior Advisor for Chemistry, Toxicology, and Related
Sciences
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, DC

Ms Heidi Irrig
Senior Regulatory Trade Manager
Syngenta
Greensboro, NC

Dr Barakat Mahmoud
Senior Science Advisor
Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of
Agriculture
Washington, DC

Ms Marie Maratos Bhat
International Issues Analyst
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.

Dr Sara Mcgrath
Chemist
Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN)
U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA)
College Park, MD

Ms Alinne Oliveira
Director
Bryant Christie, Inc.
Seattle, WA

Mr Nelson Ramírez
Agricultural Specialist
U.S. Embassy
Santiago

Dr Virna Stillwaugh
Vice President for Scientific Affairs
Northwest Horticultural Council

URUGUAY

Mrs Leticia Bettucci
Analista de Residuos de Plaguicidas-Dirección General
de Servicios Agrícolas
Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca
Montevideo

Mrs Susana Franchi
Head of Pesticides Residues Laboratory
Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries
Montevideo

ZAMBIA - ZAMBIE

Mr Mathias Tembo
Principal Agriculture Officer
Ministry of Agriculture
Lusaka

OBSERVERS - OBSERVATEURS - OBSERVADORES

**INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS –
ORGANISATIONS GOUVERNEMENTALES
INTERNATIONALES –
ORGANIZACIONES GUBERNAMENTALES
INTERNACIONALES**

**INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON
AGRICULTURE (IICA)**

Mr José Urdaz
Director SAIA
IICA
Vázquez de Coronado

Mr Eric Bolanos
Especialista SAIA
IICA
Vázquez de Coronado

Ms Ana Cordero
Especialista IICA
Vázquez de Coronado

Mr Carlos Hidalgo
Consultor IICA
Vázquez de Coronado

Ms Noemí Zúñiga
Consultor IICA
Santiago

**NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS –
ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES –
ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES**

**ASOCIACION AGROCARE LATINOAMERICA
(AGROCARE LATAM)**

Prof Karen Aracely Gatica Solares
Codex Group Coordinator
AgroCare Latinoamérica
Guatemala

Eng Lorena Caamaño
Asesora Técnica
AgroCare Latinoamérica
Canelone

Eng Carlos Mauricio Illescas Escobar
Presidente
AgroCare Latinoamérica
Guatemala

Prof Irza Irving
Asesora Técnica
AgroCare Latinoamérica
Ciudad de México

Prof Daniel Mazzarella
Asesor Técnico
AgroCare Latinoamérica
Buenos Aires

Prof Cristián Rossi
Asesor Técnico
AgroCare Latinoamérica
Guatemala

GLOBAL PULSE CONFEDERATION (CICILS)

Mr Bill Barney
Study Director
Minor Use Foundation, Inc

Ms Anna Gore
Executive Director
Minor Use Foundation, Inc

Mr Alan Norden
Board Director
Minor Use Foundation, Inc

Ms Veronica Picado
Director, Technical Operations
Minor Use Foundation, Inc

CROPLIFE INTERNATIONAL (CROPLIFE)

Mr Mark Ball
Public Affairs
Syngenta
Brussels

Dr Manojit Basu
VP Science Policy and Regulatory Affairs
CropLife America
Arlington

Mr Steve Bäseler
Senior Regulatory Policy Manager
Bayer AG
Monheim am Rhein

Mr Guadalupe Córdoba
Agronomist
Syngenta
Vicente López, Buenos Aires

Mr Craig Dunlop
Head of Regulatory Policy and Trade
Syngenta Crop Protection AG
Basel

Mr Paul Enwerekwe
Director, Regulatory Affairs, Chemistry
CropLife Canada
Ottawa

Mr Javier Fernández
Legal Adviser & Director of Regulatory Affairs
CropLife Latin America
San José

Ms Heather Griffiths
Dietary Residue Project Team Lead
Syngenta Canada Inc.
Guelph

Mr Ravindranath Hegde
Global Regulatory Strategy Lead
UPL Ltd.
New Delhi

Ms Maria Hernández
Regulatory Lead Andean Pacific
UPL
Santiago

Mr Sebastian Hoffmann
Global Regulatory Trade Manager
Bayer AG
Monheim

Ms Nevena Hristozova
Regulatory Affairs Manager
CropLife International
Bruxelles

Ms Bianca Jones
Consumer Safety
BASF
São Paulo

Ms Naoko Kobayashi
Manager
NIHON NOHAYAKU CO., LTD.
Osaka

Mrs Akari Kubota
Chief
Ishihara Sangyo Kaisha, Ltd.
Kusatsu, Shiga

Ms Amy Latham
Global Registration and MRL Strategy Leader
Corteva Agriscience
Indianapolis

Mr Neil John Lister
Global Regulatory Asset Lead - Insecticides
Gowan Crop Protection
Harpenden

Ms Paulina Marchant
Dietary Safety Latin America
Bayer S.A., Chile
Santiago

Mr Motoaki Morita
Manager
HOKKO CHEMICAL INDUSTRY CO., LTD.
Tokyo

Ms Gabriela Osorio
Country Registration Manager
Bayer
Santiago

Mr Luis Osorio
Executive Director
PROCCYT
Mexico

Ms Monika Richter
Group Lead Global MRL & Trade
BASF
Limburgerhof

Ms Simone Saito Palma
Global MRL Strategy Manager
FMC Corporation
Campinas/SP

Ms Ana Silva
Regulatory Coordinator Chile and Bolivia
FMC Química Chile Limitada
Santiago

Dr Jane Stewart
Expert Head of Consumer Safety Strategy
BASF
Research Triangle Park

Ms Pamela Suárez
Regulatory Affairs Manager
PROCCYT
Mexico

Ms Ericka Veliz
Global Trade & Government Affairs Manager
UPL Ltd.
Middletown

Mr Tokunori Yokota
General Manager
CropLife Japan
Tokyo

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF BEVERAGES
ASSOCIATIONS (ICBA)**

Ms Nakia Smith
Director, Crop Protection
The Coca-Cola Company
Atlanta

Ms Jesica Chernavsky
Senior Manager
The Coca-Cola Company

Mr Eduardo Nascimento Silva
Director
The Coca-Cola Company

**INTERNATIONAL FRUIT AND VEGETABLE JUICE
ASSOCIATION (IFU)**

Mrs Tatiana Campos
Executive Director
International Fruit & Vegetable Juice Association (IFU)
Paris

**INTERNATIONAL NUT AND DRIED FRUIT COUNCIL
FOUNDATION (INC)**

Dr Gabriele Ludwig
Sustainability Committee Member
INC - International Nut and Dried Fruit Council
Reus

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF CITRICULTURE (ISC)

Mr James Cranney
ISC Representative
International Society of Citriculture
Auburn

**INTERNATIONAL UNION OF PURE AND APPLIED
CHEMISTRY (IUPAC)**

Dr Elvira Keller
Senior Managing Scientist
Exponent International GmbH
Frankfurt am Main

Dr Nell Townsend
Senior Managing Scientist
Exponent International

**WHO PERSONNEL
PERSONNEL DE LA OMS
PERSONAL DE LA OMS**

Dr Moez Sanaa
Unit Head
World Health Organization (WHO)
Geneva

CCPR SECRETARIAT

Ms Mengmeng Qu
Division Director
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs

Dr Fengzu Zhang
Deputy Division Director/Senior Agronomist
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals of Ministry
of Agriculture and Rural Affairs
Beijing

Mr Huiqian Zhuang
Agronomist
Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA)
Beijing

Mr Nicolás Tobalina Cortés
Chilean Codex Contact Point
Agencia Chilena para la Inocuidad y Calidad
Alimentaria (ACHIPIA), Ministerio de Agricultura
Santiago

CODEX SECRETARIAT

Dr Sarah Cahill
Codex Secretary
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
Rome

Mrs Verna Carolissen-Mackay
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
Rome

Mr Chun Yin Johnny Yeung
Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
Rome

APPENDIX II**Part 1: Editorial amendments to Section 4.8****Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues of the *Procedural Manual*****(For adoption)****Note:** Changes are indicated in **bold**, and ~~striketrough~~ or underline.**4.8 RISK ANALYSIS PRINCIPLES APPLIED BY THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES****(As extracted from the 30th edition of the Procedural manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission)****Scope**

165. This document:

- addresses the respective applications of risk analysis principles by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) as the risk management body and **Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues** (JMPR) as the risk assessment body; and
- facilitates the uniform application of Section 4.1: Working principles for risk analysis for application in the framework of the Codex Alimentarius.

This document should be read in conjunction with the ~~above mentioned~~ section **mentioned above**.**General aspects****Summary of the maximum residue limit (MRL)-setting process.**

166. In addressing pesticide residue issues in Codex, ~~providing advice and taking decisions on risk management is the responsibility of~~ the Commission and CCPR **are responsible for providing advice and making decisions on risk management**, while **JMPR is responsible for** conducting risk assessments ~~is the responsibility of JMPR~~.

167. The MRL-setting process begins with a Member or Observer nominating a pesticide for evaluation by JMPR. In considering the nomination, CCPR, in consultation with the JMPR ~~Secretariat joint secretaries~~, may ~~then~~ prioritize and schedule the pesticide for evaluation.

168. The WHO Core Assessment Group considers available data encompassing a wide range of toxicological endpoints ~~with the aim of estimating to estimate~~ an **acceptable daily intake (ADI)** and an **acute reference dose (ARfD)** where necessary and if sufficient data are available.

169. The FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment considers data on registered use patterns, ~~residue~~ fate ~~of residues~~, animal and plant metabolism, analytical methodology, and residue data derived from supervised residue trials ~~in order~~ to propose residue definitions and maximum residues levels for ~~the~~ pesticides in food and feed.

170. ~~The~~ JMPR risk assessment includes ~~the estimation of both~~ **estimating** short-term (single-day) and long-term dietary exposures and ~~their comparison~~ **comparing them** with the relevant toxicological benchmarks. MRLs in or on food and animal feeds are based on good agricultural practice (GAP) information, taking into consideration information on dietary intakes, and foods derived from commodities that comply with the respective MRLs are intended to be toxicologically acceptable.

171. CCPR considers ~~JMPR's the~~ recommendations ~~of JMPR~~ in light of ~~the~~ information provided in the relevant JMPR reports and monographs. MRL recommendations accepted by CCPR are submitted to the Commission for adoption as Codex MRLs (CXLs). An active periodic review programme complements this process.

172. CCPR and JMPR should ensure that their respective contributions to the risk analysis process result in **scientifically based** outputs that are ~~scientifically based~~, fully transparent, thoroughly documented, and available **to Members** in a timely manner ~~to Members~~.

Risk assessment policy

173. CCPR shall consider the following when preparing its priority list of pesticides for JMPR evaluation:

- CCPR's terms of reference;
- JMPR's terms of reference;
- the Commission's strategic plan; and
- nomination requirements and criteria for the prioritization and scheduling of pesticides.

174. When referring pesticides to JMPR, CCPR shall provide background information and clearly specify the reasons for the request when pesticides are nominated for evaluation.

175. When referring **to** pesticides to JMPR, CCPR may also refer a range of risk management options, with a view to obtaining JMPR's guidance on the attendant risks and the likely risk reductions associated with each option. CCPR shall request JMPR to review any risk assessment policies, methods, and guidelines being considered by CCPR for assessing MRLs **for** pesticides.

176. When establishing its standards, CCPR shall clearly state when it applies any considerations based on other legitimate factors¹ relevant for the health protection of consumers and **for** the promotion of fair practices in food trade, in addition to JMPR's risk assessment and recommended MRLs, and specify its reasons for doing so.

177. JMPR applies a transparent, science-based risk assessment process for establishing an ADI and ARfD, where appropriate.

178. JMPR, in consultation with CCPR, must continue to explore developing minimum data requirements necessary for JMPR to perform risk assessments.

179. The JMPR Secretariat shall consider whether these minimum data requirements have been met when preparing the provisional agenda for **JMPR** meetings **of JMPR**.

MRLs for specific groups

MRLs for foods of animal origin

180. Farm animal metabolism studies are required whenever a pesticide is applied directly to livestock, to animal premises or housing, or when significant residues remain in crops or commodities used in animal feed (e.g. forage crops, plant parts that could be used in animal feeds, by-products, or co-products of industrial productions). The results of farm animal feeding studies and residues in animal feed **also** serve **also** as a primary source of information for estimating maximum residue levels in foods of animal origin.

181. If no adequate studies are available, no MRLs will be established for foods of animal origin. MRLs for feeds **s** (and the primary crops) should not be established in the absence of animal transfer data. Where **the exposure of** livestock **exposure** to pesticides through feeds **s** leads to residues at the **limit of quantification (LOQ)**, MRLs at the LOQ must be established for foods of animal origin. MRLs should be established for groups of foods of animal origin, for example, edible offal (mammalian), if animals are exposed to pesticide residues via animal feed, and for specific foods, for example, cattle kidney, in cases where animals are directly treated with a pesticide.

182. If the recommended MRLs or limits for foods of animal origin resulting from direct treatment of the animal and residues from animal feed do not agree, the higher recommendation will prevail regardless of whether they are recommended by JMPR or **the Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA)**.

MRL for fat-soluble pesticides

183. If a pesticide is determined as "fat soluble" after consideration of the following factors, it is indicated with the text "the residues are fat soluble" in the residue definition:

- a) When available, information concerning the partitioning of the residue (as defined) in muscle versus fat or residue in whole milk versus milk fat in the metabolism studies and livestock feeding studies determines the designation of a residue as being "fat soluble".
- b) In the absence of useful information on the distribution of residues in muscle and fat or in milk or milk fat, residues with octanol-water partition coefficient (log Pow) > 3 are likely to be "fat soluble".

184. For milk and milk products, two maximum residue levels would be estimated for fat-soluble pesticides, if the data permits: one MRL for whole milk and one for milk fat. When needed, MRLs for milk products can then be calculated from the two values, by taking into account the fat content and the contribution from the non-fat fraction.

185. For **the** regulation and monitoring of residues of fat-soluble pesticides in milk, where CXLs have been established for both whole milk and milk fat, whole milk should be analysed, and the result should be compared with the CXLs for whole milk.

¹ Statement of principle concerning the role of science in the Codex decision-making process and the extent to which other factors are taken into account (Appendix section A1.1).

MRLs for spices

186. MRLs for spices can be established ~~on the basis of~~ **based on** monitoring data in accordance with the guidelines established by JMPR.

MRLs for processed or ready-to-eat foods or feeds

187. JMPR evaluates processing studies to derive processing factors used to estimate residue concentrations in processed foods or feeds for dietary risk assessments and, if necessary, recommends MRLs for processed foods or feeds.

188. CCPR:

- a) establishes MRLs for important processed foods and feeds moving in international trade;
- b) establishes MRLs for processed foods and feeds only if the resulting value is higher than the MRL established for the corresponding raw agriculture commodity (RAC), processing factor > 1.3 (PF > 1.3);
- c) continues the practice of establishing MRLs for processed foods and feeds where, due to the nature of the residues during some specific process, significant amounts of relevant metabolites appear or increase; and
- d) supports the current JMPR practice of evaluating all processing studies provided and including in each evaluation or review a summary table of all validated processing factors.

MRLs for minor crops

189. Guidance **by CCPR** to facilitate the establishment of MRLs for pesticides for minor crops ~~by CCPR~~ is provided in Annex D.

Establishment of extraneous maximum residue limits (EMRLs)

190. The EMRL refers to a pesticide residue or a contaminant arising from environmental sources due to former agricultural uses, not from the use of the pesticide directly or indirectly on the food or feed. It is the maximum concentration of a pesticide residue that is recommended by the Commission to be legally permitted or recognized as acceptable in or on a food or animal feed.

191. Pesticides for which EMRLs are most likely ~~to be~~ needed are persistent in the environment for a relatively long period after uses has been discontinued and are expected to occur in foods or feeds at levels of sufficient concern to warrant monitoring.

