



**JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

**Eighty-seventh Session  
Geneva, Switzerland, CICG<sup>1</sup>  
18 – 22 November 2024**

**CRITICAL REVIEW - PART I<sup>2</sup>**

**1. Procedural background for the Critical Review**

1.1 According to the *Procedures for the elaboration of Codex standards and related texts, Part 2, Critical review*, in the Codex Procedural Manual, “An ongoing critical review shall ensure that proposals for new work and draft standards submitted to the Commission for adoption continue to meet the strategic priorities of the Commission and can be developed within a reasonable period of time, taking into account the requirements and availability of scientific expert advice”. Furthermore, “The Commission decides, taking into account the outcome of the ongoing critical review conducted by the Executive Committee, that a standard should be elaborated and also which subsidiary body or other body should undertake the work”.

1.2 In line with this, and taking into account the comments of the Chairpersons and the Codex Secretariat, CCEXEC is invited to critically:

- review standards and related texts submitted to the Commission for adoption;
- monitor the progress of standards development; and
- review proposals for new work or revision of standards.

**2. Examining proposed standards before submission to the Commission for adoption**

2.1 The critical review process shall ensure that draft standards submitted to the Commission for adoption have been fully considered at committee level. The Executive Committee examines proposed standards from Codex committees before they are submitted to the Commission for adoption:

- for consistency with the mandate of Codex, the decisions of the Commission, and existing Codex texts;
- to ensure that the requirements of the endorsement procedure have been fulfilled, where appropriate;
- for format and presentation; and
- for linguistic consistency.

**3. Monitoring progress of standards development**

3.1 The Executive Committee reviews the status of development of draft standards against the timeframe agreed by the Commission and shall report its findings to the Commission. CCEXEC may propose an extension of the timeframe; cancellation of work; or propose that the work be undertaken by a committee other than the one to which it was originally entrusted, including via the establishment of a limited number of subsidiary bodies, if appropriate.

---

<sup>1</sup> To be convened physically: Discussions on 18 - 20 November 2024, 10-13h and 14.30 – 17.30; Adoption of the report on 22 November 2024, 10-13h

<sup>2</sup> This document addresses the Codex committees that held sessions in June and July 2024.

### 3.2 *Criteria to facilitate the conduct of monitoring progress of standards development*<sup>3</sup>

3.2.1 When progress on a standard is delayed due to the need for scientific advice, the Executive Committee could encourage FAO and WHO to schedule an expert consultation to provide such advice in a timely manner, and recommend suspension of work until such time as scientific advice became available;

3.2.2 When scientific advice has been provided and a standard has been under consideration for more than five years, the Executive Committee should urge the committee concerned to take action within a specified timeframe;

3.2.3 When an item has been considered for several sessions without any progress and there is no prospect of reaching consensus, the Executive Committee could propose suspension of work at a particular step in the elaboration procedure for a specified period of time or discontinuation of work, or corrective action to be taken to achieve progress, fully taking into consideration the information provided by the subsidiary body concerned.

## 4. **Proposals to undertake new work or to revise a standard**

4.1 Prior to approval for development, each proposal for new work or revision of a standard shall be accompanied by a project document, prepared by the Committee or Member proposing new work or revision of a standard. The decision to undertake new work or to revise standards shall be taken by the Commission taking into account a critical review conducted by CCEXEC.

4.2 The critical review includes:

- examination of proposals for development/revisions of standards, taking into account the “*Criteria for the establishment of work priorities*”, the strategic plan of the Commission, and the required supporting work of independent risk assessment;
- identifying the standard setting needs of developing countries;
- advice on the need for coordination of work between relevant Codex subsidiary bodies;
- advice on establishment and dissolution of committees and task forces, including *ad hoc* cross-committee task forces (in areas where work falls within several committees); and
- preliminary assessment of the need for expert scientific advice and the availability of such advice from FAO, WHO or other relevant expert bodies, and the prioritization of that advice.

4.3 The decision to undertake new work or revision of individual maximum residue limits for pesticides or veterinary drugs, or the maintenance of the *General Standard on Food Additives* (including methods of analysis and sampling), the *General Standard on Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed* (including methods of analysis and sampling), the Food Categorization System and the International Numbering System, shall follow the procedures established by the committees concerned and endorsed by the Commission.

