

# 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](mailto:codex@fao.org) - [www.codexalimentarius.org](http://www.codexalimentarius.org)

Agenda item 10

CX/PR 25/56/12

July 2025

## JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

### CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

Fifty-sixth Session  
Santiago, Chile  
September 8 -13, 2025

#### STATUS UPDATE - ENHANCEMENT OF WORK BETWEEN CCPR AND JMPR

(Prepared by the Electronic Working Group chaired by the United States of America  
and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Uganda)

Codex members and observers wishing to submit comments on the recommendations in paragraph 10  
should do so as instructed in CL 2025/45-PR available on the Codex webpage<sup>1</sup>

#### BACKGROUND

1. At the 53<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR53, 2022), concerns were raised that the existing CCPR/JMPR system was insufficient to meet the global demand for evaluating new compounds, uses, and periodic reviews.<sup>2</sup> In response, Codex Members and observer organizations acknowledged the need to strengthen the evaluation system and supported efforts to enhance its effectiveness. However, they recognized that meaningful improvements would require a multidisciplinary approach and engagement with diverse stakeholders. As a result, an electronic working group (EWG) on the enhancement of collaboration between CCPR and JMPR (hereafter referred to as the Enhancement EWG) was established. This discussion paper provides background on the Enhancement EWG and an update on the current terms of reference.<sup>3</sup>
2. Following the establishment of the EWG at CCPR53, the Enhancement EWG-1 first collected information on the need to enhance the operational procedures of CCPR/JMPR and the associated opportunities and challenges. To support this effort, 15 (fifteen) Member countries and 3 (three) observer organizations responded to the circular letter CL 2022/75-PR and provided input on:
  - Opportunities for enhancement (e.g., improvements to existing processes) and major reform (e.g., governance and structural changes);
  - Anticipated challenges in implementing proposed enhancements and major reform;
  - Recommendations on key topics and themes for potential stakeholder workshop; and
  - Any addition proposals and recommendations.
3. This information was incorporated into a discussion paper that summarized responses and highlighted areas of consensus and divergent viewpoints.<sup>4</sup> Following deliberation of the discussion paper, CCPR54 (2023) agreed to<sup>5</sup>:
  - request feedback from JMPR; and
  - re-establish the EWG (Enhancement EWG-2) to explore approaches to identify priorities and develop an implementation timeline.

<sup>1</sup> Codex webpage/Circular Letters:

<https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/resources/circular-letters/en/>.

Codex webpage/CCCF/Circular Letters:

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

<sup>2</sup> [CX/PR 22/53/20](#)

<sup>3</sup> [REP22/PR53](#), paras. 253-259

<sup>4</sup> [CX/PR 23/54/15](#)

<sup>5</sup> [REP23/PR54](#), paras. 260-262

4. The Enhancement EWG-2 then prepared a follow-up discussion paper<sup>6</sup> for CCPR55 (2024). This discussion paper first summarized the guidance provided during the 2023 JMPR Regular Meeting.<sup>7</sup> In particular, JMPR-2023 discussed long-standing issues related to the enhancement of electronic quality of data, improved file naming and timely submission of full dossiers by sponsors. JMPR also called attention to:
- the challenges of the limited evaluation capacity available, as well as the option to engage full-time paid evaluators, with JMPR serving as peer reviewers;
  - the importance of early submission of data, allowing a quality control screen and the early elimination of unsatisfactory dossiers from the assessment process;
  - the focus on submission of only toxicological studies relevant to dietary exposure as a potential mechanism to reduce workload; and
  - concern that meetings are already intensive and long, so any benefits that might result from either lengthening the Meeting or hold additional meetings were considered unlikely to increase output.
5. The Enhancement EWG-2 discussion paper then outlined an approach to enhance the operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR that aimed to balance the shorter-term needs of stakeholders to reduce the backlog of scheduled evaluations with longer-term strategic efforts to increase JMPR's review capacity (See Appendix I). CCPR55 (2024) endorsed this general approach and re-established the EWG (EWG-3) to support shorter-term work over the next three years (2024 – 2026) with the following terms of reference (ToR)<sup>8</sup>:
- Facilitate collaboration with Codex Members and stakeholders to determine if support and resources are available to convene an extraordinary meeting of JMPR. If support is identified, the EWG will collaborate with the EWG on the schedule/priority list to determine the timeline and nomination process. If support is not available, the EWG will seek input on other approaches that CCPR and JMPR could adopt to reduce the backlog of evaluations.
  - Solicit input from Codex Members and stakeholders to get recommendations on targeted projects that may enhance CCPR and JMPR's current evaluation process. As part of this effort, the EWG will seek input on mechanisms to ensure current JMPR resources are used efficiently.
  - Based on (i) and (ii), provide a status update at CCPR56 (2025) and make recommendations on future activities.