192. All relevant and geographically representative monitoring data (including nil-residue results) are required to make reasonable estimates to cover international trade. JMPR has developed a standard format for reporting pesticide residues monitoring data.

193. JMPR compares data distributions in terms of the likely percentages of violations that might occur if a given EMRL is proposed to CCPR.

194. Because residues gradually decrease, CCPR evaluates **the existing EMRL, if possible**, every five years, ~~if possible, the existing EMRL~~, based on the reassessments of JMPR.

Risk assessment

Role of JMPR

195. JMPR consists of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group. It is an independent scientific expert body convened by both Directors-General of FAO and WHO, according to the rules of both organizations. ~~It is~~, charged with ~~the task of~~ providing scientific advice on pesticide residues.

196. JMPR is primarily responsible for performing the risk assessments and proposing MRLs upon which CCPR and ultimately the Commission base their risk management decisions. JMPR proposes MRLs based on residue data from GAP/registered uses or, in specific cases, such as EMRL and MRL for spices, based on monitoring data.

197. JMPR provides CCPR with science-based risk assessments that include the four components of risk assessment as defined by the Commission, namely hazard identification, hazard characterization, exposure assessment, and risk characterization, that can serve as the basis for CCPR's discussions.

198. JMPR should identify and communicate to CCPR in its assessments any information on the applicability and any constraints of the risk assessment ~~in regard to~~ **regarding** the general population and to particular subpopulations, and shall, as far as possible, identify potential risks to populations of potentially enhanced vulnerability (e.g. children).

199. JMPR communicates to CCPR possible sources of uncertainties in the exposure assessment and/or in the ~~pesticide's~~ hazard characterization ~~of the pesticide~~ that, if resolved, would allow a refinement of the risk assessment.

Dietary intake

200. JMPR is responsible for evaluating exposure to pesticides. JMPR must strive to base its exposure assessment and, hence, the dietary risk assessments on global data, including that from developing countries. In addition to ~~the~~ global environment monitoring system (GEMS/Food) data, consumption monitoring data and exposure studies may be used. The GEMS/Food diets are used to assess the risk of chronic exposure. The acute exposure calculations are based on the available high percentile consumption data provided by Members and compiled by GEMS/Food.

201. ~~In undertaking dietary exposure risk assessments to assist CCPR,~~ JMPR uses the WHO and FAO guidance documents ~~to undertake dietary exposure risk assessments to assist CCPR.~~^{ii, iii} ~~For dietary intake purposes,~~ JMPR recommends supervised trial median residues (STMRs) and highest residues (HRs) ~~for dietary intake purposes.~~

202. JMPR establishes the ADI and calculates the international estimated daily intake (IEDI). JMPR also establishes ARfDs, where appropriate, and indicates cases where an ARfD is ~~not necessary unnecessary.~~ Where an ARfD is set, JMPR calculates the international estimate of short-term intake (IESTI) for the general population and ~~for~~ children (under six years old), following a procedure described by JMPR.

203. JMPR uses the most up-to-date and most refined residue and consumption data available to calculate the IEDI. When the IEDI exceeds the ADI in one or more of the GEMS/Food cluster diets, JMPR flags this situation when recommending maximum residue levels to CCPR. JMPR also indicates relevant data to refine the IEDI.

204. Where the IESTI exceeds the ARfD for a pesticide/food combination, the JMPR report should describe the particular situation that gives rise to that acute intake concern. JMPR shall indicate the ~~possibilities to refine possibility of refining~~ the IESTI.

205. If either IESTI exceeds the ARfD or IEDI exceeds ADI, JMPR indicates that ~~the provision of~~ additional data would be necessary to refine these calculations. Members/Observers have the opportunity to supply the new data and shall commit to ~~provide them providing it~~ in accordance with the four-year rule.

206. In these cases, the four-year rule is applied when insufficient data have been submitted to set a new CXL. Members/Observers may ~~provide a~~ commitment to JMPR and CCPR to provide the necessary data for evaluation within four years. The proposed MRL is maintained for a period of no more than four years, pending the evaluation of the additional data. A second period of four years is not granted. If there is no commitment to provide additional information, or no data are supplied despite a commitment being made in relation to the four-year rule, CCPR considers withdrawal of the draft MRL.

207. ~~The estimate of the Estimating~~ short-term dietary intake requires substantial food consumption data ~~that are,~~ ~~which are~~ currently ~~are~~ only sparsely available. Governments are urged to generate relevant consumption data and ~~to~~ submit ~~these data it~~ to WHO.

Risk management

Role of CCPR

208. CCPR is primarily responsible for recommending risk management proposals, such as MRLs, for adoption by the Commission.

209. CCPR shall base its risk management recommendations to the Commission on JMPR's risk assessments of the respective pesticides, considering, where appropriate, other legitimate factorsⁱⁱ relevant ~~for~~ ~~to consumer~~ health protection ~~of consumers~~ and ~~for~~ the promotion of fair practices in food trade.

210. In cases where JMPR has performed a risk assessment and CCPR or the Commission determines that additional scientific guidance is necessary, CCPR or the Commission may ~~make a specific~~ ~~specifically~~ request ~~to that~~ JMPR ~~to~~ provide further scientific guidance necessary for a risk management decision.

211. CCPR's risk management recommendations to the Commission shall take into account the relevant uncertainties as described by JMPR.

212. CCPR shall consider only MRLs recommended by JMPR.

213. CCPR shall base its recommendations on the GEMS/Food diets used to identify consumption patterns. ~~The GEMS/Food diets are used to~~ ~~and~~ assess the risk of chronic exposure. The acute exposure calculations are not based on those diets, but ~~on~~ available consumption data provided by Members and compiled by GEMS/Food.

214. If no validated methods of analysis are available for enforcing an MRL for a specific pesticide, ~~no MRL will be established by~~ CCPR ~~will not establish one~~.

Selection of pesticides for JMPR evaluation

215. Each year, CCPR, in cooperation with the JMPR Secretariat, agrees on a schedule of JMPR evaluations in the following year and considers prioritization of other pesticides for future scheduling.

Procedure for the preparation of the schedules and priority lists

216. CCPR submits the schedules and priority lists of pesticides for JMPR evaluation to the Commission for approval each year, as new work, and requests the re-establishment of the **electronic working group (EWG)** on priorities.

217. The EWG on priorities is tasked with preparing a schedule of pesticides for JMPR (evaluations for the following year) for ~~the~~ consideration ~~of by~~ CCPR and ~~the maintenance of~~ **maintaining** a priority list of pesticides for future scheduling by CCPR.

218. The schedules and priority lists are provided in the following tables:

- a) Table 1 – CCPR proposed schedule and priority lists of pesticides (new pesticides, new uses, and other evaluations).
- b) Table 2A – Schedule and priority lists of periodic reviews.
- c) Table 2B – Periodic review list (pesticides that ~~have been~~ **were** last evaluated 15 years ago or more, but not yet scheduled or listed, 15-year rule).
- d) Table 3 – Record of periodic review.
- e) Table 4 – Pesticide/Food combinations for which specific GAP is no longer supported.

219. Each year, the Codex Secretariat issues an **invitation** letter, one month after the Commission, seeking applications for membership of the EWG on priorities.

~~220. In early September of each year. At least six months prior to the next session of CCPR,~~ the EWG Chair will issue a ~~message broadcast email~~ to Members/Observers of the EWG requesting nominations for:

- a) new pesticides;
- b) new uses of pesticides previously reviewed by JMPR;
- c) other evaluations to address, for example, review of toxicological endpoint and alternative GAP; and
- d) periodic reviews of pesticides for which there are concerns, including public health.

221. Nominations for new pesticides and new uses of pesticides previously reviewed by JMPR are submitted by Members/Observers to the EWG Chair and the JMPR ~~Joint~~ Secretariat using the form in the FAO Manual.^{iv}

222. The nomination form shall provide a clear indication of the availability of data and national evaluations, as well as give an indication of the number of crops and residue trials to be evaluated. The request should also indicate the current status of national registrations for the pesticide.

223. Nominations for other evaluations and periodic reviews should be submitted, on the concern forms, Annex A and Annex B respectively, with accompanying scientific data addressing the relevant concern. For periodic reviews, the request should also provide information on the most recent evaluation, ADI, and ARfD.

224. Nominations complying with the requirements are incorporated into a list, prioritized, and scheduled according to the criteria specified below:

- a) Those received **within at least two months of the request for nominations by 30 November** are incorporated into the draft agenda paper, which is ~~then~~ distributed as a circular letter **at least four months prior to the next session of CCPR in early January**.
- b) Members and Observers are allowed two months from the **date of** distribution **date** to provide comments to the EWG Chair and JMPR ~~Joint~~ Secretariat.
- c) ~~On the basis of~~ **Based on** comments received in response to the circular letter, the EWG Chair incorporates the new nominations into the schedule and priority lists and prepares an agenda paper for CCPR. The schedule seeks to ~~provide a~~ balance new pesticides, new uses, other evaluations, and periodic reviews.
- d) Following plenary discussions on MRL recommendations, the EWG Chair revises the schedule and priority list, which is ~~then~~ presented as a conference room document (CRD) for CCPR's consideration. To cover the

possibility that a Member ~~7~~ or Observer cannot meet the JMPR data call-in deadline for new pesticide evaluations, CCPR will include reserve pesticides.

- e) Following plenary discussion on CRD, CCPR will agree on a JMPR evaluation schedule for the following year. The final schedule will take into account available JMPR resources.
- f) At this point, the schedule will be closed for the inclusion of additional pesticides. However, with the agreement of the JMPR Secretariat, the inclusion of additional foods or feeds for scheduled pesticides may be accepted.

Nomination requirements and criteria for the prioritization and scheduling of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR

New pesticides

Nomination requirements

225. Before a nomination is accepted, the following requirements must be met:

- a) an intention to register the pesticide for use in a Member Nation;
- b) the foods or feeds proposed for consideration should be traded internationally;
- c) there is a commitment by the Member/Observer of the pesticide to provide supporting data for review in response to the JMPR "data call-in";
- d) the use of the pesticide is expected to give rise to residues in or on a food or feed moving in international trade;
- e) the pesticide has not ~~been~~ already ~~been~~ accepted for consideration; and
- f) the nomination form has been completed.

Prioritization criteria

226. The following criteria are applied when preparing the schedules and priority lists:

- a) the period of time since the pesticide was nominated for evaluation; a pesticide that was nominated first will have higher priority;
- b) timing of data availability;
- c) commitment by the Member/Observer to provide supporting data for review with a firm date for data submission; and
- d) the provision of information on the foods or feeds for which CXL are sought and the number of trials for each food or feed.

Scheduling criteria

227. ~~In order for~~ For CCPR to schedule a pesticide for JMPR evaluation in the following year:

- a) it must be registered for use in a Member Nation and formulation labels made available by the time of ~~the~~ JMPR "data call-in"; and
- b) if the use of the pesticide does not give rise to detectable residues in foods and feeds, it will be afforded a lower priority than those listed pesticides for which use does give rise to measurable residues.

New uses of pesticides previously reviewed by JMPR

Nomination requirement

228. At the request of a Member/Observer, pesticides previously evaluated by JMPR may be listed in Table 1 for the inclusion of additional uses.

Prioritization criteria

229. When prioritizing new use evaluations, the EWG on priorities will consider the following criteria:

- a) the date the request was received; ~~and~~
- b) commitment by the Member/Observer to provide the required data for review in response to the JMPR "data call-in".

Scheduling criteria

230. Scheduling criteria are specified in the new pesticide section (paragraph 227).

Other evaluations

Nomination requirements

231. Pesticides previously evaluated by JMPR may be listed for further toxicological and/or residue evaluations by JMPR as a result of requests from CCPR or Members when:

- a) a Member seeks to obtain a revised MRL for one or more foods or feeds; for example, **based on the basis of** alternative GAP;
- b) CCPR requests a clarification or reconsideration of a recommendation from JMPR;
- c) new toxicological data becomes available to indicate a significant change in **the the** ADI or ARfD;
- d) a data deficiency is noted by JMPR during a new pesticide evaluation or periodic review and Members/Observers will supply the required information; and
- e) CCPR elects to schedule the pesticide under the four-year rule.

232. In this case, the four-year rule is applied when insufficient data have been submitted to confirm or amend an existing CXL. The CXL is recommended for withdrawal. However, Members/Observers may provide a commitment to JMPR and CCPR to provide the necessary data for review within four years. The existing CXL is maintained for a period of no more than four years pending the review of the additional data. A second period of four years is not granted.

Prioritization criteria

233. When prioritizing pesticides for other evaluations, the EWG on priorities will consider the following criteria:

- a) the date the request was received;
- b) commitment by the Member/Observer to provide the required toxicological and/or residue data for review in response to the JMPR "data call-in";
- c) whether the data is submitted under the four-year rule for evaluations; and
- d) the reason for its submission; for example, a request from CCPR.

Scheduling criteria

234. Scheduling criteria are as specified in the new pesticides section.

Periodic review

235. Pesticides that have not been reviewed toxicologically for more than 15 years and/or not had a significant review of CXL for 15 years will be listed in Table 2B of the schedules and priority lists.

236. 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. The nominating Member should submit the concern form in Annex B and accompanying relevant scientific information substantiating the concern for consideration by the JMPR Secretariat/EWG on priorities.

237. Pesticides listed in Table 2B may be nominated for inclusion in Table 2A and thus considered for scheduling for periodic review **on the basis of based on** the availability of data necessary for the review. The nominating Member should submit an inventory and brief explanation of the relevant toxicological and residue data package for consideration by the JMPR Secretariat/EWG on priorities. The Member should inform the EWG on priorities, whether all or some CXLs will be supported, and **should** specify each supported and unsupported CXL.

238. Pesticides listed in Table 2B, for which no periodic review has been undertaken for 25 years, will be brought to the attention of CCPR **with a view** to transfer to Table 2A and subsequent scheduling.

239. Pesticides which have been the subject of a periodic review during the previous 15 years, and thus are not listed in Table 2B, may be considered for transferring to Table 2A, where a concern form in Annex B and accompanying scientific information, upon review, demonstrates a public health concern.

Scheduling and prioritization criteria for pesticides listed in Table 2A

240. The EWG on priorities and CCPR will consider the following periodic review criteria:

- a) if scientific data concerning the intake and/or toxicity profile of a pesticide indicates some level of public health concern;
- b) if no ARfD has been established by Codex or if an established ADI or ARfD are of public health concern and

information is available from Members on national registrations and/or the conclusions from national/regional evaluations indicated a public health concern;

- c) the availability of current labels (authorized GAP) arising from recent national reviews;
- d) CCPR has been advised by a Member that the residues from a pesticide has been responsible for trade disruption;
- e) the date the data will be submitted;
- f) if there is a closely related pesticide that is a candidate for periodic review that can be evaluated concurrently; and
- g) CCPR agrees to schedule the pesticide under the four-year rule.

241. In this case, the four-year rule is applied when insufficient data have been submitted to confirm or amend an existing CXL. The CXL is recommended for withdrawal. However, Members/Observers may provide a commitment to JMPR and CCPR to provide the necessary data for review within four years. The existing CXL is maintained for a period of no more than four years pending the review of the additional data. A second period of four years is not granted.

Periodic review procedure

Identify pesticides for periodic review and solicit data commitments

242. Pesticides are listed for periodic review according to the process and procedures described in Section 4.8: Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residue (paragraph 215). The process provides Members/Observers a notice of a periodic review.

243. When a pesticide is listed for periodic review, Members/Observers are able to support it, regarding the two following possibilities:

- a) Case A: The pesticide is supported by the original sponsor, who is committed to submit a complete data package to meet JMPR's data requirements.

If the original sponsor does not support some uses, Members/Observers may support them.

- b) Case B: The pesticide is not supported by the original sponsor; in this case, interested Members/Observers may support the review of the pesticide.

