INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) held its fifty-third session online, from 4 to 8 July with report adoption on 13 July 2022, at the kind invitation of the Government of China. Dr Guibiao YE, Division Director, Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs the People's Republic of China, chaired the meeting. The session was attended by XX Member Countries, one Member Organization, and XX Observer Organizations. The list of participants is contained in Appendix I.

OPENING OF THE SESSION

2. Mr Li Jinxiang, Chief Veterinary Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China, opened the meeting, welcoming participants, recalling the role of CCPR in protecting consumer health, and in building a sound, open and equitable international system of pesticide residue standards, to facilitate safe and fair food trade. He further stressed that the Chinese government would continue to support the work of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, and fulfil its responsibilities related to hosting CCPR.

3. Dr Xiongwu Qiao, former Chair of CCPR, Mr Carlos Watson, FAO Representative to China and DPR Korea, Mr Soren Madsen on behalf WHO, Mr Steve Wearne, Chairperson of CAC and Mr Tom Heilandt, Codex Secretary, also addressed the Committee.

Division of Competence

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

ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)[1]

5. CCPR adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the Session.

6. CCPR agreed to discuss the following under Agenda Item 7:

- Proposal for a modification of the portion of the commodity to which MRLs apply and which is analysed for fruits with inedible peel (Agenda Item 17, proposal of Ecuador)
- Revision of the Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989): Group 023 Oilseeds (proposal of Australia)

APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEURS (Agenda Item 2)

7. CCPR appointed Julian Cudmore (UK) and David Lunn (NZ) to act as rapporteurs.

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

8. CCPR noted that the document was mainly for information.

9. As regards the adoption of the new MRLs by CAC44, an Observer noted that the online Codex MRLs pesticide database had not been consequently updated to reflect these changes, requested the Codex Secretariat to provide appropriate resources and priority to update this database in a timely manner following CAC approval.

Conclusion

10. CCPR noted the information provided and in particular:

(i) acknowledged that issues related to coordination of work between CCPR and CCRVDF would be considered under Agenda Items 7(d) and 8.

(ii) encouraged Members and Observers to plan and implement activities to build awareness of Codex and to engage high level political support for Codex work on the occasion of the 60th Anniversary of CAC in 2023.

(iii) encouraged Members and Observers to actively engage in opportunities to contribute to the discussions in CCEXEC on issues of general interest to Codex such as the ongoing discussion on the operationalization of the Statements of Principle (SoP); the future of Codex and on how to address cross-cutting, overarching, and emerging issues; and the monitoring the use of Codex standards, through their regional coordinators and/or by providing replies to relevant circular letters.

1 CX/PR 22/53/1
2 CX/PR 22/53/2

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO (Agenda Item 4a)[3]

FAO

11. The Representative of FAO informed CCPR that FAO hosted the first celebration of the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) on 12 May 2022. The event served to map out the priorities for plant health including fostering development and implementation of the international standards on phytosanitary measures to protect global plant resources while facilitating safe trade.

WHO

12. The WHO Representative informed the meeting of the new WHO Global Strategy for Food Safety 2022-2030. The Strategy had been developed to guide and support Member States in their efforts to prioritize, plan, implement, monitor and regularly evaluate actions towards the reduction of the burden of foodborne diseases by continuously strengthening food safety systems and promoting global cooperation. An important element in the Strategy would be an emphasis on an updated estimate of the global burden of foodborne disease and guidance for similar estimates to be developed at the national level.

Conclusion

13. CCPR welcomed the report by FAO and WHO and noted the information provided.

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (Agenda Item 4b)[4]

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

14. The Representative of the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre introduced the item and drew attention to recent and ongoing activities implemented by the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre in collaboration with the Member States. The Representative highlighted coordinated research and technical cooperation projects of interest to CCPR; the Joint Centre's work on capacity building including supervised field trials and matters related to stability and purity of certified reference materials (see Agenda item 15); supporting food safety networks and enhancing active participation of developing countries in Codex matters, including research involving: (i) the use of radio-labelled material, that could support JMPR evaluations and the process of elaborating prioritized Codex MRLs including dual use compounds; (ii) analytical methods for testing and monitoring a mixture of chemical hazards including pesticide residues, among others.

15. Delegations, in particular those from low and lower middle income countries, expressed appreciation to the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre for their support and cooperation in strengthening food safety capacities in their countries, including laboratory capacities and development of laboratory networks, which have made significant contributions to improving their food control systems and participation in Codex work. They asked for continued support from and more collaboration with the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre.

16. The Representative further noted that the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre would continue to support Member States with capacity building, technology transfer, networking and research activities as described in the working document.

Conclusion

17. CCPR welcomed the information provided and commended the Joint FAO/IAEA Centre for their capacity building and other activities concerning the safety of pesticides, and chemicals in general, in food and feed, through the use of nuclear and related techniques, to strengthen capacities in developing countries, noted the support of Member States to these activities and encouraged further cooperation in this regard.

REPORT ON ITEMS OF GENERAL CONSIDERATION ARISING FROM THE 2021 JMPR EXTRA AND REGULAR MEETINGS (Agenda Item 5a)[5]

18. CCPR noted the information provided by the FAO and WHO JMPR Secretariats including comments made by delegations as follows:

1. Benefits and challenges to virtual JMPR meetings

19. The JMPR Secretariat presented feedback from the 2021 Extra and Regular JMPR Meetings that were conducted in virtual environment due to COVID-19. The meetings were productive with outcomes of more than 500 recommendations for MRLs by overcoming the difficulties in conducting such technical discussions online. It was noted that the virtual format is not favourable to the efficient completion of the heavy workload of the JMPR due to various challenges and constraints. The online-only meeting format is expected to give only limited benefits which overall are outweighed by counterproductive aspects that do not aid future JMPR decision making.

---

3 CX/PR 22/53/3

4 CX/PR 22/53/4

5 2021 JMPR Extra Meeting: https://www.fao.org/3/cb6975en/cb6975en.pdf
2021 JMPR Regular Meeting: https://www.fao.org/3/cb8313en/cb8313en.pdf

2. International estimate of short-term intakes (IESTI) equations

20. The JMPR Secretariat presented the detailed section on the IESTI equations included in the JMPR report. The JMPR 2021 confirmed the JMPR 2019 conclusion that, the current IESTI equations used as part of JMPR risk assessments are fit for the purpose of ensuring consumer protection and provide confidence that adoption of recommended MRLs is not expected to result in a public health concern.

