

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

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

Agenda Item 11

CRD09

Original language only

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

53rd Session

(Virtual)

4-8 July and 13 July 2022

REPORT OF THE VIRTUAL PRE-MEETING

DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW

(Prepared by the Electronic Working Group chaired by Chile
and co-chaired by Australia, India and Kenya)

This CRD should be read in conjunction with CX/PR 22/53/13; CX/PR 22/53/13-Add.1; CRD06 and CRD presented by Codex Members and Observers

INTRODUCTION

1. On 28 June 2022, the pre-meeting of the Electronic Working Group (EWG) on “Discussion paper on the Proposal for the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review” took place virtually. The meeting was held in English, French and Spanish and the program was published on the Codex website.
2. The objective was to provide Members and Observers with an opportunity to make progress on the development of these proposal based on the information provided in the working documents and comments received in reply to CL 2021/39-PR in order facilitate the consideration of this item by CCPR. The conclusions and recommendations of this meeting will be presented to the consideration of the CCPR53.
3. Previously to this meeting, the EWG Co-Chairs prepared a revised discussion paper (see Appendix I of the CR06) that considered the comments received in reply to CL 2022/39-PR.

METHODOLOGY

4. To facilitate the discussion, Chile, as the Chair of the EWG, presented a summary of the work carried out. Subsequently, the draft of the Discussion paper was presented (see Appendix I of CRD06) where Members and observers had the opportunity to make general and specific comments.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

6. Members and observers expressed their support for the proposal presented in the Section I of document CX/PR 22/53/13 and the options for data support presented in Section 2; and support the establishment of an eWG to refine the proposal for consideration by CCR54.
7. Some members and observers made inquiries and/or requested clarifications on specific aspects of sections 1 and 2, which were answered by EWG Co-Chairs, therefore, no amendments to the discussion paper were considered necessary.

CONCLUSIONS

8. It was agreed with establishment of an EWG to further develop and refine the management proposal for consideration by CCPR54 (2023).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE CCPR53

9. Codex members and Observers are invited to consider:
 - (i) The revised proposal for the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review described as presented in Section 1 of Appendix I.
 - (ii) The different options for data support that could be addressed by Codex, FAO/WHO, JMPR, governments and industry to further assist countries in implementing the proposed management approach as presented in Section 2 of Appendix I.
 - (iii) The establishment of an EWG to further develop and refine the management proposal for consideration by CCPR54 (2023).

**PROPOSAL FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS
WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN¹ SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW**