Commitment to support pesticides or existing CXL or new proposed MRL

244. The commitment of Members/Observers to provide data for the periodic review should be addressed to the Chair of the EWG on priorities and the JMPR ~~Joint~~ Secretariat according to the FAO Manual²³ and the considerations of JMPR on pesticides no longer supported by the original sponsor.

245. For Case A and Case B, data should be submitted in accordance with the guidance of JMPR for the respective cases:ⁱ

- a) in cases where some uses are not supported by the manufacturer but are supported by Members/Observers;
- b) if the current GAP support the current CXL, justification for it as well as relevant labels are required; and
- c) if GAP were modified, supervised residue trial studies conducted according to current GAP, and relevant studies to support new MRL in animal and processed foods are required.

ELABORATION PROCEDURE

Utilization of the an accelerated procedure approach for the elaboration of MRLs (Step 5/8 procedure)

246. In order to accelerate the adoption of a proposed MRL, CCPR can recommend to the Commission to omit Steps 6 and 7 and adopt the proposed MRL at Step 8. This procedure is called approach is referred to as "adoption at Step 5/8 procedure". The preconditions for the utilization of adoption at Step 5/8 procedure are:

- a) the new proposed MRL is circulated at Step 3;
- b) the JMPR report is available electronically by early February, at least four months prior to the next session of CCPR; and
- c) no intake concerns were identified by JMPR.

247. If a delegation has a concern with advancing a given MRL, a concern form in Annex A must be submitted following the procedure described in the Procedure for submitting concerns and clarifications, later in this section, at least one month before the CCPR session.

248. If that concern is addressed at the CCPR session and the JMPR position remains unchanged, CCPR will decide if the MRL will be advanced to Step 5/8 ~~procedure~~.

249. If the concern cannot be addressed at the CCPR session, the MRL will be advanced to Step 5 at the CCPR session, and the concern will be addressed by JMPR according to the procedure described in paragraphs 255–260: Procedure for submitting concerns and clarifications. Any other draft MRLs for the pesticide, satisfying the above conditions, should be advanced to Step 5/8 ~~procedure~~.

250. The result of the consideration of the concern by JMPR will be considered at the next CCPR session. If the JMPR position remains unchanged, CCPR will decide if the MRL will be advanced to Step 8.

251. If either IEDI exceeds ADI or IESTI exceeds ARfD in one or more cluster diets, or the ARfD is exceeded in one or more foods or feeds, the accelerated ~~procedure~~ **approach** shall not be applied, and the procedure described in paragraphs 200–207: Dietary intake applies.

REVOCATION OF CXLs

252. CXLs are proposed for revocation in the following scenarios:

- a) as a result of the periodic review procedure including CXLs of pesticides that have not been reviewed for more than 25 years and are not supported by any Member/Observer;
- b) where new scientific data, following the JMPR risk assessment, indicate that the pesticide use may compromise human health;
- c) the pesticide is no longer produced and commercialized, and there is no remaining stock;
- d) the pesticide is produced but is not used in food or feed; and
- e) there is no international trade of foods or feeds in which the pesticide may have been used.

253. When a pesticide meets one or more of conditions (a–e), its CXL list will be included in the agenda for the next CCPR session for the committee to consider a recommendation to the Commission for revocation of the CXL. Decisions of the Commission on revocation of CXL will take effect a year after the close of the session of the Commission where such decisions were made.

254. If a pesticide meeting the above stated conditions is environmentally persistent, the need for EMRLs to cover international trade should be considered before its CXLs are revoked. A Member/Observer should indicate the need to maintain CXLs for a period not exceeding four years. Within that period, Members/Observers will be requested to provide monitoring data to allow EMRLs to be established. CCPR will make a decision to establish EMLs when JMPR has evaluated monitoring data and all CXLs will be revoked.

PROCEDURE FOR SUBMITTING CONCERNS AND CLARIFICATIONS

Concerns with the advancement of an MRL or the evaluation of a pesticide

255. If Members intend to express concerns with advancement of an MRL or the evaluation of a pesticide, they should complete and submit the concern form in Annex A to the Codex and ~~the~~ JMPR ~~Secretariat Secretaries~~ accompanied by scientific data at least one month before the CCPR session.

256. JMPR will evaluate the scientific data provided with the concern form. CCPR will decide whether JMPR should address the concern and schedule it based on JMPR recommendations and workload.

257. When a concern form is not submitted one month prior to the CCPR session, JMPR will consider the concern at a following meeting and CCPR would subsequently decide on the status of the MRL.

258. When considering concerns expressed by Members, CCPR should recognize the position taken by JMPR as the best available scientific opinion (applicable at the international level) until and if a different position is indicated.

259. Science-based concerns based on the same data/information should be considered only once by JMPR in relationship to any specific pesticide, MRL or CXL.

260. If the same information is submitted, JMPR should simply note that this information has already been reviewed and therefore no further review is warranted.

Concerns with public health on previously evaluated pesticides

261. If Members intend to express a public health concern on a previously evaluated pesticide for prioritization, they should complete and submit the form in Annex B along with the accompanying relevant scientific information substantiating the concern to the Chair of EWG on priorities and the JMPR **Secretariat Secretaries**, in accordance with paragraph 215: Selection of pesticides for JMPR evaluation based on their potential higher concern regarding public health.

262. JMPR, in consultation with the EWG on priorities, will consider whether the submitted information indicates some level of public health concern and present proposals at the subsequent CCPR session.

263. If the concern in regard to a pesticide is supported by CCPR, the pesticide will be assigned a high priority and scheduled for the next available year.

264. However, if a Member or Observer disagrees with the proposal by the EWG on priorities, it must lodge additional scientific data to the Chair of the EWG on priorities one month before the next CCPR session. At the following CCPR session, the EWG on priorities will report its proposal. CCPR will make its final decision on prioritization.

Request for clarification

265. If Members seek clarification on a pesticide, they must complete the form provided in Annex A and indicate the specific parts of the JMPR evaluation for which they seek clarification. Such requests must be included in the response to relevant Codex circular letters or other Codex papers. JMPR will address such requests for clarification during the next JMPR meeting and provide a response to such requests by the following CCPR session. CCPR will record any responses or changes in decisions made resulting from the request for clarification. Pending JMPR's respond to the request of the clarification, the MRL relevant to the request can proceed through the Codex 5/8 Step process for the elaboration of CXL.

Addressing differences in procedures for risk assessment

266. MRLs should not be prevented from advancement when there is a science-based concern regarding current JMPR risk assessment procedures that JMPR has addressed through the concern form process. However, where differences exist in procedures for risk assessment (i.e. use of variability factor, use of human studies) it is imperative that CCPR/JMPR attempt to address these differences in order to limit them where possible. Appropriate action by CCPR to address these issues may include referring the issue:

- a) to JMPR if there is additional or new information, or if CCPR wishes to provide risk management input to JMPR on the conduct of risk assessments;
- b) to national governments or regional authorities for input with a discussion and decision at the next CCPR; and/or
- c) where justified by its nature, to a scientific consultation if the resources are available. Members recommending any such action by CCPR should provide information supporting their recommendation for the consideration of the committee.

RISK COMMUNICATION

267. In accordance with Section 4.1: [Working principles for risk analysis for application in the framework of the Codex Alimentarius](#), CCPR, in cooperation with JMPR, shall ensure that the risk analysis process is fully transparent and thoroughly documented and that results are made available in a timely manner to Members and Observers.

268. In order to ensure the transparency of the assessment process in JMPR, CCPR provides comments on the guidelines related to assessment procedures being drafted and published by JMPR.

269. CCPR and JMPR recognize that good communication between risk assessors and risk managers is an essential requirement for successfully performing their risk analysis activities.

270. CCPR and JMPR must continue to develop procedures to enhance communication between the two bodies.

ⁱ FAO. 2009. *Submission and evaluation of pesticide residues data for the estimation of maximum residue levels in food and feed*. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper, 197. Rome.

ⁱⁱ WHO.1997. *Guideline for predicting dietary intake of pesticide residues*. Joint UNEP/FAO/WHO Food Contamination Monitoring Programme in collaboration with the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues. Geneva.

ⁱⁱⁱ FAO. 2003. *Pesticide Residues in Food 2003 Report*. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper No.176, Rome. Chapter 3.

^{iv} FAO and WHO. 2016. *Manual on the development and use of FAO and WHO specifications for pesticides*. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper, No. 228. Rome, FAO

Part 2: Correction to the definition of “fat” in the *Classification of food and feed* (CXA 4-1989)**(For adoption)****Note:** Changes are indicated in **bold**, and ~~strikethrough~~ or underline.**Mammalian fats (except fat from marine mammals)****Class B****Type 06****Mammalian products****Group 031****Group Letter Code MF**

Group 031. Mammalian fats, excluding milk fats are derived from the fatty tissues of animals (not processed). For processed animal fats see Group 085.

Exposure to pesticides is through animal metabolism following oral intake with feed or through dermal intake as a consequence of external use of the pesticides against ectoparasites.

The entire commodity may be consumed.

Fat is the ~~food-lipid~~-based tissue that is trimmable from an animal carcass or cuts from an animal carcass. It may include **subcutaneous**, omental, or perirenal fat. It does not include interstitial or intramuscular carcass fat or milk fat.

Portion of the commodity to which the MRL applies (and which is analysed): **Whole commodity.**

The scientific species names of the relevant animals are not repeated for this group of commodities. For these names see Group 030 Muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals).

APPENDIX III

MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(At Step 5/8)
(For adoption by CAC)

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
15	Chlormequat			
	GC 0640 Barley	5	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.04 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.04 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.2	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.5	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.2	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.1	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.2	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.2	5/8	
41	Folpet			
	FI 0327 Banana	2	5/8	
	GC 0640 Barley	1.5	5/8	
	AS 0640 Barley, hay and/or straw	40 (dw)	5/8	
	AB 0269 Grape pomace, dried	20 (dw)	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.04	5/8	
	AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	40 (dw)	5/8	
	FB 1236 Wine-grapes	15	5/8	
103	Phosmet			
	FB 0265 Cranberry	3	5/8	
	VR 0589 Potato	0.05 (*)	5/8	
142	Prochloraz			
	FI 0326 Avocado	5 Po	5/8	
	GC 0640 Barley	0.6	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.01	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.08	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.4	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.2	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.02	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.02	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01	5/8	
	GC 0647 Oats	0.5	5/8	
	GC 0650 Rye	0.15	5/8	
	AS 0081 Straw and hay of cereal grains (excluding pseudocereals) (subgroup)	40 (dw)	5/8	
	GC 0653 Triticale	0.15	5/8	
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.4	5/8	
147	Methoprene			
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.02	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.02	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.02	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.02	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.02	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.2	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.1	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.02	5/8	
	TN 0085 Tree nuts (group)	3 Po	5/8	
160	Propiconazole			
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.2	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.05	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	3	5/8	
173	Buprofezin			
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.05 (*)	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05 (*)	5/8	
176	Hexythiazox			
	FB 2005 Cane berries (subgroup)	4	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.05	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.05	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.05	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.05	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.05	5/8	
	FM 0106 Group of milk fats	0.05	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.05	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	MU 1100 Hops, dried	20	5/8	
184	Etofenprox			
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.5	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.02	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.1	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.1	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	3	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.1	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.07	5/8	
	GC 0649 Rice	9	5/8	
	CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.3	5/8	
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	0.04	5/8	
189	Tebuconazole			
	HS 0780 Cumin seed	0.9	5/8	
193	Fenpyroximate			
	FP 0226 Apple	0.1	5/8	
	AB 0226 Apple pomace, dried	1 (dw)	5/8	
	DF 0226 Apples, dried	0.5	5/8	
	VO 2700 Cherry tomato	0.2	5/8	

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
VC 0431	Summer squash	0.04	5/8	
VC 0424	Cucumbers	0.04	5/8	
MF 0100	Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.2	5/8	
ML 0106	Group of milks	0.01	5/8	
MM 0095	Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05	5/8	
OR 0003	Mandarin, oil	25	5/8	
FC 0003	Mandarins (including mandarin-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.15	5/8	
AB 0003	Mandarins, dried pulp	0.8 (dw)	5/8	
OR 0004	Orange oil, edible	25	5/8	
AB 0004	Orange, dried pulp	0.8 (dw)	5/8	
HS 3382	Orange, peel (fresh)	0.5	5/8	
FC 0004	Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.15	5/8	
HS 3383	Satsuma mandarin, peel (fresh)	0.6	5/8	
VO 0448	Tomato	0.2	5/8	
196 Tebufenozide				
PF 0111	Group of avian fats	0.02	5/8	
PM 0110	Group of avian muscle	0.02 (*)	5/8	
PO 0111	Group of avian, edible offal of	0.02 (*)	5/8	
MO 0105	Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.06	5/8	
PE 0112	Group of eggs	0.02 (*)	5/8	
MF 0100	Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.2	5/8	
ML 0106	Group of milks	0.02	5/8	
MM 0095	Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.03	5/8	
GC 0649	Rice	15	5/8	
CM 0649	Rice, husked	0.6	5/8	
CM 1205	Rice, polished	0.3	5/8	
202 Fipronil				
FI 0327	Banana	0.004 (*)	5/8	
AS 0640	Barley, hay and/or straw	0.05 (dw)	5/8	
GC 2087	Barley, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks (subgroup)	0.002 (*)	5/8	
SO 0691	Cotton seed	0.003	5/8	
VD 2065	Dry beans (subgroup)	0.008	5/8	except soya beans
VD 2066	Dry peas (subgroup)	0.008	5/8	
PF 0111	Group of avian fats	0.05	5/8	
PM 0110	Group of avian muscle	0.02	5/8	
PO 0111	Group of avian, edible offal of	0.02	5/8	