21. The EU expressed disagreement with the conclusion and informed the meeting that further work on the subject would be undertaken at EU level. The USA found the conclusions of the JMPR satisfactory and that no further work would be necessary.

Conclusion

22. CCPR recalled its decision[6] to suspend discussion on the review of the IESTI equations awaiting feedback from JMPR. Based on the feedback from JMPR as provided in Section 2.2, General Considerations, of the report of the 2021 JMPR Regular Meeting, CCPR agreed to discontinue the consideration of this matter.

3. First considerations on a possible need for amendments to EHC 240 guidance on appropriate use of toxicological historical control data (HCD)

23. The JMPR Secretariat informed the meeting that this was an on-going activity and that the subject is expected to be discussed further in a future JMPR meeting. Meanwhile, JMPR was aware of and participating in an EFSA project on HCD and would take advantage of the information generated in that project.

4. Guidance on the assessment and interpretation of non-linear dispositional kinetics

24. The JMPR Secretariat informed the meeting that a working group under JMPR had been established to prepare for further discussions on this subject during the upcoming JMPR 2022 meeting.

5. Recommendations for use of leafy vegetables to extrapolate residues to the Subgroup 027A Herbs (herbaceous plants)

25. The JMPR Secretariat presented the 2021 JMPR response to the concerns expressed by CCPR52 on using residues in mustard greens to extrapolate to herbs. Recalling the principles laid down in the *Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Groups* (CXG 84-2012), and the flexibility provided for the use of alternative representative commodities, the Meeting provided further justification and confirmed that the selection of mustard greens to extrapolate residues to the Subgroup 027A Herbs is appropriate.

26. Several delegations expressed their support to the JMPR approach on selection and utilization of alternative representative commodities. It was noted that the response of JMPR could be further discussed in the framework of similar situations such as the establishment/extrapolation of MRLs for okra (see Agenda Item 7a).

REPORT ON RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC CONCERNS RAISED BY CCPR ARISING FROM THE 2021 JMPR REGULAR MEETING (Agenda Item 5b)[7]

27. CCPR noted that specific concerns on compounds raised by CCPR would be addressed when discussing the relevant compounds under Agenda Item 6.

28. The following compounds were addressed under Section 3 of the report of the 2021 JMPR Regular Meeting:

- Section 3.1: 312 Afidopyropen
- Section 3.2: 069 Benomyl, 072 Carbendazim, 077 Thiophanate-methyl
- Section 3.3: 081 Chlorothalonil
- Section 3.4: 017 Chlorpyrifos and 090 Chlorpyrifos-methyl
- Section 3.5: 265 Fluensulfone
- Section 3.6: 313 Metconazole
- Section 3.7: 160 Propiconazole

6 REP21/PR52, para. 216(iv)

7 Section 3 of the JMPR Report (2021, regular meeting) https://www.fao.org/3/cb8313en/cb8313en.pdf

PROPOSED MRLs FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED (at Steps 7 and 4) (Agenda Item 6)[8]

General Remarks

29. The EU advised CCPR that they would be introducing reservations for a number of proposed MRLs during the discussions on the individual compounds and that the reasons for these reservations were outlined in CRD13.

30. The EU explained to CCPR that it was current EU policy to align EU MRLs with Codex MRLs (CXLs) if four conditions were fulfilled: (i) the EU sets MRLs for the commodity under consideration; (ii) the current EU MRL is lower than the CXL; (iii) toxicological data are available at EU level and the proposed CXL is safe for European consumers; (iv) the CXL is acceptable to the EU with respect to areas such as consumer protection, supporting data and extrapolations, as well as environmental issues of global nature (such as the decline of pollinators or the accumulation of persistent bioaccumulative and toxic substances in the environment) in conformity with WTO rules and as announced in the Farm to Fork Strategy and the EU Green Deal.

31. The EU also explained that the MRLs and the currently taken positions for seven triazole substances might be revised in future, pending an evaluation of triazole derivative metabolites (TDMs) in the EU.

32. In the interest of transparency, the EU advised CCPR that they would be making reservations during the discussions on the individual compounds where they considered these criteria had not been met (CRD13REV).

33. Switzerland advised CCPR that they would be supporting all the EU reservations as their residue risk assessment approach was the same as that of the EU.

34. An Observer expressed similar concerns as those raised by the EU on environmental issues.

35. CCPR welcomed these clarifications from the EU, agreed that these reservations, where relevant, would be noted in the report and that general reservations related to policy differences would not be discussed further at this meeting.

36. In the subsequent discussions on the compounds Clothianidin (238), Thiamethoxam (245) and Quinoxyfen (222), a number of observers and delegations noted that environmental issues (such as pollinator decline and environmental accumulation) are not included in the CCPR risk management principles, and that CCPR was not the forum to address these concerns.

17 CHLORPYRIFOS

37. The JMPR Secretariat informed that chlorpyrifos and chlorpyrifos-methyl were scheduled together for a periodic evaluation by the 2024 JMPR in response the concern form raised by the EU but that the available toxicology dossier for chlorpyrifos was incomplete.

38. Although CCPRwas advised that a full chlorpyrifos dossier to support a periodic review might become available in the future, in light of the public health concern expressed by the JMPR Secretariat, CCPR agreed to revoke all CXLs, but to maintain chlorpyrifos on the periodic review schedule for the 2024 JMPR pending confirmation that a full data package would be available for review.

34 ETHION

39. CCPR noted that the 2021 JMPR had adopted the ARfD of 0.02 mg/kg bw established by JECFA.

35 ETHOXYQUIN

40. The JMPR Secretariat informed that ethoxyquin had been scheduled for a periodic review for toxicology, but that the submitted data were insufficient to establish an ADI or an ARfD.

69 BENOMYL / 72 CARBENDAZIM / 77 THIOPHANATE-METHYL

41. CCPR noted that JMPR would re-evaluate these compounds in 2023 in response to the concern form raised by EU.

81 CHLOROTHALONIL

42. The JMPR Secretariat indicated that in response to the concern form raised by the EU, the JMPR had concluded that the concerns raised had not been sufficiently substantiated and that they did not merit any review in advance of the normal periodic review process. The EU and Switzerland noted that the full JMPR toxicology evaluation was yet to be published, and that they maintained their previous reservations with respect to the advancement of this MRL because of their concerns over the genotoxicity of some metabolites.