### 4.4 *Discussion papers*<sup>4</sup>

Discussion papers are important discussion tools for committees before proposing new work. Discussion papers are listed for information purposes only.

## 5. **Ongoing development of the supporting documentation for the critical review**

5.1 The documents to support the critical review have evolved over time with the aim of better supporting this task. CCEXEC72 (2016)<sup>5</sup> welcomed a new structure for the critical review documents and the delivery of relevant documents in instalments to ensure timely availability; indicated the value of more information and insights from the Chairpersons on committee work; and highlighted the importance of maintaining a horizontal view of the work of committees and the interactions between committees.

5.2 Further structural revisions were made in the documents submitted to CCEXEC77 (2019)<sup>6</sup> to improve readability and give more prominence and emphasis on information and insights from the Chairpersons of committees. CCEXEC78 (2020) being presented with a review of the critical review<sup>7</sup> requested the Codex Secretariat to consult and bring proposals to CCEXEC on how to give more weight to the outcome on the critical review at CAC<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> CCEXEC58 (2006)

<sup>4</sup> CCEXEC63 (2009)

<sup>5</sup> REP17/EXEC1, paragraphs 7-14

<sup>6</sup> CX/EXEC 19/77/5

<sup>7</sup> CX/EXEC 20/78/4

<sup>8</sup> REP20/EXEC1, paragraph 52(iii)

5.3 As indicated at CCEXEC86 (2024)<sup>9</sup>, the Codex Secretariat is carefully reviewing the critical review documents to ensure a consistent approach including on the degree to which information from the committee reports should be included therein. This will continue to evolve as documents are developed for upcoming sessions of CCEXEC.

5.4 To further facilitate the work of CCEXEC in its critical review of new work proposals and making recommendations to CAC on work priorities, the Codex Secretariat is presenting an overview of all new work proposals for CCEXEC87. Hence, new work proposals are compiled in CX/EXEC 24/87/2 Add. 3.

## **6. Structure of appendices**

6.1 The work of the different committees is addressed in separate appendices.

6.2 The structure of the appendices for each committee is as follows:

1. General information on the committee and session
2. Overall comments (Codex Secretariat/Chairperson)
3. Status of work items (Overview)
4. Specific comments on individual work items (Codex Secretariat/Chairperson)

## **7. List of appendices**

Appendix 1: Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, 55th Session (CCPR55)

Appendix 2: FAO/WHO Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean, 23rd Session (CCLAC23)

---

<sup>9</sup> REP24/EXEC1, paragraph 11

## Appendix 1

## 1. General

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR55)</b>		
<b>Host</b>	China	<b>Chairperson</b>	Dr Weili Shan
		<b>Vice-Chairperson</b>	Dr Lifang Duan
<b>Session reported on</b>	CCPR55	03-08 June 2024	
<b>Next Session</b>	CCPR56	19-24 May 2025	
<b>Report</b>	<u>REP24/PR55</u>		

## 2. Overall comments

**Secretariat's summary on key issues discussed and agreed by CCPR55:**

Forty-seven Member countries, one Member organization, and nine Observer organizations attended CCPR55. Two virtual working group (VWG) meetings before the plenary and one in-session working group (ISWG) were held to facilitate considering and resolving the issues raised in the relevant working documents.

CCPR55 was a resounding success, excellently chaired by the Host Country. CCPR55 demonstrated its productivity by forwarding 257 maximum residue limits (MRLs) for pesticides for different commodity/pesticide combinations to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5/8. This was accompanied by the revocation of 108 existing MRLs (CXLs) and discontinuation of work on MRLs in the Step Procedure, further solidifying CCPR's effectiveness in setting MRLs for pesticides. Progress was also made on making consequential amendments to MRLs, advancing a Codex guidance on reference materials that is in development, and advancing several work management processes within CCPR and between CCPR and JMPR.

A particular aspect of JMPR's work that may or will impact CCPR's work on setting MRLs for pesticides concerns the new methodology being tested by JMPR to improve dietary exposure calculations (i.e., the global estimate of chronic dietary exposure (GECDE)). Questions were raised about its impact on the existing and future MRLs for pesticides and the interaction of JMPR and CCPR when considering its application from risk assessment and management perspectives. The JMPR Secretariat explained that GECDE will allow the alignment of risk assessment methodologies between JECFA and JMPR. This discussion is ongoing, and further discussions will be held between JMPR and CCPR to ensure transparency and inclusiveness in considering this matter.