SECTION 1. MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC RE-EVALUATION

1. Unsupported compounds without public health concerns (PHCs) due for periodic review will be managed according to the periodic review procedures described in the Codex Procedures Manual.
2. At each Session, the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) will consider the establishment of an Electronic Working Group (EWG) for Unsupported Compounds.
3. Consistent with current practice, the Chair of the EWG on Priorities will continue to provide the following information regarding compounds listed in Tables 2A, 2B and 3 distributed to members and observers each year:
 - i. Status of health concerns, currently presented in the “Table 2B PHC only” tab of the Scheduling and Priority Lists of Pesticides for Evaluation by the JMPR spreadsheet.
 - ii. Situation of support of the compounds and their respective CXLs
 - iii. Record and details of previous periodic evaluations (Table 3)
4. It should be noted that CCPR has agreed that the data requirements for a JMPR re-evaluation of an unsupported compound without public health concerns will not be reduced from those required for any other compound.
5. As soon as a compound is put on Table 2B (periodic review list: compounds listed under 15 year rule but not yet scheduled or listed) Codex Members should have a close look to the compounds to see which are supported and which are unsupported.
6. Member states that notice that the Codex maximum residue limits (CXLs) for a compound are not supported and the country itself is not in a position to generate the data, should communicate such concern to the Chair EWG on Unsupported Compounds in response to the Circular Letter that the Chair of the EWG on priorities issues in September each year, which includes, among others, Tables 2A and 2B.
7. In said communication, the member state must provide detailed information about which CXLs it is interested in supporting, as well as information on national register status, the surface (ha) of the crop treated with the pesticide, international trade data or others that justify the efforts to generate data.
8. The Chair of the EWG on Unsupported Compounds should ~~seek ask the availability of relevant toxicology and/or residue data generated after the last evaluation of the the Joint FAO/WHO Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR Secretariat),~~ which kind of data are required to conduct the reevaluations (toxicology and/or residue studies) if necessary, the Chair must engage the JMPR in this process, through the JMPR Joint Secretaries. The engagement of JMPR at this early stage of the procedure is essential, both to avoid that the dossier to be prepared will be found incomplete, and to avoid unnecessary repetition of studies.
9. The Chair of the EWG on Unsupported Compounds will report to the CCPR plenary the list of pesticides and CXLs for which some member states have expressed concern about the possible revocation of CXLs due to the lack of support, a qualification of whether there is a reasonable justification to advance in the search for possible supports as well as the studies that should be presented according to the JMPR.
10. Opportunities should be discuss by a stakeholders group including especially from those members having evaluated the active substance and/or authorized uses and those members and observers having an interest in keeping the substance in the Codex system. It should add as a criterion, that if you have national registrations, it could be considered
11. For those compounds for which support is obtained, the member (s) should inform both the Chair of the EWG on Priorities and the Chair of the EWG on Unsupported Compounds whether all or some of the CXLs will be supported and should specify each supported and unsupported CXL and the timeframe for provision of relevant data to JMPR.

No support of compound/CXL combinations
12. For substances where support for one or more CXL for an unsupported substance is announced and support can be realized as described before, the remaining unsupported CXL will be revoked after renewal of the compound.

¹ In the context of this document “unsupported compounds without public health concern” describes compounds, for which no public health concern form has been lodged by a Member or where JMPR has not indicated any public health concern. These compounds are waiting for a periodic review after 15 years without a sponsor stating support for the compound.

13. For compounds and their CXLs for which there is no support obtained according to points 5–9, CCPR in its next session should once again ask for support. If no support is given, the withdrawal of CXLs should be endorsed in the following CCPR meeting.

Capacity building activities to strengthen capabilities of Codex members to satisfy requirements for JMPR evaluations

14. Provide capacity building activities to promote the improvement of human resources for those Codex members with difficulties in carrying out the necessary technical studies. These would include technical support to meet the requirements of studies and to meet formal procedures for the data submission. Ideally, these activities could be directed towards experts from different sectors within government and/or research institutes. Some activities proposed to carry out capacity building on:
 - i. Field trials (residues)
 - ii. Toxicological studies
 - iii. Data submission within periodic review procedures

SECTION 2. OPTIONS FOR EFFICIENT DATA SUPPORT THAT COULD BE ADDRESSED BY CODEX, FAO/WHO, JMPR, GOVERNMENTS AND INDUSTRY TO FURTHER ASSIST COUNTRIES IN IMPLEMENTING THE PROPOSED MANAGEMENT APPROACH

15. It is generally agreed that it is possible that Codex members and observers participating in CCPR can collaborate efficiently with other members which currently lack the ability to independently support important uses/compounds for their production systems.
16. However, greater efforts are needed to clarify the work as described in paragraphs 5 to 9 namely: define the scope of the problem with respect to the number of maximum residue limits (MRLs), identify members and observers who are interested in specific compounds, and describe the data required for JMPR to conduct the periodic review.
17. To carry out the above, it is key to prioritize the different cases to ensure that collaboration can be carried out efficiently.
18. Information on the Codex system and the JMPR periodic review process, generation of the required data package and accompanying dossier, should be shared with the generic manufacturers as well as to members and observers having unsupported compounds. This would be the one of the roles of EWG on Unsupported Compounds.

Kind of collaboration activities

19. Collaboration activities focusing on specific projects, courses and training amongst Codex members, between members and observers with the support of the JMPR Secretariat or with other international organizations such as FAO and WHO.