8 CX/PR 22/53/5

43. In response to the concern form raised by the UK, the JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR the overall chronic exposures for metabolite R613636 had been determined and an acute exposure undertaken for cranberries and there were no public health concerns identified. The UK noted that they had not yet seen the assessment and understood this would not be published until after the September 2022 JMPR. However, the UK was content that the update from the JMPR Secretariate addressed the concern raised.

44. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for cranberry for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXL, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

90 CHLORPYRIFOS-METHYL

45. CCPR agreed to retain all the CXLs under the 4-year rule, awaiting the periodic re-evaluation by the 2024 JMPR.

110 IMAZALIL

46. The EU and Switzerland introduced a reservation to the advancement of the proposed MRL for Citrus fruits pending the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU.

47. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL of citrus fruits (group), citrus oil, edible and citrus pulp, dried for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

114 GUAZATINE

48. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that guazatine was scheduled for periodic review but the toxicological data package was incomplete and the ADI and ARfD were withdrawn in 1997.

49. CCPR was informed that a full toxicological data package was available and the JMPR agreed to perform the re-evaluation if the data submitted is sufficient.

138 METALAXYL / 212 METALAXYL-M

50. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for apple and pear because the residue trials were not representative of the presented GAP and not adequate to demonstrate a no-residue situation.

51. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for apples; brussels sprouts; cabbages, head (at 0.06 mg/kg); carrot; flowerhead brassicas (subgroup); ginseng; grapes; lettuce, leaf; melons, except watermelon; onion, bulb; pear; pepper, black, white; potato; spinach; sunflower seed; tomato (subgroup) for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs.

52. CCPR agreed to revoke the CXLs for asparagus; broccoli; cauliflower; cereal grains; cotton seed; lettuce, head; peanut; peas, shelled (succulent seeds); pome fruits; raspberries, red, black; soya bean (dry); spices, seeds as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

53. CCPR agreed to retain the CXLs for avocados; cacao beans; citrus fruits (group); cucumber; gherkin; hops, dry; peppers (subgroup); peppers chili, dried; squash, summer; sugar beet; watermelon; winter squash under the 4-year rule

54. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for orange oil, edible and oranges, sweet, sour (including orange-like hybrids) (subgroup) to Step 4, maintain the MRL of peppers, sweet (including pimento or pimiento) at Step 7 and withdraw all remaining MRLs at Step 7, awaiting the submission of new data.

55. Following a discussion on how the CXLs for metalaxyl and metalaxyl-M should be published in the Codex pesticide database, CCPR agreed to list all CXLs for both metalaxyl and metalaxyl-M under 'Metalaxyl (138)' with footnotes identifying the source of the data for each CXL. For metalaxyl-it would include a note that would indicate that the MRLs for metalaxyl-M (212) are the listed under metalaxyl (138), with the subsequent revocation of all CXLs for metalaxyl-M.

56. CCPR also agreed to maintain a blank entry for 'Metalaxyl-M', with a note that "the proposed maximum residue levels are reported under metalaxyl".

57. CCPR noted that the JMPR would reconsider processing data for ginseng and a new use for pineapple based on data to be submitted by the Republic of Korea and Thailand, respectively.

147 METHOPRENE

58. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for soya bean (dry), because chronic risk could not be excluded for European consumers, the lack of studies on the metabolic behaviour after post-harvest treatment and the nature and magnitude of residues in processed products.

59. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for soya bean (dry) for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

156 CLOFENTEZINE

60. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for hop, dry pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU.

61. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for hops, dry for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

160 PROPICONAZOLE

62. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that in response to a concern form submitted by the EU, the 2021 JMPR reviewed health-based guidance values, metabolites and residue definitions of propiconazole on the basis of data available to the 2021 JMPR Meeting. The JMPR indicated there were different policies on how to interpret data and concluded that propiconazole did not merit any review in advance of the normal periodic review.

63. The EU expressed the same concerns as submitted in the concern form from 2020; following the non-approval of propiconazole in the EU, the consumer risk assessment could not be finalized due to several data gaps, and no conclusion could be drawn on the general toxicity and genotoxicity of several metabolites. An acute intake concern had also been identified for peaches for EU consumers.

64. An Observer expressed a general concern on the toxicity of propiconazole and its triazole metabolites.

167 TERBUFOS

65. CCPR noted the concern raised by the EU that the JMPR toxicological assessment for terbufos had not been updated since 2003 and more critical reference values were proposed in the current Draft Decision Guidance Document of the Chemical Review Committee (CRC) of the Rotterdam Convention. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that the concern from for terbufos would be reviewed by the September 2022 JMPR.

171 PROFENOFOS

66. CCPR agreed to revoke the CXL for teas (tea and herb teas) as recommended by the Codex Secretariat to correct an administrative error.

178 BIFENTHRIN

67. CCPR agreed to withdraw the MRLs for celery and strawberry currently at Step 4, and retain the proposed MRL for lettuce, head at Step 4 awaiting for alternative GAP. JMPR might proceed with the review in 2024 due to the heavy workload for the 2023 JMPR.

189 TEBUCONAZOLE (189)

68. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for coffee beans, pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU and that a risk assessment for TDMs had not been carried out for tebuconazole.

69. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for coffee beans for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXL, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

193 FENPYROXIMATE

70. The JPMR Secretariat informed CCPR that a new ADI and ARfD had been established and acute dietary risk assessments for the current and all previous recommendations by the JMPR had been undertaken. The JMPR had identified public health concerns for some of the commodities.

71. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for lemons and limes (subgroup); pummelo and grapefruits (subgroup) due to an acute consumer risk identified for European consumers.

72. An Observer also expressed their acute intake concerns for fenpyroximate.

73. CCPR agreed to maintain the CXLs under the 4-year rule for apple; apples, dried; beans with pods (subgroup); cucumber; eggplants (subgroup); melons, except watermelons; pear and tomatoes (subgroup) awaiting confirmation of alternative GAP information and supporting data and to exclude plums (subgroup) from the CXL for stone fruit (group).

74. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for edible offal (mammalian); lemons and limes (subgroup); lemons and limes, edible oil refined; lemons and limes, dried pulp; mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; plums (including fresh prunes) (subgroup), prunes, pummelo and grapefruits (subgroup); pummelo and grapefruits, dried pulp; pummelo and grapefruits oil, edible, succulent beans without pods (subgroup) to adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs and the withdrawal of the MRL at Step 4 for plums.