**Chairperson's comments:**

CCPR55 was held successfully. As with previous sessions, fruitful results were made in establishing standards, with most topics advancing smoothly. The session's success can be attributed to extensive consultation and communication among all parties involved before and during CCPR55. The virtual pre-session meetings of the working groups, which are utilized in various committees, greatly contributed to the efficient progress of CCPR55. The collaborative efforts of the Codex Secretariat, the CCPR Secretariat, the JMPR Secretariat, and the Chairs of the Electronic Working Groups (EWGs) in preparing for the meeting played a crucial role in the success.

During CCPR55, several issues were thoroughly discussed and received significant attention. These topics, which will also be addressed in future CCPR sessions, include but are not limited to the potential implementation of a new dietary exposure methodology by JMPR in the future; the implications of the revised *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) for the establishment of Codex MRLs for pesticide residues (CXLs); the management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review (particularly those listed in Table 2A of the priority list); and the prospect of setting MRLs through extrapolation for minor crops.

**3. Status of work items**

Topic	Job Number	Target year	Recommendation of the Committee
<b>For decision by the Commission</b>			
1. MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies)	-	-	Adoption at Step 5/8
2. Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage	N07-2023	2026	Adoption at Step 5
3. Consequential amendments to the CXLs for the pepper subgroup: MRLs for okra	-	-	Adoption
4. Consequential amendment to the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (CXA 4-1989) – Additional commodities for Class D – Processed Foods of Plant Origin	-	-	Adoption
5. Priority list of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR	-	-	Approval
6. CXLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies)	-	-	Revocation
7. MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) that were withdrawn (discontinued) from the Step Procedure	-	-	Discontinuation
<b>For information</b>			
8. Expansion of the scope of the Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage to cover mixtures of pesticides.	For information by CCEXEC87 and CAC47		
9. Management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic review	For consideration by CCPR56		
10. National registration of pesticides	For consideration by CCPR56		
11. Analysis of previous decisions by CCPR to establish MRLs for tomato and pepper to derive corresponding MRLs for eggplant	For consideration by CCPR56		
12. Coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF: Joint CCPR/CCRVDF working group on compounds for dual use – Status of work	For consideration by CCPR56 and CCRVDF27		
13. Enhancement of the operational procedure of CCPR and JMPR	For consideration by CCPR56		

#### 4. Specific comments

<p><b>1. MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies), Paragraph 222(i)(a), Appendix II</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CCPR55 agreed to forward to CAC47 a total of 257 new/revised MRLs for different combinations of pesticides (28 in total) /commodities for adoption at Step 5/8.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>Most of the MRLs recommended by JMPR2023 were advanced using Steps 5/8, with Steps 6 and 7 omitted. However, a few recommendations were withdrawn or postponed for further discussion, primarily due to a lack of support from dietary risk assessment.</p> <p>The EU expressed more reservations about the JMPR recommendations than the previous year, and some of these reservations were attributed to the unavailability of JMPR evaluation on the Internet. The difficulties in getting some important documents on time as described in the Codex Procedural Manual, have been a situation for some years.</p>
<p><b>2. Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage, Paragraph 230(i), Appendix IX</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CCPR55 agreed to forward to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5 the Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage (see also item 8). These guidelines are expected to provide a set of internationally agreed provisions that can be applied consistently worldwide to monitor the stability and purity of RMs/stock solutions.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>The VWG and ISWG further revised the guidelines and presented CRD27 as the basis for the discussion at CCPR55. CCPR55 agreed to forward the guidelines to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5 while acknowledging that certain refinements may still be required.</p>
<p><b>3. Consequential amendments to the CXLs for the pepper subgroup: MRLs for okra, Paragraph 222(i)(c), Appendix VII</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CCPR54 agreed to keep okra in Subgroup 12B (Pepper and pepper-like commodities) in the revised <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (CXA 4-1989) while awaiting the generation of data and subsequent evaluation by JMPR to enable the establishment of single or group MRLs for okra. CCPR54 meanwhile agreed to make consequential amendments to the MRLs for the subgroup of peppers (VO 0051) to provisionally include okra, martynia, and roselle and, for this purpose, added a qualifying note to the corresponding MRLs.</p> <p>CCPR55 noted that the MRLs for the pepper subgroup needed the same consequential amendment for pyrethrin (063) and permethrin (120). Thus, the same note was included in these MRLs to ensure consistency with the previous management decision.</p> <p>The addition of the qualifying note for the MRLs of pyrethrin (063) and permethrin (120) arising from the consequential amendment will increase the availability of MRLs for okra, a growing commodity in international trade, pending the submission of relevant data to clarify the suitable representative commodity for okra, martynia, and roselle in the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (CXA 4-1989) to extrapolate MRLs.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>CCPR55 forwarded for adoption the consequential amendments to the relevant CXLs of Pyrethrin (063) and Permethrin (120) for Subgroup 12B based on the decision of CCPR54.</p>
<p><b>4. Consequential amendment to the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (CXA 4-1989) – Additional commodities for Class D – Processed Foods of Plant Origin, Paragraph 222(iv), Appendix VIII</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CCPR55 agreed to forward to CAC47 for adoption the consequential amendment to the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (CXA 4-1989) – Additional commodities for Class D – Processed Foods or Plant Origin, which was the replacement of the temporary code CP 0448 Tomato, ketchup, with DM 3527 under Group 069 Miscellaneous derived edible products of plant origin. This amendment aligns the commodity with the revised Class D of the Classification to allow the assignment of corresponding MRLs.</p>