Collaborative activities that can be efficiently developed within the framework of Codex, FAO, WHO, others international organizations, government agencies, industry, etc.:

a) Codex

20. Through the JMPR and the Codex Secretariats, coordinate and carry out workshops on periodic re-evaluations, providing details of each stage of the procedure, requirements, and data to be submitted by the industry or country interested in supporting the re-evaluation. These workshops could be virtual to facilitate participation and reduce costs.
21. The EWG of unsupported compounds could be functioning permanently as a complement to the EWG on priorities.

b) FAO, WHO and other international organizations

22. FAO and WHO can provide information on what data is available and more important on what data is missing. This is necessary to define the workload for those who will provide the missing data.
23. Financial support to carry out the workshops indicated in letter a), along with providing experts, if necessary.

c) Relevant government agencies (i.e. twinning activities between Codex members)

24. Relevant government agencies can provide their latest evaluation as far as available.

25. Interested countries could finance translation into native languages, in order to carry out the trainings proposed in letter a)
 - d) Industry/trading companies**
26. Concerned members should strengthen their efforts to bring interested small and medium enterprises (SME) together that produce substances and/or formulations, to facilitate shared data generation, through financial support/sponsorship.
27. The industry/sponsor that initially registered the compound could provide, upon request, the toxicological and residues background for the pesticides to be re-evaluated.
28. In case all efforts mentioned in paragraph 30 failed, other stakeholders (industry, trading agencies and relevant government agencies) can create common infrastructure and financial support system for capacity building and research facilities to aid in the generation of necessary data to support CXLs.
 - e) Other relevant parties (if any) to assist Codex members, currently lacking the capacity to independently support pesticides/uses important to their production systems, to provide the required data package for the JMPR periodic review**
29. Other international agencies may provide projects for capacity building, while research institutes may be willing to conduct some studies.
30. Other relevant parties are trading companies, trading associations, food associations and agricultural organizations to ensure the flow of information between farmers, national agencies and main exporting countries.
31. Work together to conduct necessary field trials to support revised GAPs: Codex /FAO could act to facilitate collaboration amongst interested member countries (national trade bodies/Industrial groups/crop research bodies) via “collaboration fund” to make best use of resources/prevent duplication of effort.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**Chair: Chile**

Roxana Vera Muñoz
 Head of International Agreements Subdepartment, Department of International Affairs
 Agricultural and Livestock Service, SAG
 (Chair)

Co-chairs**Australia**

Mrs. Karina Budd
 Director
 Residue Chemistry and Laboratory
 Performance Evaluation Section,
 National Residue Survey, Exports
 Division, Department of Agriculture

India

Dr. S.C. Dubey
 Assistant Director General
 Plant Protection and Biosafety
 Indian Council of Agricultural
 Research

Kenya

Mrs. Lucy M. Namu
 Head Quality Assurance and
 Laboratory, Accreditation,
 Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate
 Service (KEPHIS)

Argentina

Carla Serafino
 Registry of Agrochemicals and Biologics of the
 National Service of Agrifood Health and Quality
 (SENASA)

Canada

Monique Thomas
 Pest Management Regulatory Agency, Health

Chile

Paulina Chávez
 Ministerio de Salud

Eduardo Aylwin
 Agencia Chilena para la Calidad e Inocuidad
 Alimentaria (ACHIPIA)

Francisco Sánchez
 Importadores y Productores de Productos
 Fitosanitarios para la Agricultura (IMPPA).

