



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

56th Session

Santiago, Chile

8-13 September 2025

MATTERS REFERRED TO CCPR BY CAC AND/OR OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES

(Prepared by the Codex Secretariat)

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND ITS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MATTERS FOR INFORMATION

Specific matters

Standards and related texts adopted at Steps 5, 5/8 or 8 including consequential amendment

1. The 47th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC47, 2024) adopted¹:
 - Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) at Step 5/8.
 - Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage at Step 5.
 - Additional consequential amendments to the Codex MRLs for the peppers group/subgroup to provide MRLs for okra, martynia, and roselle.
 - Consequential amendment to include a new commodity and associated commodity code in Class D— Processed Foods of Plant Origin of the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989).

Approval of new work

2. CAC47 approved new work on the Priority list of pesticides for evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR).²

Revocation

3. CAC47 approved the revocation of MRLs (CXLs) for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) as proposed by CCPR55.³

Discontinuation of work

4. CAC47 approved discontinuation of work on MRLs for different combinations of pesticides/commodity(ies) in the Step Procedure as proposed by CCPR55 (2024).⁴

Other issues related to the work of CCPR

Management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review.

5. CAC47 encouraged Members and Observers to submit and share data to facilitate JMPR's periodic review of compounds without public health concerns.⁵
6. CCPR56 will consider this matter under Agenda item 8.1.

¹ REP24/CAC47, para 97, Appendices II, III and VII

² REP24/CAC47 para 169(i), Appendix V

³ REP24/CAC47, para 98, Appendix IV

⁴ REP24/CAC47, para 99, Appendix VI

⁵ REP24/CAC47, para 100

Coordination of work between CCPR and the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF)

7. CAC47 endorsed the recommendation of CCEXEC87 to explore the scheduling of a virtual session of CCPR and CCRVDF to consider the recommendations of the virtual meeting of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF Electronic Working Group (EWG), noting that this would be the first time such an arrangement was made and might be used in the future to address common issues involving different Codex committees.⁶
8. CCPR56 will consider this matter under Agenda item 11.

Provision of scientific advice to CCPRAlignment of methodologies on dietary exposure assessment

9. CCEXEC87 highlighted the importance of FAO and WHO in providing scientific advice on pesticides to Codex. The Committee stressed the pivotal role of these organizations in supporting JMPR to provide the scientific basis for the establishment of MRLs for CCPR. The Committee also encouraged FAO and WHO to facilitate the resolution by JMPR of its continuing discussions about exposure assessment and to communicate its conclusions promptly, as requested by CCPR. CAC47 endorsed these recommendations.⁷

Status and availability of the 2024 JMPR report

10. CCEXEC87 (2024) had an exchange of views on the timely availability of FAO and WHO monographs and encouraged the parent organizations to continue prioritizing timely publication efforts. CAC47 endorsed this recommendation.⁸
11. CCEXEC88 (2025) noted concerns with the exceptionally late publication of the 2024 JMPR report, which had led to the postponement of CCPR56 from May 2025 to September 2025, which also resulted in limited time for Members to prepare for CCPR56. The Committee requested FAO and WHO to ensure the timely publication of future JMPR reports.⁹
12. CCPR56 will consider matters related to FAO and WHO provision of scientific advice to CCPR, including the timely availability of JMPR publications under Agenda item 5.1.

General mattersThe model for future Codex work

13. CCEXEC86 (2024)¹⁰:
 - noted that, as the format of meetings continues to evolve, the Model for future Codex work¹¹ should be retained as a reference document, and periodic updates on the evolution of working mechanisms and identification of any challenges encountered that may require further consideration by CCEXEC, CAC, or the Codex Committee on General Principles (CCGP) should be provided through a working document prepared by the Codex Secretariat;
 - noted the importance of working groups in progressing the work of Codex between sessions, and recommended that the Codex Secretariat provide clarity on the use of virtual tools therein, including a clear distinction between virtual working group meetings and webinars, which should then be established and consistently applied;
 - encouraged more Members to take leadership roles in committee working groups to ensure their sustainability and inclusiveness, while recognizing the challenges these Members may face, and further encouraged the Codex Secretariat and experienced working group chairs to proactively seek engagement of other Members and provide guidance and support; and
 - reminded Codex committees of the importance of good work management practices and prioritization of work to avoid excessive establishment of EWGs and the related burden on all concerned and ensure that agenda items can be adequately discussed within the available plenary session time.