75. CCPR agreed to withdraw the proposed MRLs for apricot; bush berries (subgroup); cane berries (subgroup); cherries (subgroup); fruiting vegetables, cucurbits and summer squashes (subgroup); mandarins (subgroup); mandarin oil; orange oil, edible; orange, dried pulp; oranges, sweet, sour (subgroup); peach; stems and petioles (subgroup and watermelon in view of the acute intake concerns identified by JMPR and to revoke the CXL for cherries (subgroup).

197 FENBUCONAZOLE

76. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for Tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried) for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

202 FIPRONIL

77. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that a chronic risk had been identified for fipronil. The CCPR was advised that the manufacturer would submit data and alternative GAP information to address this risk.

78. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on retaining the CXLs in light of this identified risk.

79. CCPR agreed to retain all the CXLs under the 4-year rule and retain the MRLs at Step 4.

207 CYPRODINIL

80. An Observer expressed concerns relating to the carcinogenicity of cyprodinil and proposed that there should be further studies before any MRLs are advanced.

81. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the CXL for beans (dry) as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

209 METHOXYFENOZIDE

82. CCPR noted the comment from the EU that methoxyfenozide was only authorized in the EU for use in greenhouses owing to the risk to honey bees.

83. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

213 TRIFLOXYSTROBIN

84. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of all the proposed MRLs because no conclusion could be drawn on the general toxicity of several metabolites in EU evaluation.

85. CCPR was advised that the new residue data for citrus fruit would be available in December 2023 and agreed to maintain the CXL for citrus fruits (group) and citrus pulp, dried under the 4-year rule, awaiting the evaluation by JMPR.

86. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

215 FENHEXAMID

87. CCPR agreed to advance the MRLs for asparagus (at the LOQ), bulb onions (subgroup) and pears for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

222 QUINOXYFEN

88. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for cherries (subgroup) pending the ongoing review of MRLs for non-approved substances due to environmental issues of a global nature, in this case, persistence, bioaccumulation and toxicity in the environment.

89. The EU, Switzerland and an Observer supported advancement to Step 5 (instead of using the accelerated procedure) to allow the delegations time to consider this issue.

90. CCPR noted that currently, consideration of environmental issues of global concern was not within its mandate and agreed to advance the proposed MRL for cherries (subgroup) for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXL, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

224 DIFENOCONAZOLE

91. CCPR noted the reservations from the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of all the proposed MRLs pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU; that a chronic risk for European consumers was identified and that a risk assessment for TDMs has not been carried out for difenoconazole.

92. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

231 MANDIPROPAMID

93. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs for edible offal (mammalian) and mammalian fats (except milk fats) as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

232 PROTHIOCONAZOLE

94. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of all proposed MRLs, pending the outcome of ongoing periodic re-evaluation in EU, and that a risk assessment for TDMs has not been carried out for prothioconazole.

95. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

96. CCPR further agreed that MRLs for mammalian fats (except milk fats) and meat (from mammals other than marine mammals) were below the LOQ in all the trials and this should be indicated accordingly, i.e. by introducing (*) next to the MRLs.

233 SPINETORAM

97. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried) because they had identified an acute intake concern for tea and that the concentration of metabolites was only estimated from the metabolism studies in apples.

98. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

238 CLOTHIANIDIN

99. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for barley; eggs; liver of cattle, goats, pigs & sheep; milks; oats; poultry edible offal of; poultry fats; poultry meat; rice, husked; sorghum grain; sorgo or sorghum, sweet; sweet corn (subgroup of); triticale; wheat pending their ongoing review of MRLs for non-approved substances due to environmental issues of a global nature, in this case, pollinator decline.

100. The EU, Switzerland and an Observer supported advancement to Step 5 (instead of using the accelerated procedure) to allow the delegations time to consider this issue.

101. CCPR noted that currently, consideration of environmental issues of global concern was not within its mandate and agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

239 FLUOPYRAM

102. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for coffee beans for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

245 THIAMETHOXAM

103. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for barley; edible offal (mammalian); eggs; mammalian fats (except milk fats); meat (from mammals other than marine mammals); milks; oats; persimmon, Japanese; poultry, edible offal of; poultry fats; poultry meat; rice, husked; sorghum grain; sorgo or sorghum, sweet; sweet corns, subgroup of; triticale; wheat pending their ongoing review of MRLs for non-approved substances due to environmental issues of a global nature, in this case, pollinator decline.

104. The EU, Switzerland and an Observer supported advancement to Step 5 (instead of using the accelerated procedure) to allow the delegations time to consider this issue.

105. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

246 ACETAMIPRID

106. CCPR noted the reservation from the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for pistachio nuts and tree nuts (group), pending the outcome of an ongoing evaluation concerning toxicological reference values and residue definitions in the EU.

107. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for pistachio nuts and tree nuts (group) (except pistachio nut) for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the CXL for tree nuts (group), as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

252 SULFOXAFLOR

108. CCPR noted the reservation from the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for elderberries because the extrapolation from blueberries to elderberries was not foreseen in the Codex extrapolation rules. JMPR clarified that the similar growth habit and identical use patterns supported this extrapolation.

109. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

262 BIXAFEN

110. The EU noted the value used in the dietary burden calculation for barley should be corrected and the JMPR Secretariat confirmed that this would be done.

111. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

265 FLUENSULFONE

112. The JMPR Secretariat indicated that in response to the concern form submitted by the USA relating to the residue database used to recommend the pome fruit MRL and the need for a citrus juice MRL, the 2021 JMPR reviewed the studies and established a new proposed MRL for pome fruit and confirmed that it was not possible to establish a process factor for citrus juice.

113. CCPR noted that the EU and Switzerland had confirmed their reservation on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for pome fruits because the metabolism studies were not representative for the residue behaviour observed in the residue trials and that the genotoxic potential of metabolite 2- Methylsulfonylthiazole (MeS) could not be excluded.

114. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for pome fruit (group) to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR (with the subsequent withdrawal the 2019 JMPR recommendation) and to advance the proposed MRLs for apple juice and apples, dried to Step 5/8 for adoption, as recommended by the 2019 JMPR.

268 ISOXAFLUTOLE

115. CCPR noted that the EU residue definition for risk assessment also included the metabolite RPA 203328.

116. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for soya bean (dry) for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

271 TRINEXAPAC-ETHYL

117. CCPR noted the reservation of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for rye and rice pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU.