<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>The consequential amendments to the <i>Classification of Food and Feed</i> (CXA 4-1989) conform with the current practice of recommending MRLs.</p>
<p><b>5. Priority list of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR, Paragraph 261(i-ii), Appendix X</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CCPR55 agreed to endorse the proposed Priority List of Pesticides for evaluation by the 2025 JMPR for submission to CAC47 for approval as new work for CCPR.</p> <p>The Committee continues to work on the schedules for future JMPR evaluations to facilitate the continued scheduling of compounds for JMPR safety assessment.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>According to the Codex procedures, establishing a Priority List of Pesticides is the first step in elaborating MRLs. A list of six compounds (with two reserve compounds) was proposed for evaluation in the 2025 Schedule of New Compounds, and 20 (with three reserve compounds) nominations were listed in the 2025 Schedule of New Uses and other evaluations. Ten compounds were proposed for the 2025 periodic review evaluations.</p>
<p><b>6. CXLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) proposed for revocation, Paragraph 222(i)(b), Appendix III</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>Due to the proposed adoption of MRLs for different combinations of pesticides/commodities (see item 1), CCPR55 agreed to forward 108 CXLs for different combinations of pesticides (14 in total)/commodities for revocation by CAC47.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>Most of the proposed revocations are related to the pesticides under periodic review, as data submitted for the scheduled periodic review were insufficient for concluding the residue definition. Additionally, some proposed revocations occurred due to the replacement of new recommendations.</p>
<p><b>7. MRLs for different combinations of pesticide/commodity(ies) that were withdrawn (discontinued) from the Step Procedure by CCPR, Paragraph 222(ii)(a), Appendix IV</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CCPR55 agreed to inform CAC47 about the MRLs in the Step Procedure, which has been withdrawn due to new or revised MRLs proposed for adoption or due to other reasons, as explained in REP24/PR55, which means discontinuing work.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>The MRLs have been withdrawn mainly due to the public health concern identified during the risk assessment by JMPR or as a result of replacing new recommendations.</p>
<p><b>8. Expansion of the scope of the Guidelines for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials and related stock solutions of pesticides during prolonged storage to cover mixtures of pesticides, Paragraph 230(ii-iii)</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CCPR55 agreed to expand the guidelines to cover mixed pesticide standard solutions. As this was not part of the original scope of the work (currently applicable to single pesticides), CCPR55 agreed to inform CCEXEC and CAC accordingly (see item 2).</p> <p>Expanding the guidelines' scope will reflect current laboratory practices for monitoring the stability and purity of reference materials (RMs) and related stock solutions and ensure their completeness.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>As there was general support in CCPR55 for expanding the scope of the guidelines to cover mixed pesticide standard solutions, the EWG was proposed to be re-established to refine relevant sections in the document and submit for consideration by CCPR56.</p>

**9. Management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review, Paragraphs 237 and 238(i-iii)**

**Status and Secretariat's comments:**

Under the Management approach to address unsupported compounds without public health concerns scheduled for periodic reviews, that is, for internal use by CCPR and described in REP23/PR54, Appendix XII, CCPR55 agreed that for amitraz (122), bitertanol (144), dinocap (087), fenthion (039), methamidophos (100) and parathion-methyl (059), if no support was obtained for the periodic review of these six substances, CCPR56 (2025) would recommend revocation of the CXLs by CAC48 (2025) should there still be no support by the submission of a suitable data package by then.