Guidelines for new work proposals

14. CCEXEC87 (2024) welcomed the Codex Secretariat's plans to develop practical guidelines for Members on the development of new work proposals and proposed that¹²:

⁶ REP24/EXEC87, para 49; REP24/CAC47 paras 22(i), 131

⁷ REP24/EXEC87, para 34; REP24/CAC47 paras 16, 22(i)

⁸ REP24/EXEC87, paras 14-22, 23(i); REP24/CAC47 para 22(i)

⁹ REP25/EXEC88 paras 95-96

¹⁰ REP24/EXEC86, para 61

¹¹ CX/EXEC 24/86/3

¹² REP24/EXEC87, para 82(ii)

- the guidelines should encourage the development of group commodity standards and the drafting of commodity standards to facilitate future enlargement of their scope by adding similar products, and a review of standards that may have been developed by other organizations for commodities for which there is established international trade; and
- the Codex Secretariat engages with Members through the forthcoming FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees to build awareness of the development of these guidelines and the Handbook on EWGs and seek input on issues that Members would wish to see included in these guidelines.

Codex EWGs handbook

15. CCEXEC73 (2017) recognised the need for practical guidance for all participants involved throughout the EWG lifecycle and recommended that the Codex Secretariat develop practical guidance for EWGs.¹³
16. The practical guidance for EWGs has been published as the *Codex electronic working groups handbook*.¹⁴ CAC47 welcomed its publication and encouraged its use.¹⁵

Codex Strategic Plan 2026-2031

17. CAC47 adopted the Codex Strategic Plan 2026-2031¹⁶.
18. A monitoring framework was presented by the Codex Secretariat at CCEXEC88 (2025) for review. CCEXEC88 agreed on the monitoring framework with revisions. The Committee noted that comments on the revised version would be sought from Members and Observers through a circular letter (CL) to be considered by CCEXEC89 (2025) and submitted to CAC48 (2025) for approval. The monitoring framework for the Codex Strategic Plan 2026-2031 will be reviewed biennially and further discussed, with submission for approval by CAC48.¹⁷

Monitoring the use and impact of Codex texts

19. CAC47 recalled the ongoing work on building a mechanism to monitor the use and impact of Codex texts, including an annual survey, case studies, and collaboration with the World Trade Organization (WTO), and thanked Members for participating in the 2024 Codex survey.¹⁸
20. The reports of the Codex survey 2023 on the use and impact of Codex texts, and the use and implementation of Codex, the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), and the World Organisation for Animal Health (WOAH) standards¹⁹ have been published online.²⁰

¹³ REP17/EXEC73, paras 88 and 91(i)

¹⁴ <https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/aee7614e-d630-4665-a98c-74adcc4d3040>

¹⁵ REP24/CAC47, para 22(ii)

¹⁶ REP24/CAC47, Appendix IX

¹⁷ REP25/EXEC88 paras 82 (i-ii), 82 (iv) and Appendix II

¹⁸ REP24/CAC47, para 209

¹⁹ <https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/d93faf09-2ecd-4ee5-89e7-d39412baaf7c>

²⁰ <https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/e57dc773-117b-4a37-aa70-2cdb8b3339c2>

MATTERS ARISING FROM OTHER SUBSIDIARY BODIES

MATTERS FOR INFORMATION**Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF)**Environmental inhibitors