118. An Observer requested that the proposed MRLs are not advanced pending the outcome of the EU periodic review.

119. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

292 PENDIMETHALIN

120. CCPR noted the reservations from the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for leek as the GAP considered by the JMPR related to a use in Hungary which was only authorized for pre-emergence use and residues should be < 0.01 mg/kg, although additional data are being considered in an ongoing evaluation. The EU noted that the data were not sufficient to confirm that residues would be < 0.01 mg/kg for flowerhead brassicas (subgroup) and sugar cane.

121. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that for the MRLs recommended at the LOQ a suitable method had been validated and that there was sufficient evidence to support the recommendation that residues would be < 0.01 mg/kg.

122. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

299 ISOPROTHIOLANE

123. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for banana pending the outcome of their ongoing import tolerance requests.

124. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRL for banana for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

304 ETHIPROLE

125. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRL for soya bean (dry) pending the outcome of an ongoing evaluation.

126. CCPR noted the proposal from the EU for the JMPR to re-evaluate the toxicological reference values for ethiprole in light of new data made available to the EU.

127. An Observer also proposed that JMPR conduct a further review of ethiprole before any MRLs are adopted as several adverse effects in neurobehavioral parameters in mice have been observed

128. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

305 FENPICOXAMID

129. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

309 PYDIFLUMETOFEN

130. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs pending the outcome of an ongoing evaluation for pydiflumetofen in the EU. The EU noted that the approach taken to derive the MRLs for bulb onions (subgroup); green onions (subgroup); head brassicas; root vegetables (subgroup); succulent beans without pods (subgroup); succulent peas without pods (subgroup); sunflower seeds (subgroup) was not fully in line with the OECD methodology for rotational crop studies. The EU also noted that the proposed MRL for elderberries was based on the extrapolation from blueberries to elderberries which is not foreseen in the Codex extrapolation rules.

131. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, with the subsequent revocation of the associated CXLs, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR. CCPR also noted that the proposed CXL for sorghum and millet (subgroup) will be qualified to exclude sorghum grain.

312 AFIDOPYROPEN

132. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that in response to the concern form submitted by the USA, the 2021 JMPR reviewed the data and confirmed that the information was only sufficient to conclude that the dimer metabolite M007 was of similar toxicity to afidopyropen. The JMPR noted that no new data were provided with the concern form. The JMPR also informed CCPR that the residue definition proposed by the 2019 JMPR as the 'sum of afidopyropen + M007, expressed as afidoyropen' was imprecise and had been revised to 'sum of afidopyropen + M007.

133. Regarding the concern about the low proposed MRL for milk, the JMPR indicated that it was supported by both the analytical method and expected residues.

134. CCPR noted the information provided by the JMPR Secretariat.

313 METCONAZOLE

135. The JMPR Secretariat informed CCPR that in response to a concern form submitted by the USA, the 2021 JMPR re-evaluated the decline trials for wheat, rye, barley and oat, and proposed a new MRL for wheat which was also extrapolated to triticale. The 2021 JMPR reconfirmed the existing CXLs for animal commodities.

136. CCPR noted the reservation from the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for wheat and triticale pending the outcome of the ongoing periodic re-evaluation in the EU and that a risk assessment for TDMs has not been carried out for metconazole.

137. CCPR agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for triticale; wheat; wheat bran, unprocessed for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

314 PYFLUBUMIDE

138. CCPR agreed to withdraw the proposed MRLs for apple; tea, green, black (black, fermented and dried) at Step 4 noting that JMPR had identified an acute exposure concern for these commodities and that no new toxicological data will be provided.

319 FLUTIANIL

139. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

320 MEFENTRIFLUCONAZOLE

140. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that mefentrifluconazole was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 2022 JMPR in September.

141. CCPR agreed to establish an ADI of 0-0.04 mg/kg bw and an ARfD of 0.3 mg/kg bw for mefentrifluconazole.

321 PYRASULFOTOLE

142. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs due to the lack of available toxicological data at EU level, pending the outcome of the review of the JMPR monograph.

143. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

322 PYRAZIFLUMID

144. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs for apple; grapes; pear; and persimmon, Japanese based on the lack of available toxicological data at EU level, pending the outcome of the review of the JMPR monograph.

145. CCPR noted that the 2021 JMPR was not able to recommend MRLs for animal commodities due to the absence of an enforcement method.

146. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

323 SPIROPIDION

147. CCPR noted the reservations of the EU and Switzerland on the advancement of the proposed MRLs based on the lack of available toxicological data at EU level, pending the outcome of the review of the JMPR monograph

148. CCPR agreed to advance all the proposed MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8, as recommended by the 2021 JMPR.

324 TETRANILIPROLE

149. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that tetraniliprole was scheduled for residue evaluation by the 2022 JMPR in September, noting that an ADI of 0-2 mg/kg bw had been established and that an ARfD was unnecessary.

Conclusion

150. CCPR:

(i) agreed to forward to CAC45:

a) MRLs for adoption at Step 5/8 (Appendix II).

b) CXLs for revocation by CAC44 (Appendix III).

(ii) noted that:

a) MRLs retained at Steps 4 and 7 would be attached as Appendices IV and V (for information).

b) MRLs in the Step Procedure which have been withdrawn are attached as Appendix VI (discontinuation of work).

REVISION OF THE CLASSIFICATION OF FOOD AND FEED (CXA 4-1989) (Agenda Item 7)

General remarks

151. The USA and the Netherlands, as Chair and co-Chair of the EWG, introduced the item, recalled the ToR of the EWG, and explained the key points of discussion in the EWG, the conclusions and recommendations made. They further explained that comments submitted in reply to the various CLs had been taken into account to prepare revised proposals for discussion in the virtual pre-meeting that took place on 27 June 2022 (CRD03). The recommendations of the pre-meeting as presented in CRD07 would be considered under Agenda Items 7(a) – (d).

152. In addition, CCPR was informed that the pre-meeting had also addressed the proposals from Ecuador and Australia on the consideration of the portion of the commodity to which MRLs apply and which is analysed in relation to Group 14 (Assorted fruits – inedible peel)/Group 006 (Assorted tropical and sub-tropical fruits – inedible peel) and Group 023 Oilseeds and that the recommendations from the virtual pre-meeting would be considered under this agenda item.

153. The Codex Secretariat also informed CCPR that consideration of consequential amendments to the Classification of Food and Feed related to the inclusion of new code numbers/names to address MRLs arising from the 2021 JMPR evaluations and the review of the *Guidelines on portion of commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analysed* (CXG 41-1993) would also be considered under this agenda item as a follow-up to the discussion on Agenda Item 6 and the requests from Ecuador and Australia.