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
MO 0105	Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.05	5/8	
PE 0112	Group of eggs	0.04	5/8	
MF 0100	Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.15	5/8	
FM 0106	Group of milk fats	0.3	5/8	
ML 0106	Group of milks	0.02	5/8	
MM 0095	Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.015	5/8	
VL 0053	Leafy vegetables (group)	0.01	5/8	Residues resulting from rotational cropping.
GC 2091	Maize cereals (subgroup)	0.01	5/8	
AS 0647	Oat straw and fodder, dry	0.05 (dw)	5/8	
VA 0385	Onion, bulb	0.03	5/8	
VR 0589	Potato	0.05	5/8	
GC 0649	Rice	0.002	5/8	
CM 0649	Rice, husked	0.001 (*)	5/8	
CM 1205	Rice, polished	0.001 (*)	5/8	
VR 0075	Root and tuber vegetables (group)	0.002	5/8	Except potato and sugar beet. Residues resulting from rotational cropping.
AS 0650	Rye straw and fodder, dry	0.05 (dw)	5/8	
VD 0541	Soya bean (dry)	0.002	5/8	
OC 0541	Soya bean oil, crude	0.01	5/8	
AL 3538	Soya bean, hulls	0.015	5/8	
VR 0596	Sugar beet	0.004	5/8	
GS 0659	Sugar cane	0.01	5/8	
SO 2091	Sunflower seeds (subgroup)	0.01	5/8	
VO 2045	Tomatoes (subgroup)	0.004 (*)	5/8	
AS 0653	Triticale, hay and/or straw	0.05 (dw)	5/8	
AS 0654	Wheat, hay and/or straw	0.05 (dw)	5/8	
GC 2086	Wheat, similar grains, and pseudocereals without husks (subgroup)	0.03	5/8	
203 Spinosad				
MF 0812	Cattle fat	3	5/8	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
ML 0812	Cattle milk	1	5/8	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
FM 0812	Cattle milk fat	9	5/8	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
MM 0812	Cattle muscle	0.3	5/8	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
PF 0111	Group of avian fats	0.2	5/8	
PM 0110	Group of avian muscle	0.01	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.01	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.5	5/8	except cattle
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.01	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	2	5/8	except cattle
	FM 0106 Group of milk fats	2	5/8	except cattle
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.2	5/8	except cattle
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.07	5/8	except cattle
	FI 0345 Mango	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	DT 1114 Tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried)	10	5/8	
217	Novaluron			
	AM 0660 Almond hulls	15	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	1.5	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.04	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.1	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.2	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.3	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	3	5/8	
	FM 0106 Group of milk fats	3	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.2	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.2	5/8	
	GC 0649 Rice	5	5/8	
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	0.15	5/8	
	TN 0085 Tree nuts (group)	0.08	5/8	
229	Azoxystrobin			
	FI 0326 Avocado	1.5	5/8	
	VC 0045 Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits (group)	1	5/8	except melons and watermelons
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.07	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.05	5/8	
	FM 0106 Group of milk fats	0.03	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.01	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
	MU 1100 Hops, dried	40	5/8	
	VC 0046 Melons (except watermelon)	5	5/8	
	FI 0353 Pineapple	2	5/8	
	VC 0432 Watermelon	5	5/8	
239	Cyproconazole			
	VD 2065 Dry beans (subgroup)	0.02	5/8	except soya bean
	VD 2066 Dry peas (subgroup)	0.02	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.5	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.02	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.01	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01	5/8	
	AL 3301 Legume feeds with low water (<20%) content (hay) (subgroup)	0.3	5/8	except soya bean and lentil
242	Flubendiamide			
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	1	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	2	5/8	
	FM 0106 Group of milk fats	5	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.1	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.2	5/8	
	GC 0649 Rice	4	5/8	
	CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.1	5/8	
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	0.01 (*)	5/8	
246	Acetamiprid			
	VD 2065 Dry beans (subgroup)	0.2	5/8	except soya beans and mung beans
	VD 0536 Mung bean (dry)	0.4	5/8	
	VD 2066 Subgroup of dry peas	0.2	5/8	
263	Cyantraniliprole			
	SO 0305 Olives for oil production	1	5/8	
	FT 0305 Table olives	1	5/8	
285	Flupyradifurone			
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.3	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.8	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	1	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	4	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.7	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	1	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.7	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	1.5	5/8	
	SO 0305 Olives for oil production	5	5/8	
	SO 0495 Rape seed	0.4	5/8	
	FT 0305 Table olives	5	5/8	
288	Acibenzolar-S-methyl			
	FP 0226 Apple	0.02	5/8	
	DF 0226 Apples, dried	0.06	5/8	
	VS 0623 Cardoon	0.2	5/8	
	VS 0624 Celery	0.2	5/8	
	VS 0625 Celtuce	0.2	5/8	
	VS 0380 Fennel, bulb	0.2	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	VS 0627 Rhubarb	0.2	5/8	
302	Fosetyl Al			
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.05 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.5	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.05	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.3	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.1	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.15	5/8	
	AB 0004 Orange, dried pulp	150	5/8	
	FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	50	5/8	
	GC 0649 Rice	40	5/8	
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	40	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
309	Pydiflumetofen			
	FB 2005 Cane berries (subgroup)	4	5/8	
	SB 0716 Coffee beans	0.2	5/8	
	AB 1204 Cotton gin trash	7	5/8	
	SO 0691 Cotton seed	0.6	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.1	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.02	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.1	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	VL 0482 Lettuce, head	20	5/8	
	FI 0345 Mango	0.08	5/8	
	FI 2540 Pitaya	0.9	5/8	
	VB 2016 Stem Brassicas (subgroup)	0.1	5/8	Based on rotational crops.
	VP 2064 Underground immature beans and peas (subgroup)	0.02	5/8	Based on rotational crops.
324	Tetraniliprole			
	AS 0640 Barley, hay and/or straw	0.06 (dw)	5/8	
	GC 2087 Barley, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks (subgroup)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	1	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.15	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.15	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.07	5/8	
	GC 2088 Rice cereals (subgroup)	0.5	5/8	
	AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	9 (dw)	5/8	
	CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.02	5/8	
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	0.02	5/8	
	AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	0.06 (dw)	5/8	
	GC 2086 Wheat, similar grains, and pseudocereals without husks (subgroup)	0.01 (*)	5/8	

	Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
339	Cyclobutrifluram				
	FI 0327	Banana	0.01 (*)	5/8	
340	Fenpropidin				
	FI 0327	Banana	9	5/8	
	GC 0640	Barley	0.15	5/8	
	AS 3304	Cereal grains (including pseudocereals) feed products with low water (<20%) content (hay and/or straw) (subgroup)	4 (dw)	5/8	
	AM 3573	Fodder beet, leaves or tops	30 (dw)	5/8	
	AM 1051	Fodder beet, roots	0.03	5/8	
	PF 0111	Group of avian fats	0.02	5/8	
	PM 0110	Group of avian muscle	0.02	5/8	
	PO 0111	Group of avian, edible offal of	0.08	5/8	
	MO 0105	Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.4	5/8	
	PE 0112	Group of eggs	0.02	5/8	
	MF 0100	Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.02	5/8	
	ML 0106	Group of milks	0.02 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095	Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.02	5/8	
	VR 0596	Sugar beet	0.03	5/8	
	AV 0596	Sugar beet leaves or tops (dry)	30 (dw)	5/8	
	AM 3599	Sugar beet, dried pulp	0.2	5/8	
	GC 0653	Triticale	0.05	5/8	
	GC 0654	Wheat	0.05	5/8	
	CF 0654	Wheat bran, processed	0.3	5/8	
341	Florpyrauxifen-benzyl				
	PF 0111	Group of avian fats	0.03 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110	Group of avian muscle	0.03 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111	Group of avian, edible offal of	0.03 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105	Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.09	5/8	
	PE 0112	Group of eggs	0.03 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100	Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.03 (*)	5/8	
	ML 0106	Group of milks	0.03 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095	Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.03 (*)	5/8	
	AS 0162	Hay and/or straw of grasses for animal feed (subgroup)	5 (dw)	5/8	
	GC 0645	Maize	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	AS 3557	Maize, hay and/or straw	0.01 (*) (dw)	5/8	
	GC 0649	Rice	0.3	5/8	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
	AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	2 (dw)	5/8	
	CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.01 (*)	5/8	
342	Fluoxapiprolin			
	VO 2700 Cherry tomato	0.1	5/8	
	DF 0269 Grape, dried (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanias)	0.5	5/8	
	FB 0269 Grapes	0.15	5/8	
	PF 0111 Group of avian fats	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PM 0110 Group of avian muscle	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PO 0111 Group of avian, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	PE 0112 Group of eggs	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MF 0100 Group of mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	ML 0106 Group of milks	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	MM 0095 Group of muscle (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	VA 0385 Onion, bulb	0.03	5/8	
	VR 0589 Potato	0.01 (*)	5/8	
	VO 0448 Tomato	0.1	5/8	
	DV 0448 Tomato, dried	0.6	5/8	

APPENDIX IV

MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(For revocation)
(For approval by CAC)

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
15	Chlormequat			
	GC 0640 Barley	2	CXL-D	
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.5	CXL-D	
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.2	CXL-D	
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.1	CXL-D	
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.2	CXL-D	
	ML 0106 Milks	0.2	CXL-D	
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.04 (*)	CXL-D	
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.04 (*)	CXL-D	
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.2	CXL-D	
39	Fenthion			
	FS 0013 Cherries (subgroup)	2	CXL-D	
	FC 0001 Citrus fruits (group)	2	CXL-D	
	OC 0305 Olive oil, virgin	1	CXL-D	
	CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.05	CXL-D	
	FT 0305 Table olives	1	CXL-D	
41	Folpet			
	VC 0424 Cucumber	1	CXL-D	
	VL 0482 Lettuce, head	50	CXL-D	
	VC 0046 Melons (except watermelon)	3	CXL-D	
	VA 0385 Onion, bulb	1	CXL-D	
	FB 0275 Strawberry	5	CXL-D	
	VO 0448 Tomato	3	CXL-D	
59	Parathion-Methyl			
	FP 0226 Apple	0.2	CXL-D	
	VD 0071 Bean (dry)	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
	VB 0041 Cabbages, head	0.05	CXL-D	
	DF 0269 Grape, dried (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas)	1	CXL-D	
	FB 0269 Grapes	0.5	CXL-D	
	FS 0245 Nectarine	0.3	CXL-D	
	FS 0247 Peach	0.3	CXL-D	
	VD 0072 Peas (dry)	0.3	CXL-D	
	VR 0589 Potato	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
	HS 0191 Spices, fruits and berries	5	CXL-D	
	HS 0193 Spices, roots and rhizomes	3	CXL-D	
	HS 0190 Spices, seeds	5	CXL-D	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
	VR 0596 Sugar beet	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
72	Carbendazim			
	FS 0240 Apricot	2		CXL-D
	VS 0621 Asparagus	0.2		CXL-D
	FI 0327 Banana	0.2		CXL-D
	GC 0640 Barley	0.5		CXL-D
	AS 0640 Barley, hay and/or straw	2		CXL-D
	VD 0071 Bean (dry)	0.5		CXL-D
	FB 0018 Berries and other small fruits	1		CXL-D Except grapes.
	VB 0402 Brussels sprouts	0.5		CXL-D
	VR 0577 Carrot	0.2		CXL-D
	MM 0812 Cattle meat	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	FS 0013 Cherries (subgroup)	10		CXL-D Based on thiophanatemethyl use.
	PF 0840 Chicken fat	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	SB 0716 Coffee beans	0.1		CXL-D
	VP 0526 Common bean (pods and/or immature seeds)	0.5		CXL-D
	VC 0424 Cucumber	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	VP 0529 Garden pea, shelled (succulent seeds)	0.02		CXL-D
	VC 0425 Gherkin	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	FB 0269 Grapes	3		CXL-D
	VL 0482 Lettuce, head	5		CXL-D
	FI 0345 Mango	5		CXL-D Based on carbendazime use.
	ML 0106 Milks	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	FS 0245 Nectarine	2		CXL-D
	FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	1		CXL-D
	FS 0247 Peach	2		CXL-D
	SO 0697 Peanut	0.1	(*)	CXL-D
	AL 0697 Peanut fodder	3		CXL-D
	VO 0444 Peppers chili	2		CXL-D
	HS 0444 Peppers chili, dried	20		CXL-D
	FI 0353 Pineapple	5		CXL-D
	FS 0014 Plums (including fresh prunes) (subgroup)	0.5		CXL-D
	FP 0009 Pome fruits (group)	3		CXL-D
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	SO 0495 Rape seed	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
	AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	15		CXL-D

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
CM 0649 Rice, husked	2	(*)	CXL-D
GC 0650 Rye	0.1		CXL-D
VD 0541 Soya bean (dry)	0.5		CXL-D
AL 0541 Soya bean, hay and/or straw	0.1		CXL-D
HS 0191 Spices, fruits and berries	0.1		CXL-D
HS 0193 Spices, roots and rhizomes	0.1		CXL-D
HS 0190 Spices, seeds	5		CXL-D
VC 0431 Squash, summer	0.5		CXL-D
VR 0596 Sugar beet	0.1	(*)	CXL-D
VO 0448 Tomato	0.5		CXL-D
TN 0085 Tree nuts (group)	0.1	(*)	CXL-D
GC 0654 Wheat	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	1		CXL-D
87 Dinocap			
FP 0226 Apple	0.2		CXL-D
VC 0424 Cucumber	0.07		CXL-D
VC 0045 Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits (group)	0.05	(*)	CXL-D Except cucumbers, summer squash, and melons (except watermelons).
FB 0269 Grapes	0.5		CXL-D
VC 0046 Melons (except watermelon)	0.5		CXL-D
FS 0247 Peach	0.1		CXL-D
VO 0051 Peppers (subgroup)	0.2		CXL-D MRL provisionally applies to okra, martynia, and roselle.
HS 0444 Peppers chili, dried	2		CXL-D
VC 0431 Squash, summer	0.07		CXL-D
FB 0275 Strawberry	0.5		CXL-D Except glasshouse-grown strawberry.
VO 0448 Tomato	0.3		CXL-D
90 Chlorpyrifos-Methyl			
GC 0640 Barley	3	Po	CXL-D
FC 0001 Citrus fruits (group)	2		CXL-D
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.01		CXL-D
VO 0440 Eggplant	1		CXL-D
PE 0112 Eggs	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
AB 0269 Grape pomace, dried	5		CXL-D
FB 0269 Grapes	1		CXL-D
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.1	(fat)	CXL-D
FM 0183 Milk fats	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
ML 0106 Milks	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
VO 0051 Peppers (subgroup)	1		CXL-D MRL provisionally applies to okra, martynia, and roselle.

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
HS 0444 Peppers chili, dried	10	CXL-D	
FP 0009 Pome fruits (group)	1	CXL-D	
VR 0589 Potato	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (fat)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
HS 0191 Spices, fruits and berries	0.3	CXL-D	
HS 0193 Spices, roots and rhizomes	5	CXL-D	
HS 0190 Spices, seeds	1	CXL-D	
FS 0012 Stone fruits (group)	0.5	CXL-D	
FB 0275 Strawberry	0.06	CXL-D	
VO 0448 Tomato	1	CXL-D	
GC 0654 Wheat	3 Po	CXL-D	
CM 0654 Wheat bran, unprocessed	6 PoP	CXL-D	
CF 1210 Wheat germ	5 PoP	CXL-D	
100 Methamidophos			
SO 0691 Cotton seed	0.2	CXL-D	
AM 1051 Fodder beet, roots	0.02	CXL-D	
VR 0589 Potato	0.05	CXL-D	
VR 0596 Sugar beet	0.02	CXL-D	
103 Phosmet			
FS 0240 Apricot	10	CXL-D	
FB 0020 Blueberries	10	CXL-D	
MM 0812 Cattle meat	1 (fat)	CXL-D	
FB 0265 Cranberry	3	CXL-D	
FB 0269 Grapes	10	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.02	CXL-D	
FS 0245 Nectarine	10	CXL-D	
FS 0247 Peach	10	CXL-D	
VR 0589 Potato	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
122 Amitraz			
MM 0812 Cattle meat	0.05	CXL-D	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
FS 0013 Cherries (subgroup)	0.5	CXL-D	
SO 0691 Cotton seed	0.5	CXL-D	
OC 0691 Cotton seed oil, crude	0.05	CXL-D	
VC 0424 Cucumber	0.5	CXL-D	
MO 0097 Edible offal of cattle, pigs & sheep	0.2	CXL-D	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
ML 0106 Milks	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.5	CXL-D	
FS 0247 Peach	0.5	CXL-D	

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)		Step	Note
MM 0818	Pig meat	0.05		CXL-D	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
FP 0009	Pome fruits (group)	0.5		CXL-D	
MM 0822	Sheep meat	0.1		CXL-D	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
VO 0448	Tomato	0.5		CXL-D	
142 Prochloraz					
FI 0030	Assorted tropical and sub-tropical fruits - inedible peel	7	Po	CXL-D	
GC 0080	Cereal grains (group)	2		CXL-D	
FC 0001	Citrus fruits (group)	10	Po	CXL-D	
MO 0105	Edible offal (mammalian)	10		CXL-D	
PE 0112	Eggs	0.1		CXL-D	
SO 0693	Linseed	0.05		CXL-D	
MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.5	(fat)	CXL-D	
ML 0106	Milks	0.05	(*)	CXL-D	
VF 0450	Mushrooms	3		CXL-D	
HS 0790	Pepper, black, white	10		CXL-D	
PM 0110	Poultry meat	0.05	(*)	CXL-D	
PO 0111	Poultry, edible offal of	0.2		CXL-D	
SO 0495	Rape seed	0.7		CXL-D	
AS 0081	Straw and hay of cereal grains (excluding pseudocereals) (subgroup)	40		CXL-D	
SO 0702	Sunflower seed	0.5		CXL-D	
OR 0702	Sunflower seed oil, edible	1		CXL-D	
CM 0654	Wheat bran, unprocessed	7		CXL-D	
144 Bitertanol					
FS 0240	Apricot	1		CXL-D	
FI 0327	Banana	0.5		CXL-D	
GC 0640	Barley	0.05	(*)	CXL-D	
AS 0640	Barley, hay and/or straw	0.05	(*)	CXL-D	
FS 0013	Cherries (subgroup)	1		CXL-D	
VC 0424	Cucumber	0.5		CXL-D	
MO 0105	Edible offal (mammalian)	0.05	(*)	CXL-D	
PE 0112	Eggs	0.01	(*)	CXL-D	
MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05	(*) (fat)	CXL-D	
ML 0106	Milks	0.05	(*)	CXL-D	
FS 0245	Nectarine	1		CXL-D	
AS 0647	Oat straw and fodder, dry	0.05	(*)	CXL-D	
GC 0647	Oats	0.05	(*)	CXL-D	