21. CCRVDF27 (2024) agreed to include bromoform, an environmental inhibitor compound, for ruminant tissues and milk in the priority list for evaluation by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA). In addition, at CAC47, Members welcomed FAO's work on food safety implications of the use of environmental inhibitors in agrifood systems, which provided valuable information on possible food safety and regulatory aspects of these inhibitors and provided a good basis on which to advance discussions on this topic. Strong support for ongoing activities on this topic was expressed (See also Agenda item 4a).²¹

Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS)Information document for the Guidelines on sampling (CXG 50-2004)

22. CCMAS39 (2018) agreed to revise the *Guidelines on sampling* (CXG 50-2004) as the Guidelines were difficult to understand, thus a revision was necessary to simplify and make it more readable and understandable. The revised Guidelines aim to assist those responsible for selecting statistical sampling plans that are suitable for inspections under specifications established by Codex standards. CCMAS42 (2023) finalized the revision of the Guidelines that were subsequently adopted by CAC46 (2023).²²
23. The revised Guidelines are accompanied by a supporting information document, namely the e-book and sampling plan apps, which have been developed to support their implementation. CCMAS44 (2025) agreed to inform all Codex committees that the "Information document for the *Guidelines on sampling* (CXG 50-2004)" will be published on the Codex website²³.

Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food (CCCF)Evaluation of ethylene oxide (EtO) and 2-chloroethanol (2-CE)

24. CCCF18 agreed to retain these compounds in its priority list for evaluation by JECFA. The JECFA Secretariat informed the Committee that FAO and WHO would jointly determine what could be accomplished from the overall work program, considering available resources, the suitability of experts, and existing data, and would report to CCCF19 accordingly.²⁴

MATTERS FOR ACTION**Codex Committee on General Principles (CCGP)**Codex Procedural Manual: Review of inconsistencies in language and superseded content

25. The Codex Secretariat informed CCGP32 (2021) about developing a digital, user-friendly Procedural Manual to ensure up-to-date content and easy search, while retaining a downloadable PDF format. Codex members welcomed this and emphasized the inclusion of all relevant guidance and decisions approved by the Commission. The Committee noted that the Secretariat would consider changes to enhance consistency and clarity, and the printable PDF version would remain available for download.²⁵
26. The Codex Secretariat presented the new format and observations on language inconsistencies and outdated content to CCGP33 (2023). The project initially focused on digitizing the Procedural Manual, but several editorial and formatting inconsistencies needed to be addressed first. The Secretariat listed changes to improve the Procedural Manual for CCGP's review. Such changes did not relate to a substantive review, but to an ongoing identification of outdated content. Future changes involving the identification of outdated content will be submitted for consideration by future CCGP sessions.
27. CCGP33 agreed with the Codex Secretariat's proposed changes and to seek CAC46 (2023) approval to issue a CL to solicit proposals from Codex members on language inconsistencies and outdated content in the Procedural Manual for future CAC consideration and possible referral to CCGP. CAC46 concurred with this request.²⁶

²¹ REP24/RVDF27 paras 137-138; REP24/CAC47 para 225

²² REP18/MAS39, paras 62, 63, 71; REP23/MAS43, para 81(i); REP23/CAC46, 92(ii) and Appendix II

²³ REP25/MAS44, para 100 (i-ii)

²⁴ REP25/CF18 paras 175-177

²⁵ REP21/GP32, paras 30, 42, 43(v)

²⁶ REP23/GP33 paras 20, 22, 33, 36(ii-iii); REP23/CAC46 paras 20, 115(iii)