154. CCPR considered the recommendations of the virtual pre-meeting, made the following decisions and agreed with or noted the following comments:

ESTABLISHMENT OF MRLs FOR PESTICIDES FOR OKRA (Agenda Item 7a)[9]

155. CCPR recalled previous feedback from JMPR on the difficulty to extrapolate MRLs for okra from the Subgroup Pepper and pepper-like commodities, and so the exclusion of okra, martynia and roselle from the group MRL for peppers. CCPR52 agreed that the EWG on the revision of the Classification of food and feed should consider representative commodities from which MRLs for okra could be extrapolated and whether monitoring data could be used to extrapolate MRLs for this commodity.

156. The EWG Chair informed CCPR that the EWG had considered an appropriate representative commodity taking into account monitoring data submitted by Canada and India. The EWG noted the difficulty in drawing conclusions from monitoring data not knowing the GAP behind the okra residue data and without being able to compare residue trials on okra and chili peppers with known GAPs. Based on the available monitoring data the EWG made two proposals for consideration by CCPR53 using chili (non-bell) pepper (chili pepper) as the representative commodity which led to the low exceedances for okra and the sufficient conservatism in MRLs derived using the OECD MRL calculator to be protection of actual residues in okra.

157. The two options would lead to different amendments to the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) and/or the table of representative commodities in the *Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Groups* (CXG 84-2012).

158. The virtual pre-meeting of the WG on the revision of the Classification considered the two options proposed by the EWG and an alternative proposal from the EU (Option 3) as follows:

    1. Option 1: Include a footnote to the current Subgroup 12B reading: Only data from chili pepper can be used to set a CXL or
    2. Option 2: Create a separate Subgroup 12D Okra with chili pepper as the representative commodity.
    3. Option 3: Create a separate Subgroup 12D Okra (including martynia and roselle) with okra as the representative commodity.

159. The VWG could not find consensus on any of the proposals although there was more preference for Option 1 as opposed to Option 2 and agreed to forward the 3 Options to CCPR53 for consideration and possible resolution.

160. Alternatively, the EWG Chair proposed that CCPR postpone discussion on the item and request advice from JMPR on the proposed options for consideration by CCPR54 and what could be the most representative commodity for okra given that registrants were unlikely to develop residue data because of the limited financial incentive and the fact that the EWG had not been able to reach consensus on this issue. The EWG Chair encouraged interested members and observers to submit any additional data on okra to JMPR for their consideration. He further noted that the US cropping system allowed the extrapolation from a small cultivar of eggplant.

161. The Codex Secretariat noted that procedurally it was possible to request advice from JMPR and proposed to send the three options and all the relevant information considered by the EWG as well as comments submitted to CCPR, to JMPR to request that they advise on the best of the three options or an alternative option and what could be the most suitable representative commodity for okra. She further requested members/observers to submit any other relevant data to JMPR that might facilitate discussion and advice to CCPR. Based on the advice of JMPR, CCPR could then consider possible revision of the Classification and/or the Principles and Guidance for Extrapolation.

162. The JMPR FAO Secretariat, in response to the Option 3 proposed by the pre-meeting, reminded CCPR that the 2019 JMPR had already agreed on extrapolation and that the question on the representative crop needed to be resolved. She further recalled that JMPR had revisited this issue and found that data suggested that peppers were unlikely to reflect the residues present in okra when treated according to the same GAP. She further clarified that such differences could be explained by the differences in morphology of okra fruit (ridge and slightly hairy surface) when compared to pepper (smooth-skinned surface) and their relative residue potentials when using the extrapolation principle for crop grouping. However, she noted that JMPR had not had the chance to look at all the monitoring data for the extrapolation of MRLs for okra considered by the EWG (i.e. the monitoring data from India) and therefore these options could be forwarded to JMPR, including available monitoring data for their assessment and possible advice to CCPR. She reminded CCPR that JMPR was scheduled to meet in September 2022 and that additional monitoring data should be submitted as early as possible to allow JMPR to consider the request from CCPR.

163. There was general agreement with the proposal to request advice from JMPR, however a comment was made that if a separate subgroup were created (option 3) it was unlikely that there would be field-trial data available for okra.

---

[9] CX/PR 22/53/6; CL 2022/34-PR; CX/PR 22/53/6-Add.1 (Canada, Egypt, EU, Kenya, Mauritius, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Thailand, United Kingdom, USA)

Conclusion

164. CCPR agreed to request:

(i) advice from JMPR on the 3 options and to forward all information/data considered by the EWG and all comments submitted to CCPR for JMPR consideration; and

(ii) members/observers to submit any additional monitoring data/other information to JMPR to facilitate the consideration of this matter.

CLASS B – PRIMARY FOOD COMMODITIES OF ANIMAL ORIGIN (ALL TYPES) (Agenda Item 7b)[10]

CLASS E – PROCESSED FOODS OF ANIMAL ORIGIN (ALL TYPES) (Agenda Item 7c)[11]

165. The USA, as Chair of the EWG, also on behalf of the Co-Chair,The Netherlands, introduced the reports of the EWG and the virtual pre-meeting, focusing on the key changes as presented in Appendix I of CRD07 and the recommendation of the virtual pre-meeting that the revised Class B and Class E could be further considered in the EWG and that the EWG should develop the table of representative commodities for each of the classes.

166. CCPR considered the recommendation in CRD07 and expressed agreement with the structure outlined and that consideration of additional commodities and representative commodities would be taken up by the EWG including proposals submitted in writing to this session as available in CRDs.

167. A Member referring to their comments in CRD20 and noting the intent of the document is the classification of food and feed for the purposes of setting MRLs for pesticides, requested to amend the explanatory note in Class B: Group 44 Aquatic Animal Products as some aspects of the note did not relate to the Codex mandate nor had any information relevant to pesticide residues. CCPR noted that this issue could be considered in the EWG.

168. CCPR also noted support for inclusion of bee products such as honey. An Observer noted that dolphins and whales should not be included as commodities in the Classification as in their view, dolphins and whales should not be included in the diet as a food group.

Other matters

Modification of the portion of commodities to which MRLs applied and which is analysed:

Group 014 (Assorted fruits – inedible peel) (Agenda Item 17) (CXG 41-1993) and Group 006 (Assorted tropical and sub-tropical fruits - inedible peel (CXA 4-1989))

Group 023 Oilseeds

169. The EWG Chair recalled that the issues raised in the proposal for the modification of the portion of commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analysed raised by Ecuador for Group 014/Group 006 (Agenda Item 17, CX/PR 22/53/19 and CRD05) and by Australia for Group 023 Oilseeds (CRD11) had been considered by the pre-meeting and that it was proposed that they should be considered further by the EWG in order to make recommendations for consideration by CCPR54.