### ENHANCEMENT EWG-3 STATUS UPDATE AND CONCLUSIONS

#### **ToR (i): Resources to convene extraordinary meetings of JMPR to reduce the backlog of new use evaluations JMPR**

6. In support ToR (i), the EWG Chair previously indicated that it was exploring how to improve financial and other types of support for the work of JMPR.<sup>9</sup> This included the possibility of convening an extraordinary meeting of JMPR, with a focus on new uses, to reduce the backlog of evaluations and consulting with CCPR and JMPR to identify projects that will improve the evaluation process. Further information on potential enhancement activities is not yet available for deliberation at CCPR56 (2025).

#### **ToR (ii): Resources for targeted projects to enhance the current JMPR's evaluation process**

7. In support of ToR (ii), the EWG developed a proposal template and requested input from EWG participants on other approaches to reduce the backlog of evaluation and targeted projects that may enhance CCPR's and JMPR's current evaluation process. In response:
- One Member country supported the proposal to convene an extraordinary meeting of JMPR.
  - One observer organization submitted two proposals related to JMPR staffing and best practices in JMPR dossier submission. The project proposals are provided in Appendix III and further summarized below.

<sup>6</sup> [CX/PR 24/55/10](#)

<sup>7</sup> [2023, JMPR Summary Report, General Considerations, Section 2.7 – Enhancement Process.](#)

<sup>8</sup> [REP24/PR55](#), paras. 262-273

<sup>9</sup> [PR55/CRD23](#) (2024).

Project Title	Objectives	Anticipated Outputs/Outcomes
<b>Guidance to submitters of data to JMPR</b>	To provide some general principles and guidance to data submitters on the best practices in dossier submission to the expert panels of the Joint Meeting on Pesticides Residues (JMPR) when applying for Codex Maximum Residue Limits (CXLs).	Present a guidance document for data submitters to JMPR in a breakout session during CCPR56. Publish this guidance document publicly as an annex to the CropLife International "Working with the JMPR and CCPR - Manual for the Agrochemical Industry".
<b>Permanent JMPR staff</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Focus support on drafting initial reviews for JMPR Expert Panel review</li> <li>2. Secondments from existing institutions, or (to be considered) recently retired experts from governments agencies.</li> <li>3. External consultants paid through a transparently organized "fee system" allowing funding from data submitters.</li> </ol>	Draft initial review documents for new active ingredients, new uses, and periodic reviews. These preliminary draft review documents would then be provided to the JMPR expert panels for their development of recommendations to the CCPR.

## CONCLUSIONS

8. While the EWG has completed its terms of reference, the EWG was unable to determine if support and resources are available to convene an extraordinary meeting of JMPR or adopt other approaches to reduce the backlog of evaluations. Codex members and observer organizations are invited to provide additional information and proposals on potential mechanisms that could support the short-term approach endorsed by CCPR.
9. Two proposals were submitted to the EWG on JMPR staffing and best practices in JMPR dossier submission. Codex members and observer organizations are invited to provide feedback on the proposals or submit additional project ideas.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

10. CCPR is invited to consider the proposed short-term approach summarized in Appendix I and additional project proposals that were submitted to the EWG (Appendix II). If there is support, please provide feedback on mechanisms to contribute financial and/or human resources on the following:
  - (i) Organization of extraordinary meetings of JMPR (ToR-i) to reduce the backlog of new use evaluations (i.e., additional MRLs for existing compounds not scheduled for periodic reviews nor complete evaluation by JMPR) or
  - (ii) Design and implementation of targeted projects to improve JMPR's evaluation process (ToR-ii), such as those described in Appendices I and II or
  - (iii) Development of other potential activities that CCPR could advance without changes to the procedures and policies of FAO and WHO applicable for the operation of JMPR not considered in the short-term approach presented in Appendix I.

**APPENDIX I****APPROACH TO ENHANCE THE OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF CCPR AND JMPR****(For comments on additional short-term approaches)****Potential Short-term Approaches to Enhance the Operational Procedures of CCPR and JMPR, 2024 - 2026***Goal: Address immediate stakeholder concerns related to the backlog of evaluations and be responsive to the needs of JMPR.***Convene an extraordinary meeting of JMPR to reduce the backlog of new use evaluations.**

While JMPR has raised concerns that additional meetings are resource intensive and may not increase the long-term output of JMPR, a targeted extraordinary meeting that focuses on new uses may help reduce the backlog of evaluations. Convening an extraordinary meeting will require coordination with stakeholders to:

- determine the appropriate review capacity,
- identify candidate compounds, and
- confirm that there are resources, staffing, and experts available to support the meeting.