28. CCGP34 (2025) reviewed the replies to CL 2024/27-GP on language inconsistencies and outdated content in the Procedural Manual. Members emphasized the need for Section 4.8 (Risk Analysis Principles by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues) to be clear and consistent with Section 2 (Elaboration of Codex standards and related texts). The Committee agreed that CCPR should review the comments and, therefore, forward the comments related to Section 4.8 to CCPR for their consideration.²⁷
29. Comments²⁸ from Members in response to CL 2024/27-GP on language inconsistencies and outdated content in Section 4.8 of the Procedural Manual are presented in Part 1 of Appendix I. The Codex Secretariat assessed these comments²⁹ and suggested follow-up actions, which are presented in Part 2. Specific comments³⁰ to this assessment are reproduced in Part 3. Other comments³¹ submitted to CCGP34 on Section 4.8 were of a general nature and supported efforts to ensure consistent language and updated content, but did not provide specific revisions. CCPR56 will consider those specific comments proposing revisions to the text in Section 4.8, including the Secretariat's evaluations. The amendments aim to enhance language consistency across Section 4.8 and remove or update outdated content without altering the provisions in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR.
30. In addressing the request from CCGP34, CCPR56 should focus its consideration on ensuring consistency in the wording of the Risk Analysis Principles, rather than undertaking a substantive revision or comprehensive overhaul of the principles themselves. It is important to note that the intent is to address the editorial proposals contained in the Appendix during the session. Therefore, no additional circular letters are required to solicit further comments or input on this matter.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENDORSEMENT BY CCPR

31. CCPR56 is invited to:
- (i) note the matters for information arising from CAC, CCEXEC relevant to the work of CCPR, and other subsidiary bodies, i.e., CCCF on prioritization of EtO and 2-CE for evaluation by JECFA, CCMAS on the revised Guidelines on Sampling (CXG 50-2004) and their apps (e-book), and CCRVDF on work on EIs;
 - (ii) note that other recommendations arising from CAC and/or CCEXEC about provision of scientific advice to CCPR unsupported compounds, and coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF will be considered under the relevant agenda items (i.e., Agenda items 5a, 8.1, and 11, respectively);
 - (iii) encourage:
 - (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) consider the request of CCGP34 in paragraph 28 per the comments found in Appendix I and, considering the clarification provided in paragraphs 29-30, agree on changes to Section 4.8 as appropriate.

²⁷ REP25/GP34 para 43(v)

²⁸ CX/CAC 24/47/2-Add.1

²⁹ CX/GP 25/34/5, Appendix I, Table 6

³⁰ GP34/CRD06 (EU)

³¹ GP34/CRD06 (Thailand); GP34/CRD15 (Uganda); GP34/CRD16 (El Salvador); GP34/CRD19 (African Union); GP34/CRD21 (Ghana); GP34/CRD22 (Burundi)

APPENDIX I**Original language only**

Part 1: Comments in reply to CL 2024/27-GP
relevant to Section 4.8 “Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues” as contained in
CX/CAC 24/47/2 Add.1
(For consideration by CCPR)

Comments by Member States of the European Union (MSEU) and the United States of America (USA)

| COMMENT | MEMBER/OBSERVER |
|--|-----------------|
| Is there any content of the PM, apart from in Section 3, that you consider superseded and that would need a review, and why? | |
| Section 4 RISK ANALYSIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (page 127) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paras 219-224- The priority list now has a rolling submission and does not follow the prescribed dates necessarily. The Priorities EWG invitation also does not wait until after the CAC to be issued. (Codex Secretariat’s note: See Appendix I, Part 2 of this document.) Para 246- JMPR report is not always available by February. (Codex Secretariat’s note: See Appendix I, Part 2 of this document.) | USA |
| See Table 1. | EU |