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
FS 0247 Peach	1	CXL-D	
FS 0014 Plums (including fresh prunes) (subgroup)	2	CXL-D	
FP 0009 Pome fruits (group)	2	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
GC 0650 Rye	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
AS 0650 Rye straw and fodder, dry	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
VO 0448 Tomato	3	CXL-D	
GC 0653 Triticale	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
AS 0653 Triticale, hay and/or straw	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
GC 0654 Wheat	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
AS 0654 Wheat, hay and/or straw	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
147 Methoprene			
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.02	CXL-D	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.02	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.2 (fat)	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.1 F	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.02	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.02	CXL-D	
160 Propiconazole			
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.2	CXL-D	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.05	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
173 Buprofezin			
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01	CXL-D	
176 Hexythiazox			
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.05	CXL-D	

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
PE 0112 Eggs	0.05	CXL-D	
DH 1100 Hops, dry	3	CXL-D	
MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.05	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05 (fat)	CXL-D	
FM 0183 Milk fats	0.05	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.05	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.05 (*) (fat)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.05	CXL-D	
184 Etofenprox			
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.05 (*)	CXL-D	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.5 (fat)	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.02	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
GC 0649 Rice	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
193 Fenpyroximate			
FP 0226 Apple	0.2	CXL-D	
DF 0226 Apples, dried	1	CXL-D	
VP 2060 Beans with pods (subgroup)	0.5	CXL-D	
VC 0424 Cucumber	0.3	CXL-D	
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.8	CXL-D	
VO 2046 Eggplants (subgroup)	0.3	CXL-D	
MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.2	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.2 (fat)	CXL-D	
VC 0046 Melons (except watermelon)	0.2	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.01	CXL-D	
FP 0230 Pear	0.2	CXL-D	
VC 0431 Squash, summer	0.06	CXL-D	
FS 0012 Stone fruits (group)	0.4	CXL-D	Except cherries.
VO 2045 Tomatoes (subgroup)	0.3	CXL-D	
196 Tebufenozide			
ML 0812 Cattle milk	0.05	CXL-D	
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.02 (*)	CXL-D	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.02 (*)	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05 (fat)	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.02 (*)	CXL-D	
CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.1	CXL-D	

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
202	Fipronil			
	FI 0327 Banana	0.005	CXL-D	
	GC 0640 Barley	0.002 (*)	CXL-D	
	HH 0722 Basil, leaves	1.5	CXL-D	
	VB 0041 Cabbages, head	0.02	CXL-D	
	MO 1280 Cattle kidney	0.02	CXL-D	
	MO 1281 Cattle liver	0.1	CXL-D	
	MM 0812 Cattle meat	0.5 (fat)	CXL-D	
	ML 0812 Cattle milk	0.02	CXL-D	
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.02	CXL-D	
	VB 0042 Flowerhead brassicas (includes Broccoli: Broccoli, Chinese and cauliflower)	0.02	CXL-D	
	GC 0645 Maize	0.01	CXL-D	
	AS 0645 Maize fodder (dry)	0.1	CXL-D	
	GC 0647 Oats	0.002 (*)	CXL-D	
	VR 0589 Potato	0.02	CXL-D	
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.02	CXL-D	
	GC 0649 Rice	0.01	CXL-D	
	AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	0.2	CXL-D	
	GC 0650 Rye	0.002 (*)	CXL-D	
	VR 0596 Sugar beet	0.2	CXL-D	
	SO 0702 Sunflower seed	0.002 (*)	CXL-D	
	GC 0653 Triticale	0.002 (*)	CXL-D	
	GC 0654 Wheat	0.002 (*)	CXL-D	
203	Spinosad			
	MM 0812 Cattle meat	3 (fat)	CXL-D	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
	ML 0812 Cattle milk	1	CXL-D	The MRL accommodates external animal treatment.
	FM 0812 Cattle milk fat	5	CXL-D	
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.5	CXL-D	Except cattle.
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.01	CXL-D	
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	2 (fat)	CXL-D	
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.2 (fat)	CXL-D	
217	Novaluron			
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.7	CXL-D	
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.1	CXL-D	
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	10 (fat)	CXL-D	
	FM 0183 Milk fats	7	CXL-D	

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
ML 0106 Milks	0.4	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.5 (fat)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.1	CXL-D	
229 Azoxystrobin			
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.07	CXL-D	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
VC 0045 Fruiting vegetables, cucurbits (group)	1	CXL-D	
DH 1100 Hops, dry	30	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.05 (fat)	CXL-D	
FM 0183 Milk fats	0.03	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.01	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
239 Cyproconazole			
VD 0071 Bean (dry)	0.02 (*)	CXL-D	
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.5	CXL-D	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
GC 0645 Maize	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.01	CXL-D	
VD 0072 Peas (dry)	0.02 (*)	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01 (*)	CXL-D	
242 Flubendiamide			
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	1	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	2 (fat)	CXL-D	
FM 0183 Milk fats	5	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.1	CXL-D	
285 Flupyradifurone			
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	4	CXL-D	
PE 0112 Eggs	0.7	CXL-D	
MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	1	CXL-D	
MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	1.5	CXL-D	
ML 0106 Milks	0.7	CXL-D	
PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.3	CXL-D	
PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.8	CXL-D	
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	1	CXL-D	
288 Acibenzolar-S-methyl			
FP 0226 Apple	0.3	CXL-D	
MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.02 (*)	CXL-D	

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
PE 0112	Eggs	0.02	(*)	CXL-D
MF 0100	Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.02	(*)	CXL-D
MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.02	(*)	CXL-D
ML 0106	Milks	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
PF 0111	Poultry fats	0.02	(*)	CXL-D
PM 0110	Poultry meat	0.02	(*)	CXL-D
PO 0111	Poultry, edible offal of	0.02	(*)	CXL-D
302 Fosetyl Al				
MO 0105	Edible offal (mammalian)	0.5		CXL-D
PE 0112	Eggs	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
MF 0100	Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.3		CXL-D
MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.15		CXL-D
ML 0106	Milks	0.1		CXL-D
FC 0004	Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	20		CXL-D
PF 0111	Poultry fats	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
PM 0110	Poultry meat	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
PO 0111	Poultry, edible offal of	0.05	(*)	CXL-D
309 Pydiflumetofen				
SO 0691	Cotton seed	0.02		CXL-D Based on rotational crops.
MO 0105	Edible offal (mammalian)	0.1		CXL-D
PE 0112	Eggs	0.02		CXL-D
MF 0100	Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.1		CXL-D
MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.1	(fat)	CXL-D
ML 0106	Milks	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
PF 0111	Poultry fats	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
PM 0110	Poultry meat	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
PO 0111	Poultry, edible offal of	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
VB 2016	Stem Brassicas (subgroup)	0.1		CXL-D Based on rotational crops.
VP 2064	Underground immature beans and peas (subgroup)	0.02		CXL-D Based on rotational crops.
324 Tetraniliprole				
MO 0105	Edible offal (mammalian)	1		CXL-D
PE 0112	Eggs	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
MF 0100	Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.15		CXL-D
MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.1		CXL-D
ML 0106	Milks	0.15		CXL-D
PF 0111	Poultry fats	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
PM 0110	Poultry meat	0.01	(*)	CXL-D

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
GC 2088 Rice cereals (subgroup)	0.02		CXL-D
AS 0649 Rice, hay and/or straw	20	(dw)	CXL-D
CM 0649 Rice, husked	0.01	(*)	CXL-D
CM 1205 Rice, polished	0.01	(*)	CXL-D

APPENDIX V

MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(Withdrawn by CCPR)
(For information)

	Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
103	Phosmet			
	FB 0020 Blueberries	20	MRL-W	
111	Iprodione			
	AM 3604 Potato, culls	0.15	MRL-W	
145	Carbosulfan			
	VO 0440 Eggplant	0.15	MRL-W	
	FI 0345 Mango	0.1	MRL-W	
160	Propiconazole			
	CM 1205 Rice, polished	10	MRL-W	
193	Fenpyroximate			
	VP 2060 Beans with pods (subgroup)	0.5	MRL-W	
	VO 0440 Eggplant	0.3	MRL-W	
	MO 0105 Group of edible offal (mammalian)	0.8	MRL-W	
202	Fipronil			
	FI 0327 Banana	0.004 (*)	MRL-W	
	AS 0640 Barley, hay and/or straw	0.07	MRL-W	
	GC 2087 Barley, similar grains, and pseudocereals with husks (subgroup)	0.004 (*)	MRL-W	
	HH 0722 Basil, leaves	0.8	MRL-W	
	VP 2060 Beans with pods (subgroup)	0.01	MRL-W	
	SO 0691 Cotton seed	0.01	MRL-W	
	VD 2065 Dry beans (subgroup)	0.01	MRL-W	Except soya beans.
	MO 0105 Edible offal (mammalian)	0.1	MRL-W	
	PE 0112 Eggs	0.04	MRL-W	
	VL 0053 Leafy vegetables (group)	0.01	MRL-W	Residues resulting from rotational cropping.
	GC 2091 Maize cereals (subgroup)	0.01	MRL-W	
	MF 0100 Mammalian fats (except milk fats)	0.4	MRL-W	
	MM 0095 Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	0.03	MRL-W	
	FM 0183 Milk fats	0.3	MRL-W	
	ML 0106 Milks	0.03	MRL-W	
	AS 3559 Oat, hay and/or straw	0.07 (dw)	MRL-W	
	VA 0385 Onion, bulb	0.03	MRL-W	
	VR 0589 Potato	0.05	MRL-W	
	PF 0111 Poultry fats	0.07	MRL-W	
	PM 0110 Poultry meat	0.07	MRL-W	
	PO 0111 Poultry, edible offal of	0.03	MRL-W	

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)		Step	Note
CM 1206	Rice bran, unprocessed	2		MRL-W	
GC 2088	Rice cereals (subgroup)	0.4		MRL-W	
AS 0649	Rice, hay and/or straw	0.6	(dw)	MRL-W	
AS 3570	Rice, hulls	2		MRL-W	
CM 0649	Rice, husked	0.4		MRL-W	
CM 1205	Rice, polished	0.15		MRL-W	
VR 0075	Root and tuber vegetables (group)	0.002		MRL-W	Except potato and sugar beet. Residues resulting from rotational cropping.
AS 3560	Rye, hay and/or straw	0.05	(dw)	MRL-W	
VD 0541	Soya bean (dry)	0.01		MRL-W	
OC 0541	Soya bean oil, crude	0.05		MRL-W	
AL 3538	Soya bean, hulls	0.06		MRL-W	
AS 0081	Straw and hay of cereal grains (excluding pseudocereals) (subgroup)	0.03	(dw)	MRL-W	Except of barley, oats, rice, rye, triticale and wheat. Residues resulting from rotational cropping.
VR 0596	Sugar beet	0.01		MRL-W	
GS 0659	Sugar cane	0.01		MRL-W	
SO 2091	Sunflower seeds (subgroup)	0.004 (*)		MRL-W	
VO 2045	Tomatoes (subgroup)	0.01 (*)		MRL-W	
AS 0653	Triticale, hay and/or straw	0.05	(dw)	MRL-W	
AS 0654	Wheat, hay and/or straw	0.05	(dw)	MRL-W	
GC 2086	Wheat, similar grains, and pseudocereals without husks (subgroup)	0.004 (*)		MRL-W	
309 Pydiflumetofen					
VL 0483	Lettuce, leaf	30		MRL-W	

APPENDIX VI

MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR PESTICIDES
(Retained at Steps 7 and 4)
(For information)

Commodity	MRL (mg/kg)	Step	Note
138 Metalaxyl			
VO 0445 Peppers, sweet (including pimento or pimienta)	0.5	7	
27 Dimethoate			
AB 0004 Orange, dried pulp	5	4	Dimethoate(027)/Omethoate(055)
FC 0004 Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	2	4	Dimethoate(027)/Omethoate(055)
52 Methyl Bromide			
CP 0179 Bread and other cooked cereal	0.01 (*)	4	To apply to commodity at point of products retail sale or when offered for consumption
SB 0715 Cacao beans	5 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
GC 0080 Cereal grains (group)	5 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
AO6 Cocoa products	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption
DF 0167 Dried fruits	2 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
DF 0167 Dried fruits	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption
AO4 Milled cereals products	1 Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
AO4 Milled cereals products	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption
SO 0697 Peanut	0.01 (*) Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption

Commodity		MRL (mg/kg)	Step		Note
SO 0697	Peanut	10	Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
TN 0085	Tree nuts (group)	0.01 (*)	Po	4	To apply to commodity at point of retail sale or when offered for consumption
TN 0085	Tree nuts (group)	10	Po	4	To apply at point of entry into a country and, in case of cereal for milling, if product has been freely exposed to air for a period of at least 24 h after fumigation and before
55 Omethoate					
AB 0004	Orange, dried pulp	0.04		4	
FC 0004	Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.02		4	
114 Guazatine					
GC 0080	Cereal grains (group)	0.05 (*)		4	
FC 0001	Citrus fruits (group)	5	Po	4	
138 Metalaxyl					
OR 0004	Orange oil, edible	7		4	
FC 0004	Oranges, sweet, sour (including Orange-like hybrids) (subgroup)	0.7	(M)	4	Residue data that was the basis for the estimation Metalaxyl (M)).
248 Flutriafol					
GC 0649	Rice	4		4	
AS 0649	Rice, hay and/or straw	6	(dw)	4	
AS 3570	Rice, hulls	20	(dw)	4	Husks.
CM 0649	Rice, husked	1		4	
CM 1205	Rice, polished	1.5		4	

APPENDIX VII**GUIDELINES FOR MONITORING THE STABILITY AND PURITY OF REFERENCE MATERIALS AND
RELATED STOCK SOLUTIONS OF PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE****(For adoption at Step 8)****PREFACE**

1. Pesticide residues in agricultural crops and food commodities have become a worldwide food safety and trade concern, which has led to enforcement of strict pesticide regulations. More than 1200 pesticides are available globally to control the pests on different agricultural crops and food commodities. Analyses of pesticides at trace levels in the food chain require the use of specific Reference Materials (RMs) of known chemical purity manufactured by the Reference Material Producers (RMPs) to ensure the reliability of the test results. Accurate determination of pesticide residues in agricultural crops and food commodities is important for food safety control and fixation of Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) of pesticides, thereby overcoming the related trade barriers. RMs with specified purity are also required for accurate qualitative and quantitative analysis of pesticide active ingredient(s) in technical products, formulations, and stock solutions.
2. Limited shelf life, diminishing purity, and high recurring cost of RMs act as major impediments to performing regular pesticide residue analysis. These problems are magnified for multi-pesticide residue analysis by testing laboratories in developing countries as they are required to allocate a large part of their funds for frequent procurement of expensive RMs. Furthermore, the use of RMs is restricted by the expiry dates specified by the RMPs in the reference material document (e.g. certificate of analysis (CoA) or product information sheet), which provides the value for purity, expiry date, and measurement uncertainty of the RMs as per ISO 33401. Many times, laboratories cannot afford the frequent purchase of high-cost RMs for their pesticide residue control work.
3. Moreover, due to supply chain constraints, some laboratories may receive RMs close to their expiry date, as mentioned in the reference material document. In such situations, the laboratories are forced to buy new standards and prepare new stock solutions more frequently than necessary. This leads to enormous amount of work and increased laboratory costs. Additionally, shipping RMs by the suppliers to laboratories increases the acquisition time for procurement (a few weeks to months), creating hurdles in sustaining pesticide residue control programs.
4. There are many RMs that remain stable even after the expiry dates stated in the reference material document with no significant change in purity. Some studies have also reported that if RMs are stored at better storage conditions than recommended by the manufacturer, provided that these conditions do not contradict those indicated by the RMP in the reference material document, the RMs are stable for much longer than the expiry dates indicated by the RMPs. Such RMs may technically be allowed to be used beyond their expiry dates if laboratory checks are in place to demonstrate that they are stable and continue meeting the purity requirements. However, the absence of guidance procedures for monitoring the stability and purity of RMs prevents their use beyond the expiry dates under the ISO/IEC 17025 laboratory quality system.
5. This document represents a crucial step towards developing comprehensive harmonized guidance enabling the laboratories to monitor the stability and purity of the pesticide RMs and their stock solutions during prolonged storage. The document aims to guide the laboratories in monitoring the stability and purity of RMs for their possible use beyond their expiry dates and for continued use of stock solutions that retain their stability and purity.

SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE

6. The purpose of this document is to furnish a framework that would assist the laboratories in monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials (RMs) of pesticides during prolonged storage and identifying expired RMs as indicated by the reference material document of RMPs but with demonstrated continuing stability and purity through robust analytical protocols so that such materials that retain their purity as per the reference material document even after expiry may continue to be used as valid RMs. Another aspect of the proposed framework is to monitor the stability of the stock solutions used for pesticide residue analysis so that those solutions that are proven to be valid may be used for accurate and reliable determination of pesticide residue levels.

7. This document applies to RMs of pesticide standards of known purity specified by a RMP, including individual RMs, stock solutions of individual RMs, and mixed pesticide standard solutions of RMs purchased from the RMPs or prepared by the laboratories from the individual RMs procured by the laboratories from the RMPs.
8. These guidelines may enable the pesticide residue laboratories and pesticide quality control laboratories to overcome the constraints associated with short expiry periods of RMs as shown in the RMP documents and use them beyond their expiry dates as indicated by RMPs. After the expiration dates of RMPs, the RMs retaining the purity specified in the reference material document may be used as RMs or as quality control materials (QCM) for the analysis of pesticides, provided that these RMs are stored under desirable conditions (low temperature and dark conditions). RMs that do not remain stable and do not show acceptable purity during prolonged storage shall not be used by laboratories for pesticide residue testing/quantitative purposes, as accurate results may not be obtained.
9. The guidelines cover the storage conditions that shall be maintained and quantitative measurements that shall be performed to monitor the stability and purity of RMs and their stock solutions before and beyond their expiration period.

GENERAL CRITERIA

10. The analysis shall be conducted in laboratories in compliance with the general criteria for testing laboratories laid down in ISO/IEC 17025ⁱ, with the scope relevant to the measurement concerned.
11. The RMs shall be procured from an RMP accredited as per ISO 17034ⁱⁱ to ensure analytical traceability or from a National Metrology Institute recognized by peers or designated by countries.
12. The stability of mixed pesticide standard solutions that may be evaluated under these guidelines include the mixed pesticide standard solutions purchased from the RMP as well as the mixed pesticide standard solutions prepared by pesticide residues laboratories by using RMs purchased from RMPs, who may certify the purity and stability of each of the individual components.
13. To ensure metrological traceability, the analytical balances used shall be calibrated with weights traceable to the national/international standards.
14. Calibrated class A glassware or appropriate electronic/automatic pipettes traceable to national/international standards shall be used for volumetric measurements.
15. The instrumentation used in purity tests should have comparable or greater sensitivity/specificity to those used in the reference material document of the RM.
16. According to the reference material document, the equipment used for storing and monitoring RMs should be traceable to national/international standards.
17. ISO Standard 33405ⁱⁱⁱ may be referred for assessing the shelf-life of an RM
18. To ensure the validity of the stability and purity testing protocols provided below, gravimetric records shall be maintained for RMs (opened or unopened), both solid and liquid, and their respective stock solutions during storage before and after use at each time. Before recording the weight, the container should attain room temperature/ambient temperature and be wiped to remove any adhering moisture. The exposure of RM and stock solutions to ambient temperatures and light must be kept as short as absolutely necessary, limiting handling time
19. The record of the storage conditions (e.g. temperature and humidity) as well as the date of use of the RM and their stock solutions shall be maintained. Also, the temperature at which the RMs and their stock solutions are opened for use shall be recorded. Data loggers and control charts shall be maintained by laboratories to document and evaluate the performance of storage equipment over time.

RECOMMENDED STORAGE CONDITIONS FOR PESTICIDE REFERENCE MATERIALS AND THEIR STOCK SOLUTIONS

20. The storage conditions of RMs are specified by RMPs in the reference material documents, as RMs are susceptible to degradation at high temperatures and other unfavourable environmental conditions. Environmental conditions (temperature and humidity, as appropriate) shall be recorded, monitored and controlled by the laboratory.

21. If a laboratory maintains the RMs at storage conditions more protective than those recommended by the RMPs (i.e., temperature lower than recommended without exposure to light and moisture, duration of handling, frequency of use etc.), the rate of degradation of the RMs is significantly minimized as long as these conditions do not contradict those indicated in the reference material document by the RMP. Under such conditions, the expiry date as recommended by the RMPs may be extended as appropriate for an RM by a date allowing for storage of up to 10 years or as long as the purity mentioned in the reference material document holds good ($\leq \pm 10\%$) (SANTE^v, 2024). Another study revealed the stability of pesticide reference standards for up to 15 years or in-stock solutions for up to 10 years.
22. To avoid any cross-contamination or degradation of RMs, the vials may be placed in an airtight capped tube/sealed pouch (made of suitable polypropylene or high-quality plastic material) and immediately stored in the freezer/refrigerator at conditions more protective than those recommended by RMPs, preferably at subzero temperature. The stock solutions must also be stored in airtight capped glassware or any other suitable type of vessels as specified by the RMP. Storage conditions shall be monitored, controlled and recorded with appropriately calibrated equipment. Exposing glassware to elevated temperatures should be avoided.

ANALYTICAL PROTOCOL FOR MONITORING THE STABILITY AND PURITY OF PESTICIDE REFERENCE MATERIALS AND INDIVIDUAL STOCK SOLUTIONS

23. Three analytical approaches may be considered for monitoring the stability and purity of individual RMs, RM stock solutions, and mixed pesticide standard solutions of RMs for the purpose of extending their use beyond the expiry date, provided their purity is proven acceptable.
24. In Approach 1, the stability of new (or unexpired) and old (or expired) RMs is determined simultaneously. The comparisons of peak area shall be based on averaged values from repeated runs, which mitigates other sources of variation in instrument response. Alternatively, an internal standard (IS) may be used to compare the peak area ratio of new (or unexpired) and old (or expired) RMs. If the deviation (in peak area) after expiration date indicated by RMP is found within $\pm 10\%$, or alternatively the peak area ratio deviation is within $\pm 10\%$, the analyte in the old (or expired) RM is considered at an acceptable level and may therefore continue to be used as a valid RM. For neat standards and stock solutions, monitoring of stability & purity may be continued regularly up to a maximum of 10 years (SANTE^v), provided the deviation in purity from the original RMP remains acceptable. Here, a new (or unexpired) RM would be required throughout the period of comparison. Approach 1 is applicable for individual neat standards and their related stock solutions.
25. In Approach 2, whenever a new (or unexpired) RM is procured by any laboratory, its purity is monitored periodically before and after expiry using the same analytical conditions as mentioned in the reference material document. Here, new (or unexpired) RM need not be procured. An unexpired IS of any pesticide RM, appropriate for the method is used to account for any change in the response of the equipment. As the analyte is spiked with the IS, the selection of the IS should be based on previous experience that shows a good stability over the expected storage time. The IS should not be susceptible to chemical degradation, should be insensitive to external factors such as light and moisture, chemically different from the analyte and should not interfere with the measurement of the tested analyte. This approach applies only to neat RMs accompanied by reference material documents.
26. In Approach 3, three different methods have been proposed to monitor the purity of mixed pesticide standard solutions. In method 3.1, the comparisons of peak area of each pesticide RM in new (or unexpired) and old (or expired) mixture shall be based on averaged values from repeated runs, which mitigates other sources of variation in instrument response, by averaging the values of replicate measurements. In the method 3.2, an IS may be used to compare the peak area ratio of each RM pesticide in new (or unexpired) and old (or expired) mixture. If the deviation (in peak area) after expiration is found within $\pm 10\%$ (Method 3.1), or the peak area ratio deviation is within $\pm 10\%$ (Method 3.2), for each pesticide RM in the mixture, the analyte in the RM is considered at an acceptable level, and may therefore continue to be used as a valid RM. In method 3.3, whenever a laboratory acquires a new (or unexpired) mixed pesticide standard from an RMP, its signal stability should be periodically monitored before and after the expiration date, employing analytical conditions as similar as possible to those indicated in the reference material documentation. In this case, it is not necessary to acquire a new (or unexpired) mixed pesticide standard from an RMP. Instead, an unexpired IS, corresponding to any suitable pesticide RM for the method, is used to compensate for possible variations in instrumental response. In this procedure, the analyte peak area (or alternatively, the peak area ratio) for every pesticide in the mixture is plotted against storage time. Subsequently, linear regression analysis is applied to assess the presence of significant changes in the analyte area (or area ratio), in accordance with the classical stability study approach established in ISO 33405. If the regression analysis determines that the data do not show a linear trend (slope close to zero), the analyte contained in the RM is considered acceptable and may continue to be used as a reference material.

If any of the components do not meet the $\pm 10\%$ criterion, the mixed pesticide standard solution may not be used as an RM. However, it may be noted that only limited publications on the behaviour of the pesticides in mixtures over long term storage are available at this time and caution should be taken when proposing to extend the life of an expired RM mixture. Mixed pesticide standard should be used for a limited time period and the stability of the analytes contained need to be demonstrated under conditions reflecting their routine use.

Approach 1: Comparing the stability of old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) pesticide reference standards (applicable to neat standards of reference materials and related stock solutions)

27. Prepare a fresh stock solution of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RM standard of the appropriate concentration depending on the response of the RM in the detector. Generally, for HPLC¹-DAD²/GC³-FID⁴, a good response is obtained between 5 mg L⁻¹ to 100 mg L⁻¹. For single quadrupole GC-MS⁵ or LC⁶-MS, or other mass spectrometry methods, the appropriate concentration typically ranges from 0.5 to 5 mg L⁻¹, while for triple quadrupole GC-MS/MS or LC-MS/MS, 0.1 to 0.5 mg L⁻¹ or lower concentration may be more appropriate to avoid signal saturation.
28. Analyze the standard solution of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RM on a proper instrument (HPLC-DAD, HPLC-UV⁷, GC-FID, LC-MS or GC-MS, LC-MS/MS, GC-MS/MS, or qNMR⁸ or other mass spectrometry methods) and record the peak area. Either of the two methods described below may be employed.
29. Method 1.1 (Peak Area Comparison): Inject standard solutions of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) individual RMs prepared from the stock solution at the same concentration into the instrument and record the peak area. It is recommended that the injection sequence contains at least five replicates of old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) standards and should be alternating to minimize the impact of drifting of signal response in the course of measurement. Calculate the mean value of the peak area for the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RM of the five replicates. The %RSD of the replicate measurements should be $\leq \pm 10\%$. Calculate the % deviation in average peak area of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) standard solutions using the formula below given. The mean value from the new (or unexpired) solution is taken to be 100% and is also used as a basis for calculating the percentage difference.

$$\begin{aligned} & \% \text{ deviation} \\ &= \frac{|(\text{Mean peak area for old (or expired) standard} - \text{Mean peak area for new (or unexpired) standard})|}{\text{Mean peak area for new (or unexpired) standard}} \times 100 \end{aligned}$$

30. Method 1.2 (Peak Area Ratio Comparison): Spike another RM (inert and unexpired) as an IS into the standard solutions of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RMs prepared from the stock solution at the same concentration. Inject the solutions and record the peak area of the RM and the IS, perform a minimum of five replicate measurements of old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) standards that should be alternated to minimize the impact of drifting of signal response in the course of measurement., and calculate the average ratio of RM area to IS area for the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RMs with %RSD $\leq 10\%$. The IS peak should have a similar abundance to the RM being verified, and it should not interfere with the analysis of the target RM in terms of either retention time or molecular weight (m/z). Calculate the % deviation using the below given formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & \% \text{ deviation} \\ &= \frac{|(\text{Mean peak area ratio of old (or expired) and internal standard} - \text{Mean peak area ratio of new (or unexpired) and internal standard})|}{\text{Mean peak area ratio of new (or unexpired) and internal standard}} \times 100 \end{aligned}$$

31. If the % deviation (as obtained from the above Method 1.1 or Method 1.2) shows a deviation of $\leq \pm 10\%$, the old (or expired) standard may be considered suitable for continuing use.
32. The old (or expired) standard shall be compared with the new (or unexpired) standard at regular intervals of at least once a year, provided the recommended storage conditions are maintained.

-
- 1 High-performance liquid chromatography
 - 2 Diode-Array Detection
 - 3 Gas chromatography
 - 4 Flame ionization Detector
 - 5 Mass Spectrometry
 - 6 Liquid Chromatography
 - 7 Ultra-violet spectroscopy
 - 8 Quantitative Nuclear Magnetic Resonance

33. To monitor the stability of the RM over time, a plot of the % deviation vs. time of monitoring may be made, which would help identify the deviation in stability of RM with time.

Approach 2: Verification of purity of neat standards of pesticide reference materials during prolonged storage (not suitable for verification of stock solutions)

34. To verify the purity of the RM, a chromatographic assay shall be performed, preferably as per the analytical conditions mentioned in the reference material document by the RMP, with the capability of resolving and detecting the target analytes away from all of its potential impurities. If it is not feasible to match the exact conditions of the RMP, deviations should be documented and justified. Furthermore, if the deviation comes from the use of a different technique, the laboratory must guarantee that the technique has an equivalent or better sensitivity and specificity. RM purity is verified by comparing the purity (in terms of percent peak area) obtained through analysis with the purity mentioned in the reference material document.
35. Prepare a fresh stock solution of the new (or unexpired) neat standards of RMs and IS (a different unexpired RM) of appropriate concentration in a suitable solvent. The IS solution should be prepared in the same solvent in which the stock solution is prepared to consider any background interference that may be present. Appropriate concentration will depend on the response of the RM using the selected detection method (see paragraph 27 of Approach 1 for suggested concentration ranges).
36. Prepare the standard solution of the RM from the stock solution and analyze it through the instrument (HPLC-DAD, HPLC-UV, GC-FID, LC-MS, GC-MS or other mass spectrometry methods in full scan mode, or qNMR) as per the analytical conditions mentioned in the reference material document. The percentage of peak area obtained through the software of the instrument is recorded as purity. Inject a blank solution of the same solvent in which the stock solution is prepared prior to this to check any background interference that may be present. A minimum of five replicate measurements shall be performed to obtain a mean value of purity, and the %RSD of the replicates should be $\leq 10\%$. The instrument shall be calibrated as per the procedures and criteria recommended by the manufacturer.
37. Compare the mean value of verified purity (percent purity) obtained from the laboratory analysis with the reference value of purity provided in the reference material document. The certified value (reference value) listed in the reference material document is considered as the purity reference value while calculating % deviation in purity.
38. The % deviation in percent purity shall be calculated as:

$$\% \text{ deviation} = \frac{|(\text{Average percent area of the peak of neat standard} - \% \text{ Purity reference value})|}{\% \text{ Purity reference value}} \times 100$$

39. To determine changes in the response of the equipment with time, spike the solution of an unexpired IS of the same concentration as RM in the standard solution of RM. Inject the solution and record the peak area of the RM and the IS and calculate the average ratio of the RM area to the IS area. The IS peak should have a similar abundance to the RM being verified, and it should not interfere with the analysis of the target RM in terms of either retention time or molecular weight (m/z). Monitoring the signal of the RM with respect to IS helps to take into account the signals that may not be visible but contribute to the percent share of the analyte on the summed area of the chromatogram.
40. Repeat the same procedure at regular intervals of at least once a year using a freshly prepared solution of the RM and compare with the freshly prepared solution of the unexpired IS, particularly before and after the RM's expiry, to monitor its stability and purity during prolonged storage and obtain % deviation in the ratio of peak area.

$$\% \text{ deviation} = \frac{|(\text{Mean peak area ratio of RM after expiry and IS} - \text{Mean peak area ratio of RM before expiry and IS})|}{\text{Mean peak area ratio of RM before expiry and IS}} \times 100$$

41. After the expiry date of the RM as indicated by its RMP, if the mean value of percent purity in terms of percent peak area obtained for the RM and the reference value (as obtained from reference material document) do not differ by more than $\pm 10\%$ (the % deviation of less than or equal to $\pm 10\%$) in approach 1 or the deviation (%) in the ratio of peak area for the RM compared to the IS is $\leq \pm 10\%$ in approach 2, the RM may be considered suitable for continuing use as a valid RM in the laboratory.