**Complete a targeted project that improves JMPR's evaluation process.**

The aim of the targeted project is to improve a specific issue in JMPR's current evaluation process. One promising area for a targeted project is electronic data submission and data quality standards. Completing a targeted project will require coordination with stakeholders to:

- consult with JMPR to identify candidate projects and requirements,
- detailed the scope of work and impact on JMPR's evaluation process, and
- confirm that there are available resources and expertise to complete the project.

**Potential Long-Term Approaches to Enhance the Operational Procedures of CCPR and JMPR, 2026 - 2028***Goal: Address strategic issues related to CCPR/JMPR policy/ procedures and independently evaluate JMPR's working procedures.***Request recommendations from JMPR and data sponsors on enhancements to policy and procedural issues.**

The EWG has previously gathered information from a range of Codex members and observer organizations on opportunities to either enhance or reform the operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR. Building off this information, CCPR could identify specific policy and procedural issues that can be addressed to increase review capacity. This will require coordination with stakeholders to:

- reach consensus on policies and procedural issues that can be changed to increase the review capacity of JMPR,
- develop a process to implement changes, and
- update the Codex policy and procedural manual as appropriate.

**Request that FAO/WHO conduct an organizational assessment and review the working procedures of CCPR and JMPR.**

There may be advantages to consulting with a third-party organization to build upon the 2002 Review of the Working Procedures of JMPR and conduct an independent organizational assessment of CCPR and JMPR. The aim of such an effort could be identify priorities and develop a strategic roadmap and timeline to address long-standing issues related to JMPR's review capacity, staffing, resources, and JMPR's operational model. This will require coordination with stakeholders to:

- consult with JMPR on the overall goals and objectives of an independent organizational assessment, and
- confirm that there are available resources and expertise to complete the project.

**APPENDIX II****PROJECT PROPOSALS****(Examples)****(For information)**

<b>EWG Participant Information</b>	
<b>Codex Delegation/ Organization</b>	CropLife International
<b>Project Proposal</b>	
<b>Project Title</b>	Permanent JMPR staff
<b>Objectives</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Focus support on drafting initial reviews for JMPR Expert Panel review</li> <li>2. Secondments from existing institutions, or (to be considered) recently retired experts from governments agencies.</li> <li>3. External consultants paid through a transparently organized “fee system” allowing funding from data submitters.</li> </ol>
<b>Anticipated Outputs/Outcomes</b>	Draft initial review documents for new active ingredients, new uses, and periodic reviews. These preliminary draft review documents would then be provided to the JMPR expert panels for their development of recommendations to the CCPR.
<b>Project Narrative and Supporting Rationale</b>	<p>Trade is critical to food security and the ability to trade food is key to the livelihoods of many. As the most important international food standards setting body, the Codex Alimentarius plays a crucial role in protecting the safety of consumers and enabling trade in agricultural products. One of its most important responsibilities is the setting of Codex Maximum Residue Limits (CXLs). Establishing CXLs is essential in bringing innovative crop protection products to markets and into the farmers’ toolbox. Voluntary submissions of data to the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) and Codex Committee of Pesticide Residues (CCPR) to support the establishment of CXLs are made by the crop protection industry and other stakeholders. Analysis conducted in 2022 by CropLife International has concluded that to meet the future demand for the setting and revision of CXLs for new active ingredients, new uses, and periodic reviews, the output from JMPR needs to increase by a factor of three (CX/PR 22/53/20). There are multiple drivers for the need to increase JMPR output such as an existing backlog made worse by interruptions in review schedules due to the global pandemic, increased size and complexity of data packages, and a lack of adequate resources to support the work of the JMPR. To enhance the process of establishing CXLs, CropLife International has submitted ideas for consideration by the CCPR via multiple Conference Room Documents (CRDs), held a series of global virtual workshops with representatives of Codex delegations, and supported the work of a CCPR electronic Working Group (eWG) focused on Codex enhancement. From these efforts a consensus has emerged that focusing on increasing the resources available to the JMPR should be one of the top priorities. Based on this consensus, CropLife International proposes to create a <b>3–5-year pilot program</b> that would use contracted staff reporting to FAO and WHO Secretariats that manage the JMPR expert panels. These contracted staff experts would draft the initial review documents for new active ingredients, new uses, and periodic reviews. These preliminary draft review documents would then be provided to the JMPR expert panels for their development of recommendations to the CCPR. If desired, this ‘contracted staff’ could also provide a resource during the JMPR meetings to update review documents at the direction of the JMPR expert panels.</p>