**Chairperson's comments:**

CCPR54 approved the management approach for compounds without public health concerns that required periodic review. However, implementing this approach in the past year was not as desirable as intended. The data available was insufficient to evaluate six nominations. The lack of data could be attributed to the low enthusiasm among Members to participate and the absence of a practical solution in the current program to address the issue of missing evaluation data. Many of the compounds listed in Table 2B of Priorities will be included in the subsequent work of the Unsupported Compounds Working Group. Thus, it is crucial to encourage active participation from all parties involved in this initiative.

**10. National registration of pesticides, Paragraphs 245-246**

**Status and Secretariat's notes**

CCPR55 agreed to transfer the work on the national registration database (NRD) to the EWG on Unsupported Compounds, which will continue developing the NRD with compounds that will go to Table 2B (compounds that have been evaluated 15 years ago or more but have not yet been scheduled or listed for periodic review) of the priority list each year and consider the compounds listed in Group 3 (compounds that in 2023 reached 15 - 19 years since their last periodic review) from this year's exercise to seek support for their periodic review.

**Chairperson's comments:**

The outcome of the work on NRD can serve as the foundation for the future work of the EWG on Unsupported compounds under periodic review. It is important to update the NRD on a regular basis, ideally every 3-5 years.

**11. Analysis of previous decisions by CCPR to establish MRLs for tomato and pepper to derive corresponding MRLs for eggplant, Paragraph 293(iv-vi)**

**Status and Secretariat's comments:**

CCPR55 recalled that the Observer of the Global Pulse Confederation (GPC) was tasked to prepare a discussion paper to assess previous decisions by CCPR to establish tomato and pepper MRLs to derive corresponding MRLs for eggplant. CCPR55 discussed either a) advancing the proposed extrapolated MRLs in the Step Procedure for adoption by CAC, based on the extrapolation approach and other information contained in the discussion paper, or (b) postponing decisions to CCPR56 (2025) following the advice of JMPR on the assessment of the process followed and data/information used in the extrapolation of the proposed MRLs.

The Observer from GPC noted that the extrapolation was performed based on the guidance provided by JMPR and CCPR in their relevant documents. The data/information used to make the calculations were those available from the JMPR report used to evaluate tomato and pepper and other available information from officially recognized sites.

There was general support for exploring methodologies that could improve the availability of MRLs for minor crops in international trade using extrapolation. However, divergent views were expressed on the opportunity to endorse the proposed procedures and extrapolate MRLs without consulting with JMPR on the steps and considerations presented in the working paper. Following discussion, CCPR55 agreed first to request JMPR consider the procedures outlined by GPC to support MRLs for eggplants based on the MRLs already established for tomatoes and/or peppers, including aspects influencing risk assessment and whether, in JMPR's view, the suggested procedure provided an appropriate basis for extrapolation. JMPR would then recommend how the suggested procedure may be improved to provide a pragmatic, science-based, and resource-efficient approach to enhance the establishment of MRLs for minor crops that could be incorporated into future procedures for setting MRLs by extrapolation to minor crops.

This matter will be considered further at CCPR56 (2025) based on JMPR's advice on the methodology's suitability.

**Chairperson's comments:**

Following the risk analysis principles applied by CCPR, JMPR is responsible for conducting risk assessments, and CCPR considers the recommendations made by JMPR. While CCPR respects the scientific expertise of JMPR, it remains to be seen whether the approach suggested by GPC can be in line with the policies made by CCPR for JMPR scientific consultation, for example, crop grouping and extrapolation, to be beneficial in assisting JMPR's assessments in the future, to elaborate more CXLs and reduce the workload of JMPR experts. This matter needs further examination during the JMPR meeting in September 2024 and revisited at CCPR56.

**12. Coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF: Joint CCPR/CCRVDF working group on compounds for dual use – Status of Work, Paragraph 280(i-iv)**

**Status and Secretariat's comments:**

CCPR55 indicated their continued support for the work of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG and noted the generally low participation in the EWG. CCPR55 endorsed scheduling a joint virtual meeting of the EWG to improve participation. It encouraged delegations to liaise with their CCRVDF counterparts to coordinate positions and actively participate in the work and the virtual meeting of the Joint EWG.