Approach 3: Verification of stability of mixed pesticide standard solutions during prolonged storage.

42. For method 3.1 and 3.2, prepare a fresh stock solution / working solution of the new (or unexpired) and old (or expired) mixed pesticide standard solution of appropriate concentration in a suitable solvent. Appropriate concentration will depend on the response of the RM using the selected detection method (see paragraph 27 of Approach 1 for suggested concentration ranges).
43. In method 3.1 and 3.2, analyze the standard solution of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) mixed pesticide standard solution on an appropriate instrument (GC or LC with detectors of appropriate specificity including LC-MS/GC-MS in full scan, GC-MSMS/LC-MSMS in MRM mode or other mass spectrometry methods or qNMR) as per the analytical conditions mentioned in the reference material document and record the peak area. Either method 3.1 or 3.2 described below may be employed.
44. Method 3.1 (Peak Area Comparison): Inject standard solutions of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) mixed pesticide standard solution prepared from the stock solution at the same concentration into the instrument and record the peak area of each pesticide RM in the mixed pesticide standard solution. It is recommended that the injection sequence contains at least five replicates of new (or unexpired) and old (or expired) standards and should be alternating to minimize the drifting of signal response in the course of measurement. Calculate the mean value of the peak area of the five replicates for the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) RM. The same will be calculated for all the pesticide RMs in the mixed pesticide standard solutions. The %RSD of the replicate measurements should be $\leq 10\%$. Calculate the % deviation in average peak area of each pesticide RM in the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) mixed pesticide standard solutions using the formula below given:

$$\begin{aligned} & \% \text{ deviation (for each pesticide RM)} \\ & = \frac{|(\text{Mean peak area for old (or expired) standard} - \text{Mean peak area for new (or unexpired) standard})|}{\text{Mean peak area for new (or unexpired) standard}} \times 100 \end{aligned}$$

45. Method 3.2 (Peak Area Ratio Comparison): Spike a different RM (inert and unexpired) as an IS into the standard solution of the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) mixed pesticide standard solutions prepared from the stock solution at same concentration. Inject the solutions and record the peak area of each pesticide RM in the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) mixed pesticide standard solutions as well as the IS by performing a minimum of five replicate measurements with %RSD $\leq 10\%$. Calculate the average area ratio of each pesticide RM in the old (or expired) and new (or unexpired) mixed pesticide standard solutions to the IS. The IS peak should have a similar abundance to the RM being verified, and it should not interfere with the analysis of the target RM in terms of either retention time or molecular weight (m/z). Calculate the % deviation of each pesticide RM in the mixture using the below given formula:

$$\begin{aligned} & \% \text{ deviation (for each pesticide RM)} \\ & = \frac{|(\text{Mean peak area ratio of old (or expired) and internal standard} - \text{Mean peak area ratio of new (or unexpired) and internal standard})|}{\text{Mean peak area ratio of new (or unexpired) and internal standard}} \times 100 \end{aligned}$$

46. If every pesticide RM in the mixture (as obtained from either Method 3.1 or Method 3.2 above) shows a deviation of $\leq \pm 10\%$ relative to the reference material document provided by the RMP, the old (or expired) mixed pesticide standard solution may be considered suitable for continuing use. If any of the RMs in the mixture (as obtained from either Method 3.1 or Method 3.2 above) shows a deviation of $> \pm 10\%$ relative to the reference material document provided by the RMP, the old (or expired) mixed pesticide standard solution is not suitable for continued use for the quantification of pesticides not meeting the required criteria.
47. Method 3.3: Prepare a fresh solution of mixed pesticide standards from the unexpired RM and an IS (another unexpired RM), at an appropriate concentration in a suitable solvent. The appropriate concentration will depend on the RM response in the detector. Analyze the mixed pesticide standard solution, prepared at an appropriate concentration from the stock solution, on an appropriate instrument as described in paragraph 43, following analytical conditions as close as possible to those established in the reference material document. Perform at least five replicate measurements to obtain a mean value of the ratio between the RM area and the IS area for each individual component. To verify measurement reproducibility, the %RSD of the replicates should be $\leq 10\%$. Repeat the same procedure at regular intervals of at least twice a year, using a new solution of mixed pesticide standards, particularly before and after the expiration date, in order to monitor its stability and purity during long-term storage. Once the RM expiration date has been reached, repeat the procedure, and prepare a plot of the area or area ratio of each component versus time. After obtaining the data, perform a linear regression analysis to determine whether the model adequately fits the data obtained in accordance with the classical stability study approach established in ISO 33405. If the regression analysis indicates that the data do not show a linear trend (coefficient of determination $R^2 < 0.8$, p-value > 0.05) and slope close

to zero, it may be concluded that storage time has not contributed to any change in the response obtained. Consequently, RM may be considered suitable for continued laboratory use.

48. The monitoring of the stability of the mixed pesticide standard solution shall be performed at regular intervals of at least twice a year, provided the recommended storage conditions are maintained.
49. To monitor the stability of the mixed pesticide standard solution over time, a plot of % deviation vs. time of monitoring may help identify and predict the deviation in stability with time.

ANNEX

Definitions

Certified Reference Material (CRM): Reference material (RM) characterized by a metrologically valid procedure for one or more specified properties, accompanied by an RM certificate that provides the value of the specified property, its associated uncertainty, and a statement of metrological traceability.

Internal standard (IS): A chemical added at a known amount to samples and/or standards in chemical analysis, including the blank and calibration standards. This substance can then be used for calibration by plotting the ratio of the analyte signal to the internal standard signal as a function of the concentrations. This ratio for the samples is then used to obtain the analyte concentrations. The internal standard used needs to provide a signal that is similar to the analyte signal in most ways but sufficiently different so that the two signals are readily distinguishable from each other.

Mixed pesticide standard solution: Reference standard of pesticide containing multiple compounds procured from a Reference Material Producer (RMP) accredited as per ISO 17034 or a mixture of pesticide standards prepared by the laboratory from individual RMs procured from RMPs to ensure analytical traceability or from a National Metrology Institute recognized by peers or designated by countries

Reference Material Document: A document that provides the relevant information about certified purity, concentration, date of expiry, and measurement uncertainty of an RM, which is in compliance with the requirement in ISO 17034 and ISO 33401^{iv}. Reference material documents can be in the form of a Product Information Sheet or Certificate of Analysis (CoA).

Purity: Characteristic of a reference material which indicates the proportion of the stated component of interest in relation to the total substance. Purity is typically expressed in percentages and should be considered when preparing standard solutions.

Quality Control Material (QCM): Reference material used for quality control of a measurement.

Reference Material (RM): Material sufficiently homogeneous and stable with respect to one or more specified properties, which has been established to be fit for its intended use in a measurement process.

Reference Material Producer (RMP): Body (organization or company, public or private) that is fully responsible for project planning and management; assignment of, and decision on property values and relevant uncertainties; authorization of property values; and issuance of a reference material certificate or other statements for the reference materials it produces.

Relative Standard Deviation (%RSD): It is expressed as the sample standard deviation divided by the sample mean multiplied by 100.

Stability: Characteristic of a reference material, when stored under specified conditions, to maintain a specified property value within specified limits for a specified period of time.

Standard solution: A chemical solution that has a precisely known concentration. Standard solutions are generally prepared by dissolving a solute of known mass into a solvent to a precise volume or by diluting a solution of known concentration with more solvent.

Stock Solution: A solution of a reference material or standard of high concentration from which appropriate dilutions can be made at the time of use.

Traceability: Metrological traceability, property of a measurement result whereby the result can be related to a reference through a documented unbroken chain of calibrations, each contributing to the measurement uncertainty.

Uncertainty: measurement uncertainty, non-negative parameter characterizing the dispersion of the quantity values being attributed to a measurand, based on the information used.

Reference Documents

- i. ISO/IEC 17025: 2017- General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories
- ii. ISO 17034:2016- General requirements for the competence of reference material producers
- iii. ISO 33405:2024-Reference Materials- Approaches for characterization and assessment of homogeneity and stability
- iv. ISO 33401:2024- Reference materials — Contents of certificates, labels and accompanying documentation
- v. SANTE/11312/2021 V2, Implemented by 01/01/2024, European Commission Directorate General for Health and Food Safety.

APPENDIX VIII

PRIORITY LIST OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR
(For approval by CAC)

2026 - NEW COMPOUND EVALUATIONS									
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA		COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ				
2026	16/05/2024	Fenmezoditiaz	Fenmezoditiaz	Yes	Yes	Rice, wheat, barley, oat	Rice, wheat, barley, oat	BASF	Manufacturer nominated compound on 30 September 2023 through EWG portal and advised that registration was expected 2024. Registration for rice in Cambodia was confirmed 16 May 2024
2026	25/03/2025	Metiltetraprole	Metiltetraprole	Yes	Yes	Cereals, Pulses, Animal Products	Soybean (min. 9 trials, processing study) , Wheat (min. 13 trials, processing study), Feeding studies in cow and hen	Sumitomo/BASF SE	Nominated via email 27 November 2023. On 25/3/25, Sumitomo confirmed that this was registered in Japan and Paraguay and revised the list of crops and residue trials.

2026 - PERIODIC REVIEWS									
YEAR	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMODITIES	COMMENTS	PREVIOUS EVALUATION	LAST TOX EVALUATION	ADI	ARfD
2026	Indoxacarb (216)	Indoxacarb (216)	FMC	For periodic review: All commodities (covered by current Codex MRLs) except for grapes, dried grapes, leaf lettuce and tea. New use nominations: Coffee, Sunflower Subgroup 004E, low growing berries, FB 2009 (represented by Strawberry) Subgroup 010A	Move to Table 2A on 4 June 2024 following a request from a member at CCPR55. On 5 December 2024, FMC confirmed that they would support the periodic review. There was also a nomination for indoxacarb on the 2026 new-use other list for Coffee, Sunflower Subgroup 004E, low growing berries, FB 2009 (represented by Strawberry) Subgroup 010A which has been merged with this periodic review nomination for the same compound/sponsor.	2005TR, 2007R, 2009R, 2012R, 2013R, 2022R	2005	0-0.01, 2005	0.1, 2005
2026	Maleic hydrazide (102)	Maleic hydrazide (102)	Drexel Chemical Company	Garlic, bulb onion, shallot, carrot, potato, animal commodities.	Added to the periodic review schedule at CCPR54 and the JMPR assessment commenced in 2024. In March 2025 in response to the Circular Letter, the Manufacturer committed to supply additional data to allow for the JMPR assessment to continue in 2026 and requested that the MRLs remain under the 4-year rule.	1976, 1996T, 1998R	1996	0.3, 1996	N/A
2025	Captan (07)	Captan (07)	Adama / UPL (co-sponsors)	Tree nuts, berries and other small fruits (blueberries, currants, gooseberries, raspberries, blackberries, dewberries, loganberries), strawberries, grapes, stone fruits (apricot, cherries, peach, nectarine, plums), pome fruits, citrus fruits, persimmon, potato, carrots, cucurbits edible peel, cucurbits inedible peel, chili peppers, sweet peppers, tomatoes, eggplant, bulb onion, garlic, maize, cotton, cereal grains, rice, rapeseed, soybean, root and rhizome spices	Captan was included on the periodic review schedule for 2025 at CCPR55 in 2024. At CCPR56, the JMPR confirmed that it had not commenced the review of captan in 2025 and requested that it be rescheduled for 2026. The Sponsor confirmed support for this periodic review and that data will be available for JMPR to review in 2026.	1963, 1995T, 2000R, 2007T (ARfD)	1995	0-0.1, 1995	0.3, 2007