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

Jorge Carvajal
 Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero (SAG)

Costa Rica

Amanda Lasso
 Codex Advisor

Alejandro Rojas León
 State Phytosanitary Service (SFE)

Ivania Morera Rodríguez
 State Phytosanitary Service (SFE)

Tatiana Vasquez Morera
 State Phytosanitary Service (SFE)

Ecuador

Jakeline Arias
 Coordinadora del Subcomité del Codex sobre residuos
 de plaguicidas

European Union

Siret SURVA
 European Commission

Finland

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

France

Florence Gérard
 Ministry of Agriculture

Xavier Sarda
 ANSES

Germany

Karsten Hohgardt
 Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food
 Safety (BVL)

Monika Schumacher
 Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture

Angela Göbel
 Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture

Guatemala

Karen Gatica
 Chemical analyst

Cristián Rossi
Technical expert

India

K.K. Sharma
Network Coordinator, ICAR-IARI

Shri Somnath Das
Export Inspection Agency

Ruchi Gupta
Research Associate, ICAR-IARI

Dr. Shobhita Kalra
Research Associate, ICAR

National Codex Contact Point, NCCP
Food Safety Standards Authority

Japan

Hidetaka KOBAYASHI
Agricultural Chemicals Office, Ministry of Agriculture,
Forestry and Fisheries

Koutarou TOMITA
Agricultural and Veterinary Chemical Residue Office,
Food Safety Standards and Evaluation Division,
Pharmaceutical and Environmental Health Bureau,
Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare

Morocco

JAAFARI Ahmed
Head of the Chemical Inputs Division at the National
Food Safety Office (ONSSA)

MESSAOUDI Bouchra
Engineer in the service of standardization and the
Codex Alimentarius at the National Food Safety Office
(ONSSA)

New Zealand

Warren Hughes
New Zealand Food Safety, Ministry for Primary
Industries

Paraguay

José Eduardo Giménez Duarte
Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y de
Semillas (SENAVE)

Republic of Korea

Codex Contact Point
Quarantine Policy Division, Ministry of Agriculture,
Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA)

Kiseon Hwang
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

Hyejin Park
National Agricultural Products Quality Management
Service

Eun Young Lee
Rural Development Administration

Jung Kyunghee
Ministry of Drug and Food Safety

Park Yumin
Ministry of Drug and Food Safety

Im Moo-Hyeog
Daegu University

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Saif M. AL-Mutairi
Saudi Food and Drug Authority

Nimah Baqadir
Saudi Food and Drug Authority

Singapore

WU Yuan Sheng
Food Safety Monitoring & Forensics Department

South Africa

Aluwani Madzivhandila
Food Control

Sweden

Niklas Montell
Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, National
Institute for Public

Thailand

Namaprn Attaviroj
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food
Standards (ACFS), Ministry of Agriculture and
Cooperatives

Chutima Sornsumrarn
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food
Standards (ACFS), Ministry of Agriculture and
Cooperatives

The Netherlands

Karin Mahieu
Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, National
Institute for Public

Uganda

Geoffrey Onen
Assistant Commissioner Directorate of Government
Analytical Laboratory (DGAL)

Josephine Nyanzi
Principal Regulatory Officer, Vet Medicine National
Drug Authority (NDA)

Moses Matovu
Research Officer National Agricultural Research
Organization (NARO)

John Wabuzibu Mwanja
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries

Rose Nakimuli
Inspection manager Chemiphar (U) Ltd

Joseph Iberet
Uganda National Bureau of Standards

Arthur Mukanga
Uganda National Bureau of Standards

Ruth Awio
Uganda National Bureau of Standards

Hakim Mufumbiro
Uganda National Bureau of Standards

United Kingdom

Paul Brian
Health and Safety Executive

United States of America

Aaron Niman
Environmental Health Scientist U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency

David Miller
Chemistry & Exposure Branch and Acting Chief,
Toxicology & Epidemiology Branch U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency

Alexander Domesle
Senior Advisor for Chemistry, Toxicology and Related
Sciences U.S. Food Safety and Inspection Service U.S.
Department of Agriculture

Marie Maratos Bhat
U.S. Codex Office U.S. Department of Agriculture

Uruguay

Susana Franchi
DAD-DGSA-MGAP

Observer Organizations

CropLife International

Wibke Meyer
Director Regulatory Affairs

**International Fruit & Vegetable Juice Association
(IFU)**

John Collins
Executive Director