The joint virtual meeting could help to facilitate discussions and consensus-based recommendations since the simultaneous participation of animal and plant health officers had not been fully achieved through the regular work on the online platform.

The cooperative work with CCRVDF on cross-cutting issues of concern to both committees on dual-use compounds would help in facilitating the establishment of single harmonized MRLs for these compounds and their enforcement by competent authorities.

**Chairperson's comments:**

The effective coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF on compounds for dual-use applications is confronted by organizational challenges and numerous technical issues. CCPR55 has endorsed and encouraged CCPR delegations to actively engage in the proceedings of the virtual meeting of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG.

**13. Enhancement of the operational procedure of CCPR and JMPR, Paragraph 273(i-iii)**

**Status and Secretariat's comments:**

CCPR55 agreed that as a first step, the focus should be given to the short-term approaches of (a) organising a possible extraordinary JMPR meeting or other means to reduce the backlog of evaluations and (b) considering targeted projects that may enhance CCPR and JMPR's current evaluation process. The EWG was re-established to consider these approaches and make recommendations on future activities at CCPR56.

Collaborative work with JMPR on improved procedures and methodologies would facilitate the establishment of MRLs and increase their availability for public health protection and trade facilitation.

**Chairperson's comments:**

CCPR55 has reached a consensus on the short-term priorities of reducing the backlog of scheduled JMPR evaluations and enhancing CCPR and JMPR's current evaluation process. Nevertheless, there are several uncertainties at the operational level that will need further examination during CCPR56.

## Appendix 2

## 1. General

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Coordinating Committee for Latin America and the Caribbean (CCLAC23)</b>		
<b>Host</b>	Ecuador	<b>Chairperson</b>	Rommel Betancourt
<b>Session reported on</b>	CCLAC23	22-26 July 2024	
<b>Next Session</b>	CCLAC24	2026 (TBC)	
<b>Report</b>	<u>REP24/LAC</u>		

## 2. Overall comments

**Codex Secretariat's comments:**

CCLAC23 was successfully conducted as a virtual session with the Chairperson, Host Secretariat, Codex Secretariat and FAO and WHO representatives physically together in Ecuador. CCLAC23 was attended by 25 of the 33 countries in the region, with participants highly engaged in the discussions. While the virtual format facilitated broader participation, it was occasionally hindered by technical issues related to sound that affected participation and interpretation.

CCLAC23 considered two work items on elaboration of standards; 1) elaboration of a regional standard for Castilla lulo (naranja); and 2) alignment of the *Regional Code of Hygienic Practice for the Preparation and Sale of Street Foods* (Latin America and the Caribbean) (CXC 43R-1995) with the *General Principles of Food Hygiene* (CXC 1-1969) and the potential new guidelines for food hygiene control measures in traditional markets for food.

CCLAC23 forwarded the regional standard for Castilla lulo (naranja) to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5/8.

**Chairperson's comments:**

It is an honour to inform that the CCLAC23 meeting was successfully held virtually. We extend our sincerest gratitude to the Government of Ecuador and Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) for their valuable collaboration and the efforts made that contributed to this achievement. It is important to highlight that seven regional positions were adopted during the meeting, representing a significant advancement for our region.

A Member country proposed the addition of French as an official language for the region, but this would present a logistical and organizational challenge, requiring additional resources for translation and interpretation. Nevertheless, CCLAC23 agreed to propose, on a pilot basis, the addition of French as a language of CCLAC24, should the appropriate extrabudgetary resources be available.

CCLAC23 observed general support to advance the regional standard for Castilla lulo (naranja) to Step 5/8 and, additionally, introduced editorial corrections and provided comments for different sections.

Regarding the *Regional Code of Hygienic Practice for the Preparation and Sale of Street Foods* (Latin America and the Caribbean) (CXC 43R-1995), CCLAC23 requested Costa Rica and Brazil to prepare a discussion paper, to be presented at CCLAC24, to address whether a review of CXC 43R-1995 was necessary to ensure consistency with CXC 1-1969 and the guidelines for food hygiene control measures in traditional markets for food, when adopted, and provide suggestions/recommendations for next steps or consequential changes to CXC 43R-1995.

It is important to highlight the development of the survey on "relevant Codex work for the region." The responses to this survey allowed for identifying the work being carried out, how to address it, and how to give it a proper focus.