Table 1: Comments of the Member states of the European Union (MSEU) received in reply to CL 2024/27-GP

| Section | Sub-section | Page Number (English version) | Paragraph | Current text | Proposed change | Rationale |
|---|---|----------------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Question a) Have you identified any language inconsistencies or translation errors in the PM? If so, can you be as specific as possible on the location of the inconsistency and its nature, and which language it concerns? | | | | | | |
| Section 4 Risk analysis | Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues | 127 - 140 | 166 - 253 | the CAC | the CAC <u>Commission</u> | |
| | | 127 - 141 | 167 - 265 | the JMPR | the JMPR | Unless “JMPR” is used as a qualifier (e.g. “ <i>the JMPR risk assessment</i> ”). |

| Section | Sub-section | Page Number (English version) | Paragraph | Current text | Proposed change | Rationale |
|---------|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|
| | | 127 - 142 | 167 - 268 | the CCPR | the CCPR | Unless “CCPR” is used as a qualifier (e.g. “ <i>the CCPR session</i> ”). |
| | | 127 | 167 | in consultation with the JMPR joint secretaries | in consultation with the JMPR joint secretaries Secretariat | Harmonization of wording. |
| | | 128 | 168 | estimating an ADI and an ARfD | estimating an <u>admissible daily intake (ADI)</u> and an <u>acute reference dose (ARfD)</u> | |
| | | 128 | 169 | The FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment considers data on registered use patterns, 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 pesticide in food and feed. | The FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment considers data on registered use patterns, fate of residues, animal and plant metabolism, analytical methodology, <u>environmental studies as necessary or requested by risk managers</u> , and residue data derived from supervised residue trials in order to propose residue definitions and maximum residues levels for the pesticide in food and feed. | JMPR often looks to environmental data, e.g. in case of rotational crop studies to make use of Dt50 values. |
| | | 129 | 181 | Where the exposure of livestock to pesticides through feeds leads to residues at the LOQ | Where the exposure of livestock to pesticides through feeds leads to residues at the <u>limit of quantification (LOQ)</u> | |
| | | 129 | 182 | recommended by JMPR or the JECFA | recommended by JMPR or the <u>Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives</u> JECFA. | This acronym is not used in the rest of this section. |
| | | 132 | 207 | submit these data to the WHO | submit these data to the WHO | |

| Section | Sub-section | Page Number (English version) | Paragraph | Current text | Proposed change | Rationale |
|---------|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | 133 | 216 | requests the re-establishment of the EWG on priorities | requests the re-establishment of the <u>electronic working group (EWG)</u> on priorities | |
| | | 135 | 226 | c) commitment by the Member/Observer to provide supporting data for revcew with a firm date for data submission; | c) commitment by the Member/Observer to provide supporting data for revcew <u>review</u> with a firm date for data submission; | Typo |
| | | 137 | 240(c) | the availability of current labels (authorized GAP) | the availability of current labels (authorized <u>authorized</u> GAP) | Typo |
| | | 138 | 244 | the JMPR Joint Secretariat | the JMPR Joint Secretariat | Harmonization of wording. |
| | | 140 | 261 | the JMPR Secretaries | the JMPR Secretaries <u>Secretariat</u> | |

| Section | Sub-section | Page Number (English version) | Paragraph | Current text | Proposed change | Rationale |
|---|---|----------------------------------|-----------|---|---|--|
| Question b) Is there any content of the PM, apart from in Section 3, that you consider superseded and that would need a review, and why? | | | | | | |
| Section 4 Risk analysis | Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues | 133 | 218 | <p>The schedules and priority lists are provided in the following tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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. | <p>The schedules and priority lists are provided in the following tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 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. f) <u>Table 5 –Unsupported compounds</u> (Codex Secretariat's Note: See Appendix I, Part 2 of this document.) | <p>The management of unsupported compounds is now a recurring item on the CCPR agenda.</p> <p>CCPR54 (2023) notably adopted an information document for the management of unsupported compounds, and the schedules and priority lists for JMPR now include a 5th table dedicated to such compounds.</p> |
| | | 134 | 220 | <p>In early September of each year, the EWG Chair will issue a broadcast email to Members/Observers</p> | <p>In early September of each year, the EWG Chair will issue a broadcast email <u>message</u> to Members/Observers (Codex Secretariat's Note: See Appendix I, Part 2 of this document.)</p> | <p>The EWG on priorities operates on the EWG forum. As such, the request for new compounds is not done anymore by an email. The word message is inclusive of all types of communication.</p> |