2026 - NEW USES AND OTHER EVALUATIONS									
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA		COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ				
2026	28/11/2017	NA	Fluopyram (243)	Yes	Yes	Avocado, Kiwi fruit, Strawberry	Avocado (4-8), kiwi fruit (4 10), strawberry (51 + 5 processing)	Bayer AG	On 29 April Bayer requested that pomegranate, guava, avocado, dragon fruit and kiwi be moved from 2025 to 2026. On 11 March 2025, the Sponsor requested that pomegranate, dragon fruit and guava be moved from 2026 to 2028, and requested that strawberry be added to the 2026 list. On 5 August 2025, the sponsor updated the number of trials that are available. Among the residue trials for strawberry, 28 were already evaluated by JMPR in 2010 but were not used to set a strawberry codex MRL since the Spray application label was not considered and only the Drip application label was followed to set a CXL at 0.4 mg/kg.
2026	9/09/2026	NA		Yes	Yes	Subgroup Herbs (HH 2095), Subgroup dried herbs (DH 2095), Subgroup of spices seeds (HS 0190), Subgroup Peas succulent (VP 0064), Subgroup Beans with pods (VP 2060), Subgroup of succulent beans without pods (VP 2062), Subgroup Bulb onions (VA 2031), Subgroup Low growing berries (FB 0275)	Extrapolation from Basil (HH 0722), Basil dried (DH 0722), Dill seed (HS 0730), Peas, shelled (VP 0064), Beans with pods (VP 0061), Beans without pods (VP 0062), Garlic (VA 0381) and Garlic (VA 0385), Strawberry (FB 0275)	Minor Use Foundation	The minor use foundation at CCPR56 nominated extrapolations to 8 specified crop subgroups.
2026	26/11/2020	NA	Trifloxystrobin (213)	Yes	Yes	Avocado	Avocado (4)	Bayer AG	Trifloxystrobin was included on the priority list for 2025 for a range of crops however Bayer requested that Dragon fruit be moved to 2026 on 29 April 2024. On 14 November, Bayer also requested that Avocado be moved from ther 2025 list to the 2026 list. On 11 March 2025, the Sponsor requested that dragon fruit be moved from 2026 to 2028. On 16 May 2025, the USA advised that the Minor Use Foundation and IR-4 will be coordinating the submission by the Manufacturer for the additional use on Onion for this compound that was already on the 2026 priority list. On 5 August 2025, the Sponsor requested that bulb onions and green onions be moved from 2026 to 2028.
2026	4/09/2025	NA		Yes	Yes	Cumin	Cumin (monitoring data)	India	In PR56/CRD19, India nominated cumin for imidacloprid and trifloxystrobin based on national approval and monitoring data
2026	9/09/2026	NA		Yes	Yes	Subgroup Eggplants (VO 2046), Subgroup Dry beans (VD 2065), Subgroup Dry peas (VD 2066), Subgroup tuberous and corm veg (VR 2071), Subgroup tomatoes (VO 2045)	Extrapolation from Eggplant (VO 0440), Bean dry (VD 0071), Peas dry (VD 0072), Lentil dry (VD0533), Potato (VR 0589), Tomato (VO 0448)	Minor Use Foundation	The minor use foundation in PR56/CRD26 nominated extrapolations to specified pulse subgroups. The requested list of extrapolations was later expanded to include a total of 5 crop subgroups.
2026	25/11/2021	NA	Florypicoxamid (332)	Yes	Yes	Cherry, peach/nectarine, plum, avocado, tree nut , broccoli, carrot, onion, potato/sweet-potato, radish, pome fruits, blueberries , hops, herbs , barley, dry beans, peas, cotton, garden beet, lettuce, peas	Cherry (23), Peach (17), Plum (8), Avocado (8), tree nut (21), cabbage (8), broccoli (15), tea (8), carrot (16), Coffee (8), Onion (24), Citrus (19), Cotton (8), Potato (29), barley, dry beans, peas	Corteva / USA	Fungicide for 2023 schedule; Crops here postponed to JMPR 2025 review of New Uses. Advised 25 November 2021. On 25 August 2023, updated 29 August 2023, additional commodities added. Label expected Q1 2024. Avocado has an approved label. On 18 December 2023, manufacturer advised that labels would be delayed to Q3, 2024, requested move to 2026. On 27 May 2024, Corteva requested that barley, dry beans and peas be added but the number of trials for those crops was to be confirmed. On 20 August 2025, the sponsor updated the list of commodities to keep cherry, peach, broccoli, carrot, onion, potato/sweet potato, hops, barley, dry beans, peas, add cotton, garden beet, lettuce, nectarine (covered by peach).
2026	13/07/2022	NA	Metalaxyl (138)/Metalaxyl-M (212)	Yes	Yes	Limes (FC 0205), Mandarin subgroup (FC 0003), Oranges subgroup (FC 0004), Pummelos subgroup (FC 0005), Fruiting Vegetables, Cucurbits group (VC 0045); Tomato (VO 0448), subgroup Pepper and pepper like commodities (VO 0051), subgroup Eggplant and Eggplant like commodities (VO 2046), subgroup Root Vegetables (except carrot) (VR 2070); Carrot (VR 0577), potato (VR 0589), Hops, dry (DH 1100); Avocado (FI 0326); Cacao Bean (SB 0715), Peppers Chili dried (HS 0444)	lemon (8), mandarin (8), orange (8), grapefruit (8), cucumber (9), melon (8), zucchini (5), tomato (8), pepper (8), carrot (8), radish (4), sugar beet (8), potato (8), cacao bean (8), avocado (4), hops (4)	Syngenta	Moved to from the periodic review list as there was a recent periodic review. CCPR53 in 2022 agreed to consider specific crops (not supported in the periodic review) under the 4 year rule. On 24 March 2025, the Sponsor updated the commodities and provided details on the residue trials which are available.
2026		NA		No	Yes	Cardamom	Monitoring data for black pepper	India	On 28 November 2024 in the eWG, India nominated cardamom and stated that 'label approval of metalaxyl on cardamom in India is under process'. In PR56/CRD19, India confirmed that metalaxyl has approved label claim for use on black pepper which belongs to the same crop subgroup as cardamom (028B Spices, fruit or berry).

2026 - NEW USES AND OTHER EVALUATIONS									
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA		COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ				
2026	22/12/2022	NA	Spiropidion (323)	Yes	Yes	Subgroup Oranges (sweet and sour) FC 0004, Subgroup Lemons and Limes FC 0002, Subgroup Pummelos FC 0005, Pome fruits (FP 0009), Subgroup Small Fruit Vine Climbing FB 2008, cotton seed (SO 0691), coffee (SB 0716), Subgroup leafy green VL 2050, Subgroup Brassica leafy vegetables VL 0054, Subgroup Head Brassicas VB 2036, Subgroup Flowerhead Brassicas VB0042, Subgroup VO 2046 Eggplant and eggplant-like commodities, Papaya (FI 0350)	Citrus fruit group (26), apple (16), pear (8), grape (18), cotton seed (15), coffee (12), Broccoli (8), Brussels sprout (5), Cauliflower (8), Eggplant (4), Tomato (16), Mustard green (4), Spinach (9), Cucumber (9), Summer squash (8), Cabbage head (8), Lettuce head (8), Lettuce leaf (8) Papaya (5)	Syngenta	Proof of registration submitted via EWG on 22/12/2022 for apple and pear. On 27 April 2023, commodities and residue trials updated by manufacturer. On 24 March 2025, the Sponsor updated the commodities and provided the residue trials which are available. On August 20 2025, the Sponsor removed avocado and confirmed the number of trials for papaya.
2026	22/12/2022	YES	Oxathiaprolin	Yes	Yes	Cacao (SB 0715), Ginseng root, Pomegranate, Strawberry	Cacao (8), Ginseng (4), pomegranate (4 + 1 processing), Strawberry (8)	Syngenta	Proof of registration submitted via EWG on 22/12/2022. On 27 April 2023, commodities and residue trials updated by manufacturer. On 7 March 2024, manufacturer updated commodity, trial information. On 28 May 2024, the manufacturer requested that the oxathiaprolin nomination be moved to 2026. On 16 May 2025, the USA advised that the Minor Use Foundation and IR-4 will be coordinating the submission by the Manufacturer for the additional uses on ginseng root and pomegranate for this compound that was already on the 2026 priority list. On August 20 2025, the Sponsor added strawberry.
2026	16/11/2023	NA	Cyclobutrifluram	Yes	Yes	Soybean (VD 0541), Potato (VR 0589), Tomato (VO 0448), cucumber (VC 0524), zucchini (VC 0431), melon (VC 2040), maize (GC 0645), Chayote (VC 0423), watermelon (VC 0432), pumpkin (VC 0429), coffee (SB 0716)	Soybean (4), potato (18), tomato (7), cucumber (10), zucchini (5), melon (8), maize (8), coffee (8) Field Rotational Crop Studies: strawberry (8), Broccoli (4), cabbage (4), lettuce (4), cucumber (4), carrot (8), radish (4), sugar beet (16), potato (12), soybean (10), bean (10), pea (10), celery (4), corn (10), wheat (10), sorghum (6), rice (8), canola (6), sunflower (6), grass (6), alfalfa (4), clover (4)	Syngenta	Manufacturer provided approved labels via EWG 16 November 2023 for tomato and potato. On 24 March 2025, the Sponsor updated the commodities and provided details on the residue trials which are available.
2026	23/11/2023	NA	Flupyradifurone (285)	Yes	Yes	Tea, Tomato, Date	Tea (8 + 2 processing), Tomato (8 + 2 processing), Date (5)	Bayer AG	Tea was included on the priority list for 2025 however Bayer requested that Tea be moved to 2026 and that tomato and date be added for 2026 on 29 April 2024. In response to CL 2024/89-PR, Saudi Arabia commented that flupyradifurone's metabolite Difluoroacetic acid (DFA) should be evaluated along side the parent compound.
2026	6/06/2024	NA		YES	YES	Eggplant (subgroup)	Extrapolation	Minor Use Foundation	Following the discussion of Agenda Item 13 and CX/PR 24/55/12 which was presented by GCP at CCPR55, the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup) was added to the existing nomination for this compound.
2026	9/09/2025	NA		Yes	Yes	Subgroup Dry Beans (VD2065), Subgroup Dry Peas (VD2066), Subgroup tuberous and corn veg (VR 2071), Subgroup eggplants (VO2046)	Extrapolation from Bean dry (VD0071) and Peas dry (VD0072), Potato (VR0589) and Sweet potato (VR0508), Peppers subgroup (VO0051)	Minor Use Foundation	The minor use foundation in PR56/CRD26 nominated extrapolations to specified pulse subgroups. The requested list of extrapolations was later expanded to include a total of 4 crop subgroups.
2026	8/12/2023	NA	Fluoxapiprolin (999)	Yes	Yes	Grapes, Lettuce, Spinach, Mustard green, Cauliflower, Cabbage, Broccoli, Summer squash, Muskmelon, Cucumber, Bell pepper, Non-bell pepper, Celery, Kohlrabi, Kale, Cocoa	Grape (16 + 2 processing), Lettuce (27), Spinach (15 trials), Mustard green (8 trials), Cauliflower (11 trials), Cabbage (16 trials), Broccoli (16 trials), Summer squash (12 trials), Muskmelon (13 trials), Cucumber (15 trials), Bell pepper (12 trials), Non-bell pepper (4 trials), Celery (12 trials), Kohlrabi (6 trials), Kale (8 trials), Cocoa (8 + 2 processing)	Bayer AG	On 27 April 2023, nominated by manufacturer for new uses via portal. On 8 December 2023, label provided on portal for grapes, registered in Australia. On 11 March 2025, the Sponsor requested that pineapple be moved to 2027 and that lettuce, Spinach, Mustard green, Cauliflower, Cabbage, Summer squash, Muskmelon, Cucumber, Bell pepper, Non-bell pepper, Celery, Kohlrabi and Kale be added to the 2026 list. On 16 May 2025, the Sponsor requested that cocoa be added to the 2026 list.
2026	18/12/2023	NA	Fluazindolizine (327)	Yes	Yes	GRAPES, STRAWBERRY, TREE NUTS, CHERRY	Grape (13), Grape processing (3), Strawberry (9); Almond (6), Pecan (6), Cherry (9)	USA/Corteva	Requested by USA 01 December 2020; registration expected in US in Q2 2023. On 18 December 2023, manufacturer advised that registration on citrus crops, peach, plum delayed to Q4, 2025. On 27 May 2024, Corteva confirmed that data will be available to submit grapes, strawberry, tree nuts, cherry for 2025 review. On 20 August 2025, the sponsor confirmed that the dossier will be available to submit in 2025 for JMPR review in 2026.
2026	18/12/2023	NA	Sulfoxaflor (252)	Yes	Yes	KIWI, TEA, PISTACHIO, PASSION FRUIT, PINEAPPLE	Kiwi fruit (6 trials), Tea (8 trials + 4 processing), Pistachio (6 trials + processing), Passion fruit (5 trials), Pineapple (14)	Corteva	Nominated by Corteva to eWG portal on 28 April 2022. On 18 December 2023, manufacturer provided label. On 27 May 2024, Corteva requested that hops and passionfruit be removed from this nomination. On 20 August 2025, the sponsor requested that blueberry be removed and passion fruit be added. The sponsor also confirmed that the dossier would be ready to submit in 2025 for JMPR review in 2026. During CCPR56, the Sponsor nominated pineapple as an additional crop.
2026	9/09/2026	NA		Yes	Yes	Subgroup Dry Beans (VD2065)	Extrapolation from Bean dry (VD0071)	Minor Use Foundation	The minor use foundation in PR56/CRD26 nominated extrapolation to the Dry Bean subgroup.

2026 - NEW USES AND OTHER EVALUATIONS									
PRIORITY	DATE STAMP	TOXICOLOGY	RESIDUE	PRIORITISATION CRITERIA		COMMODITIES	RESIDUE TRIALS	MEMBER / MANUFACTURER	COMMENTS
				REGISTERED	MRLS > LOQ				
2026	5/04/2024	NA	Fosetyl-Al (302)	Yes	Yes	Mango, Potato	Mango (7 trials), Potato (8 + 2 processing)	Bayer AG	Nominated by Bayer 25 April 2022. On 16 May 2025, the Sponsor requested that potato be added to the 2026 list.
2026	5/04/2024	NA	Isotianil (999)	Yes	Yes	Mango, Tomato, Bell pepper, Chili pepper, Potato, Cucumber, Melon, Squash	Mango (5 trials), Tomato (20 + 2 processing), Bell pepper (16 trials), Chili pepper (7 trials), Potato (20 + 2 proc), Cucumber (20 trials), Melon (20 trials), Squash (20 trials)	Bayer AG	Nominated by Bayer 25 April 2022. On 11 March 2025, the sponsor requested that Tomato, Bell pepper, Chili pepper, Potato, Cucumber, Melon, Squash be added and provided proof of registration for the additional crops and the number of trials for these additional crops was provided on 21 May 2025.
2026	14/11/2024	NA	Bixafen (262)	Yes	Yes	Apple, Banana, Coffee, Grape,	Apple (10+2 processing), Banana (14), Coffee (14+2 processing), Grape (9+4 processing)	Bayer AG	On 27 April 2023, nominated by manufacturer for new uses via portal. Bayer added orange to the nomination on 29 April 2024. Evidence of Brazilian registration provided 14 November 2024. Sponsor requested that orange and peanut be removed from the 2026 evaluation on 11 March 2025.
2026	24/10/2023	NA	Phosphonic acid (301)	Yes	Yes	Avocado	Avocado (6 trials)	Nulandis/AECI Limited, South Africa	On 30 September 2023, South Africa nominated a review of MRL in Avocado via personal message in EWG portal.
2026	8/12/2023	NA	Glyphosate (158)	Yes	Yes	TREE NUTS	Tree nuts (8)	Bayer AG	On 25 April 2022, manufacturer requested move to 2025. On 27 April 2023, commodities and residue trials updated by manufacturer. On 8 December 2023, label provided on portal for coffee, registered in Kenya. Bayer requested that Tea be deleted and tree nuts be added on 29 April 2024. On 11 March 2025, the Sponsor requested that Coffee be removed from this list.
2026	8/12/2023	NA	Tetraniliprole (324)	Yes	Yes	TEA	Tea (8 trials + 2 processing)	Bayer AG	On 27 April 2023, nominated by manufacturer for new uses via portal. On 8 December 2023, label provided on portal for tea, registered in Japan.
2026	5/12/2024	NA	Flutriafol (248)	No	Yes	Rice, Hops	Rice (9), Hops (5 + 2 processing)	USA/FMC	USA label is expected by 1Q2022. On 2 April 2022, FMC requested deferral to 2024, awaiting US registration of new uses at the end of 2023. On 16 September 2023, FMC requested move from 2025 to 2026. On 28 November 2024, the Sponsor requested that Rice and Olive fruits be added to this nomination. On 5 December 2025, the sponsor also requested that hops, rotational crops, tuberos and corm vegetables, Grasses for sugar production and root vegetables be added to the priority list. A label for hops and rice was provided while registration for the other crops was expected by the end of 2024. On 16 May 2025, the USA advised that the Minor Use Foundation and IR-4 will be coordinating the submission by the Manufacturer for the additional uses on Olives and Hops for this compound that was already on the 2026 priority list. Due to a label delay for many of the nominated crops, the sponsor requested that all crops except for rice and hops be moved to 2029 on 21 August 2025.
2026	6/06/2024	NA		YES	YES	Eggplant (subgroup)	Extrapolation	Minor Use Foundation	Fol+A4-J29 following the discussion of Agenda Item 13 and CX/PR 24/55/12 which was presented by GCP at CCPR55, and a follow up enquiry in March 2025, the additional commodity of eggplant (subgroup), was added to the existing nomination for this compound.
2026	27/03/2024	NA	Fludioxonil (211)	Yes	Yes	Welsh onion	Welsh onion (6+8 processing)	Republic of Korea	Nomination provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2026	27/03/2024	NA	Etofenprox (184)	Yes	Yes	Welsh onion	Welsh onion (6+8 processing)	Republic of Korea	Nomination provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2026	27/03/2024	NA	Tebuconazole (196)	Yes	Yes	Welsh onion	Welsh onion (6+8 processing)	Republic of Korea	Nomination provided on EWG portal on 27 March 2024.
2026 RESERVE	6/06/2024	NA	Chlorantraniliprole (230)	Yes	Yes	Thai eggplant, Durian	Thai eggplant (5), Durian (6)	Thailand	Nominated by Thailand at CCPR55 with reference to CRD13