CCLAC23 agreed to support ongoing work in various Codex Committees, including CAC and CCEXEC.

The keynote addressed the "Prevention and reduction of contaminants in food". CCLAC23 expressed appreciation to Prof. Ramos for the keynote address; recognized the importance of addressing contaminants in food and noted the importance of the application of the Codex risk analysis principles on this topic; and noted the ongoing work of FAO and the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO)/WHO in this area and encouraged Members to continue engaging with FAO and PAHO/WHO, and in the relevant Codex subsidiary bodies on this topic.

The work led by the CCLAC Member countries is progressing and has been received very positively at the global level.

**3. Status of work items**

Topic	Job Number	Target year	Recommendation of the Committee
<b>For decision by the Commission</b>			
1. Regional standard for Castilla lulo (naranjilla)	N05-2022	2025	Adoption at Step 5/8
<b>For information</b>			
2. Discussion paper to address the necessity to review the <i>Regional Code of Hygienic Practice for the Preparation and Sale of Street Foods</i> (Latin America and the Caribbean) (CXC 43R-1995), and provide suggestions/recommendations for next steps or consequential changes to CXC 43R-1995	For consideration by CCLAC24		

#### 4. Specific comments

<p><b>1. Regional standard for Castilla lulo (naranjilla), Paragraph 81, Appendix II</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CAC45 (2022) had approved new work on developing a regional standard on Castilla lulo under CCLAC.</p> <p>The EWG had not identified any outstanding issues. The use of one name in the English version for the product, i.e. "Castilla lulo (naranjilla)" had been added, and the provisions aligned to the layout for standards for fresh fruits and vegetables.</p> <p>Following a constructive discussion, CCLAC23 consensually agreed to forward the standard to CAC47 for adoption at Step 5/8, noting that the provisions on food additives and food labelling would need to be endorsed by CCFA and CCFL, respectively.</p> <p>The work is according to the envisaged timeframe and the format and presentation as well as language is according to Codex style.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>CCLAC23 noted general support to advance the regional standard for Castilla lulo (naranjilla) and agreed to forward the proposed draft standard to CAC47, included in REP24/LAC Appendix III, for adoption at Step 5/8. Each section of the document was reviewed, introducing editorial corrections. In Section 3.1 on minimum requirements, CCLAC agreed to remove the requirement of "free of trichomes (fuzz covering the fruit)" as it contradicted the product definition in Section 2, which mentions the yellow or red fuzz on unripe Castilla lulo.</p> <p>In Section 3.2.3 on Class II, the first point was amended to differentiate shape defects, and the fifth and sixth points were merged, removing the mention of damage caused by pests due to the difficulties in distinguishing between mechanical damage and pests. CCLAC has done an excellent job; progress has been made on the document, and it is ready for adoption.</p>
<p><b>2. Discussion paper to address the necessity to review the <i>Regional Code of Hygienic Practice for the Preparation and Sale of Street Foods</i> (Latin America and the Caribbean) (CXC 43R-1995), Paragraphs 21, 23 and 26(iii)</b></p>
<p><b>Status and Secretariat's comments:</b></p> <p>CCLAC23, in noting that CCFH54 (2024) had agreed to forward the guidelines for food hygiene control measures in traditional markets for food to CAC47 for final adoption, and had requested relevant FAO/WHO Coordinating Committees to review their respective texts on street vended foods to ensure consistency with this guidelines and the revised <i>General Principles of Food Hygiene</i> (CXC 1-1969), recalled that in their region, the <i>Regional Code of Hygienic Practice for the Preparation and Sale of Street Foods</i> (Latin America and the Caribbean) (CXC 43R-1995) was a text related to street vended foods.</p> <p>CCLAC23 requested Costa Rica and Brazil to prepare a discussion paper, to be presented at CCLAC24, to address whether a review of CXC 43R-1995 was necessary to ensure consistency with CXC 1-1969 and the guidelines for food hygiene control measures in traditional markets for food, when adopted, and provide suggestions/recommendations for next steps or consequential changes to CXC 43R-1995.</p>
<p><b>Chairperson's comments:</b></p> <p>The discussion was very rich on this issue. We would like to thank Costa Rica and Brazil for preparing a discussion paper, to be presented at CCLAC24 to ensure consistency with the above-mentioned standards.</p>