**Part 2: Assessment of some comments provided in reply to CL 2024/23-GP by the Codex Secretariat
as contained in CX/GP 25/34/5, Appendix I, Table 6
(For consideration by CCPR)**

Table 6: 4.8 Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

| Location | Nature of comment received | Analysis and/or proposed follow-up |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Paragraph 218 | Add a new item (f) to the list: f) Table 5 – Unsupported compounds | These principles were developed by the CCPR and adopted by CAC. Therefore, any proposals for substantive changes need to be brought to the attention of CCPR. The purpose of this exercise was to address inconsistencies and superseded content, and this goes beyond that mandate. |
| Paragraphs 219-224 | The priority list now has a rolling submission and does not follow the prescribed dates necessarily and that the EWG invitation also does not wait until after the CAC to be issued. | These dates are considered indicative and such flexibility has so far not impacted negatively on the work of CCPR, nor have concerns been expressed by Codex Members at CCPR. Therefore, it is proposed to retain the text as is and, if needed, concerns may be brought to the attention of CCPR. |
| Paragraph 220 | Remove struck through text, add bold text: “In early September of each year, the EWG Chair will issue a broadcast email message to Members/Observers...” | It is proposed to retain the text as is as an email is issued by the EWG chair to all Members/Observers. |
| Paragraph 246 | The JMPR report is not always available by February. | These dates are indicative of when the JMPR report is needed, and some degree of flexibility is required: The JMPR report is usually available between December and January. Therefore, it is proposed to retain the text as is. |

**Part 3: Additional specific comments submitted to CCGP34
relevant to Section 4.8 “Risk analysis principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues”
as contained in conference room documents (GP34/CRD06)
in reaction to comments provided by the Codex Secretariat in CX/GP 25/34/5, Appendix I, Table 6 (see Part 2)
(For consideration by CCPR)**

Comments by Member States of the European Union (MSEU)

Table 2: Comments of the Member states of the European Union (MSEU) received in CRDs submitted to CCGP34

| Location | Nature of comment received | Analysis and/or proposed follow-up |
|--|--|--|
| Paragraph 218 | Add a new item (f) to the list: f) Table 5 – Unsupported compounds | These principles were developed by the CCPR and adopted by CAC. Therefore, any proposals for substantive changes need to be brought to the attention of CCPR. The purpose of this exercise was to address inconsistencies and superseded content, and this goes beyond that mandate. |
| Paragraphs 219-224 | The priority list now has a rolling submission and does not follow the prescribed dates necessarily and that the EWG invitation also does not wait until after the CAC to be issued. | These dates are considered indicative and such flexibility has so far not impacted negatively on the work of CCPR, nor have concerns been expressed by Codex Members at CCPR. Therefore, it is proposed to retain the text as is and, if needed, concerns may be brought to the attention of CCPR. |
| Paragraph 220 | Remove struck through text, add bold text: “In early September of each year, the EWG Chair will issue a broadcast email message to Members/Observers...” | It is proposed to retain the text as is as an email is issued by the EWG chair to all Members/Observers. |
| Paragraph 246 | The JMPR report is not always available by February. | These dates are indicative of when the JMPR report is needed, and some degree of flexibility is required: The JMPR report is usually available between December and January. Therefore, it is proposed to retain the text as is. |
| <p>The MSEU suggest to forward the proposals above to CCPR for further consideration.</p> <p>As a general comment, the MSEU would stress that that any deviation from the PM should be the exception and not the rule. When flexibility is required, it should be directly provided for in the procedures, not in their implementation.</p> <p>The MSEU suggest that paragraph 246.b should be changed: <u>The JMPR report is available electronically at least three months prior the CCPR session</u></p> | | |