EWG Participant Information	
<b>Codex Delegation/ Organization</b>	CropLife International
Project Proposal	
<b>Project Title</b>	Guidance to submitters of data to JMPR
<b>Objectives</b>	To provide some general principles and guidance to data submitters on the best practices in dossier submission to the expert panels of the Joint Meeting on Pesticides Residues (JMPR) when applying for Codex Maximum Residue Limits (CXLs).
<b>Anticipated Outputs/Outcomes</b>	Present a guidance document for data submitters to JMPR in a breakout session during CCPR56. Publish this guidance document publicly as an annex to the CropLife International “Working with the JMPR and CCPR - Manual for the Agrochemical Industry”.
<b>Project Narrative and Supporting Rationale</b>	<p>Feedback from the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) and the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) in 2024 indicated there are examples of ‘poor-quality’ submissions. This has led to the inefficient use of JMPR expert’s time and expertise and in some cases prevented completion of the evaluations. Areas of concern include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submissions missing relevant data that has previously been provided to national or regional regulatory agencies</li> <li>• Submissions where data do not meet current-day JMPR scientific needs (particularly for metabolites)</li> <li>• Relevant data being submitted very late in the process</li> <li>• The scientific quality of some studies (often linked to their age)</li> </ul> <p>CropLife International takes these concerns seriously and is developing a guidance document based on the extensive experience of the members in submitting dossiers for JMPR evaluations. This document will aim to aid all data submitters in making decisions on the data they provide for JMPR reviews. It should be recognized that neither the WHO nor the FAO provide a formal set of data requirements and therefore data submitters</p>

**APPENDIX III**  
**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**CHAIR****UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Aaron Niman

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

**Co-CHAIRS****COSTA RICA****Costa Rica**

Amanda Lasso Cruz

Ministerio de Economía Industria y Comercio

Tatiana Vásquez Morera

Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado

Ivania Morera Rodríguez

Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado

**UGANDA**

Geoffrey Onen

Assistant Commissioner

Directorate of Government Analytical laboratory

**MEMBER COUNTRIES****Australia**

James Oliver Deller

Australian Pesticide and Veterinary Medicines Auth

**Belgium**

Wim Hooghe

FPS Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment

**Brazil**

Rogerio Pereira da Silva

Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock

**Chile**

Roxana Inés Vera Muñoz

Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero

Jorge Elvis Carvajal Vásquez

Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero

**Columbia**

David Lopez

Colombian Agricultural Institute

**Egypt**

Mariam Barsoum Onsy

Egyptian Organization for Standardization &amp; Quality

**France**

Florence Ferault

Ministry of Agriculture

**Germany**

Karsten Hohgardt

Bundesministerium für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft

**Guatemala**

Zenía Aguilar

Other

Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación de Guatemala

**India**

Dr S C Dubey

Member Country

Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi

Dr VANDANA TRIPATHY

Member Country

ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute

Sukesh Narayan Sinha

Member Country

ICMR-National Institute of Nutrition

Santhosh J Eapen

ICAR

**Japan**

Codex Japan

FAO/WHO

Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare

Tomoyuki KAWAI

Member Country

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

**Malaysia**

Mohammad Nazrul Fahmi Abdul Rahim

Department of Agriculture Malaysia

Nurhayati Kamyon  
Department of Agriculture

**Mexico**

Tania Daniela Fosado Soriano  
Secretaría de Economía

**New Zealand**

Warren Hughes  
Ministry for Primary Industries

Sophie Geyrhofer  
Member Country  
Ministry for Primary Industries, Plant Exports

**Nigeria**

Dr. Zainab Umar  
Standards Organization of Nigeria

**Poland**

Anna Janasik  
Agricultural and Food Quality Inspection

**Republic of Korea**

Park Yoona  
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety

Hwang Kiseon  
MAFRA

**South Africa**

Aluwani Alice Madzivhandila  
Department of Health

**Saudi Arabia**

Nimah Baqadir  
Saudi Food & Drug Authority

Saif Moala AL-Mutairi  
Member Country  
SFDA

Najla Alharbi  
Saudi Food and Drug Authority

**OBSERVERS****CropLife International**

Nevena Hristozova

Steve Basel

**Sierra Leone**

Raymonde A. B. Johnson  
Member Country  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry

**Sweden**

Niklas Montell  
Swedish Food Agency

**Thailand**

Chonnipa Pawasut  
ACFS

Namaporn Attaviroj  
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food  
Standards, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives

**The European Union**

Siret Surva  
European Commission

Anne Latrive  
European Commission

**Uganda**

Fred Barungi  
Member Country  
Uganda National Bureau of Standards

Ruth Awio  
Member Country  
Uganda National Bureau of Standards

**United Kingdom**

Julian Cudmore  
Member Country  
Health and Safety Executive, UK

**United States of America**

Marie Maratos Bhat  
USDA-US Codex Office

**Uruguay**

Susana Franchi  
Dirección General de Servicios Agrícolas