Review of the *Guidelines on portion of commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analysed* (CXG 41-1993)

170. The Codex Secretariat noted that following the requests from Australia and Ecuador to provide clarifications on provisions pertaining to the portion of the commodity to which the MRL applies and which is analysed for both Groups 014/006 and 023, the Codex Secretariat would request to task the EWG on the revision of the Classification to undertake the review of CXG41 *vis-à-vis* the Classification on provisions for the portion of the commodity to which the MRLs apply and which is analysed with a view to either integrate CXG41 into the Classification or recommend its revocation to avoid the coexistence of two Codex texts addressing the same provisions with the possibility to become redundant or contradictory.

171. The Codex Secretariat indicated that this was in line with the decision of CCPR that once the revision of the Classification would be completed, the Committee would decide on whether to retain CXG41 as s single text or integrate it into the Classification[12]. She further noted that the revision of the Classification would be completed with the finalization of the revision of Class B and Class E.

10 CX/PR 22/53/7; CL 2022/35-PR; CX/PR 22/53/7-Add.1 (Canada, Egypt, EU, Kenya, Philippines, Thailand, USA)

11 CX/PR 22/53/8

12 ALINORM 10/33/24, para. 190

Consequential amendment to Class D

172. The Codex Secretariat explained that following proposals for MRLs for a number of citrus fruits pulp (dried) and oils (edible) including soya flour arising from the 2021 JMPR evaluations, the Codex Secretariat recommended the inclusion of the additional/new code number/names in Class D of the Classification and to forward them to CAC for adoption as consequential amendment to the Classification, Class D.

173. In response to a question on updating of the database on Codex MRLs for pesticides to address the impact of the revised Classification on existing CXLs, the Codex Secretariat clarified that this work was ongoing, and that the Secretariat was in the process of hiring a consultant to assist with this work.

Conclusion

174. CCPR agreed to forward the consequential amendment to the Classification of Food and Feed, Class D, related to the inclusion of additional commodities for certain citrus fruits pulps (dried) and oils (edible) and soya flour to CAC for adoption (Appendix VII).

175. CCPR agreed to return Class B and Class E to Step 2/3 for further development by the EWG.

176. CCPR further agreed to re-establish the EWG on the revision of the Classification, chaired by USA and co-chaired by the Netherlands, working in English only, to:

(i) continue working on Class B and Class E of the Classification and prepare tables of representative commodities;

(ii) consider the proposals on the portion of the commodity to which the MRLs apply, and which is analysed for Group 006 Assorted tropical and sub-tropical fruits - inedible peel (Ecuador) and Group 023 Oilseeds (Australia); and

(iii) review the *Guidelines on portion of commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analysed* (CXG 41-1993) with a comparison to the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) to consider revocation of CXG41 to avoid coexistence of the two documents addressing the same provisions. The EWG will consider any provisions from CXG41 that could still be integrated into the revised Classification and make a proposal for consideration by CCPR54.

COORDINATION OF WORK BETWEEN CCPR AND CCRVDF: CLASS B – PRIMARY FOOD COMMODITIES OF ANIMAL ORIGIN. HARMONIZATION OF MEAT MAMMALIAN MRLs BETWEEN CCPR AND CCRVDF: HARMONIZED DEFINITION FOR EDIBLE OFFAL AND OTHER EDIBLE TISSUES (Agenda Item 7d)[13]

177. CCPR recalled its previous discussion on harmonization of terms/definitions for edible tissues of animal origin including edible offal and noted the recommendation of CCRVDF26 (2021) to harmonize the definition of edible offal to facilitate the establishment of harmonized/single MRLs for compounds with dual use.

178. The USA, as Chair of the EWG, summarized the discussion in the EWG and the virtual pre-meeting and indicated that there was support in both the EWG and VWG to forward the definition for edible offal as recommended by CCRVDF and adopted by CAC44 (2021). The EWG Chair further explained that harmonization of terms/definitions for fat, meat and muscle were not discussed in the EWG and that the VWG could not make any recommendations on the harmonization of these terms between CCPR and CCRVDF.

Edible offal

179. CCPR agreed with the recommendation to harmonize its definition for edible offal with that of CCRVDF as adopted by CAC.

Other edible tissues: fat, meat and muscle

180. CCPR consider the proposal to harmonize the definition of fat, meat and muscle with that of JECFA/CCRVDF as advised by the Joint JMPR/JECFA Working Group on Residue Definition in order to facilitate the establishment of single MRLs for compounds with dual use.

13 CX/PR 22/53/9; CL 2022/36-PR; CX/PR 22/53/9-Add.1 (Canada, Chile, Colombia, Egypt, EU, Kenya, Philippines, Thailand)

181. The Codex Secretariat indicated that there had been lots of requests from Members in both CCPR and CCRVDF to coordinate work on issues of common interest to both committees such as the establishment of harmonized/single MRLs for compounds with dual use for food of animal origin. CCEXEC and CAC had also encouraged both committees to coordinate closely on such matters to the extent possible to facilitate trade in these commodities while protecting consumers' health. The current situation by which CCPR and CCRVDF keeps different approaches to the establishment of MRLs for tissues such as meat/muscle and fat leads to the establishment of two MRLs for pesticides and veterinary drugs for the same commodity (tissue) creating (potential) trade disruption in terms of which MRL should be enforced usually resulting in the application of the most conservative MRL. The Codex Secretariat advised that CCPR not make any changes to the definitions proposed by the Joint JECFA/JMPR WG and used by JECFA/CCRVDF and to simply endorse the recommendations to harmonize the definitions, i.e., to use the JECFA/CCRVDF definitions for meat, muscle and fat to facilitate harmonization of MRLs for compounds with dual use.

182. The Codex Secretariat also advised CCPR to agree on the definitions for the portion of the commodity to which MRLs applied and which is analysed for fat and muscle as recommended by the Joint JECFA/JMPR WG which would assist the EWG on the revision of the Classification with the ongoing revision of Class B and Class E.

183. She further explained that if the above definitions would be agreeable to CCPR, they would be incorporated into the *Classification of Food and Fee*d following adoption by CAC.

184. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that the definitions that JMPR proposed to be harmonized with had been used by JECFA and CCRVDF for years and CCPR was not advised to make any modifications to the definitions. After harmonization , JMPR would recommend MRLs for meat as "meat (lean muscle)" that accurately conveys the tissues that are assayed in feeding studies. This change would make it easier for enforcement and monitoring agencies to interpret and apply the resulting MRLs to samples that might have a fat content different to that assumed under the current JMPR/CCPR convention. The change in terms would only affect existing CXLs that are listed as "meat (fat)". CXLs for residues that are classified as being "not fat soluble" could be converted directly to the new term. No immediate action would need to be taken to convert existing meat (fat) CXLs and could be addressed through the periodic review. This was for consistency with the CCPR management decision on how to handle the existing CXLs and new CXLs vis-à-vis the revised Classification. Therefore, JMPR strongly recommended to accept the proposal from the joint JECFA/JMPR WG.

185. While there was support to harmonize the definitions, a question was raised on the definition for "meat" and that it should be extended to all animals and not only mammals as covered by the current JECFA/CCRVDF definition.

186. CCPR agreed to harmonize the definition of fat, meat and muscle with that of JECFA/CCRVDF as proposed by the Joint JECFA/JMPR WG including the definition for the portion of the commodity to which MRLs apply and which is analysed for fat and muscle.

Conclusion

187. CCPR agreed to forward the definitions for edible offal, meat, muscle and fat, including definitions for the portion of the commodity to which MRLs apply and which is analysed for fat and muscle, to CAC for adoption and to inform JMPR accordingly (Appendix VIII);

COORDINATION OF WORK BETWEEN CCPR AND CCRVDF: JOINT CCPR/CCRVDF WORKING GROUP ON COMPOUNDS WITH DUAL USE – STATUS OF WORK (Agenda Item 8)[14]

188. The USA, as Chair of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG, introduced the item and summarized the information provided in the working document, including background, mandate and work process. He explained that the Joint EWG would review work already done cooperatively between CCRVDF and CCPR and identify and prioritize cross-cutting issues that impact on both committees and recommend paths forward in which both committees could collaborate to address those identified issues in order to facilitate the consideration of compounds with dual use and the possible harmonization of MRLs. This might include reflections on improved synchronization of work between CCPR and CCRVDF as well as enhanced collaboration between JECFA and JMPR. He noted the Joint EWG would provide an update on their preliminary findings to CCRVDF26 and CCPR54 in 2023.

Conclusion

189. CCPR noted the information provided by the Chair of the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG on the status of work under their mandate, supported the activities of the Joint EWG and encouraged delegations to actively participate in the work of the Joint EWG.

14 CX/PR 22/53/10

GUIDELINES FOR COMPOUNDS OF LOW PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN THAT MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX MRLs OR DO NOT GIVE RISE TO RESIDUES (at Step 7) (Agenda Item 9)[15]

190. Chile, as Chair of the EWG, also on behalf of the co-Chairs, India and USA, introduced the item and summarized the work process and key points of discussion in the EWG and as well as in the virtual pre-meeting that took place on Tuesday 28 June and presented the recommendations for consideration by CCPR. The EWG Chair highlighted the general support expressed by members and observers on the work carried out by the EWG and recalled that during the VWG, comments had been received on the scope, definitions, criteria, and on the inclusion of examples of compounds in the Guidelines. He further explained that the Guidelines had been revised based on written comments submitted and those made in the virtual pre-meeting as presented in CRD08.

191. The EWG recommended that CCPR consider the revised Guidelines and to advance it to Step 8.

Discussion

192. Noting concerns about possible inconsistencies arising should general definitions be revised by Codex or FAO/WHO, the Codex Secretariat clarified that it was unlikely that longstanding definitions would change in the near future, and that it was the responsibility of the Codex Secretariat to ensure that upon amendment/revision of general Codex definitions these would be aligned throughout Codex. She also clarified that any other definitions as recommended by the EWG that were not strictly aligned with those in other Codex or FAO/WHO texts should be understood to have been specifically formulated for the purposes of the Guidelines and was an acceptable practice in Codex.

193. CCPR noted general support for the advancement of the Guidelines and took the following decisions

- the examples would not be an integral part of the Guidelines and were for information purposes only to facilitate the development of the guidelines, as such, they would remain available in the working document; and
- all definitions in Section 2 of the Guidelines should be retained even if they were already available in other Codex or FAO/WHO texts as they contributed to the readability and clarity of the text; the definitions were aligned with those definitions from *inter alia* the Codex Procedural Manual, and from FAO and WHO texts; other definitions as recommended by the EWG were developed to suit the scope and purpose of the Guidelines.

194. Proposals were made by a delegation for amendments to two criteria, to indicate the need for case-by-case review with respect to allergenic characteristics and sensitivity of bacteria to antibiotics, respectively, but these were not taken up by the Committee.

Conclusion

195. CCPR agreed to advance the Guidelines to Step 8 for adoption by CAC45 (Appendix IX).

ENGAGEMENT OF JMPR IN PARALLEL REVIEWS OF NEW COMPOUNDS: CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE GLOBAL PROJECT MANAGER FOR THE PARALLEL REVIEW PROCESS (Agenda Item 10)[16]

196. Canada, as Chair of the EWG, also on behalf of the co-Chairs, Costa Rica and Kenya, introduced the item and recalled the previous discussions and decisions on principles and procedures to carry out parallel reviews and that CCPR52 had agreed to test and refine the procedure through a pilot project and make adjustments as necessary based on the experience gained through the pilot. CCPR52 had further agreed that work would continue to define the criteria for selecting the global management for the parallel review process.

197. The EWG Chair G outlined the mandate and work process followed by the EWG, highlighted the key issues discussed and the criteria and qualifications of the global project manager. CCPR was invited to consider the proposed qualifications and competencies of the global project manager proposed by the EWG, to consider also potential candidates and to assess and modify the proposed qualifications and competencies upon successful completion of a pilot parallel review and to continue to utilise the EWG on Priorities to seek pesticides to be considered for the pilot for the parallel review.

198. CCPR agreed with the proposal of the EWG and noted clarifications provided by the EWG Chair to questions raised on who would select the candidate; the duration of the project; concerns on conflict of interest due to the voluntary nature of the global project manager; whether such qualification may restrict the parallel review process; and resource limitations as follows:

---

15 CX/PR 22/53/11; CL 2022/37-PR; CX/PR 22/53/11-Add.1 (Canada, Chile, Egypt, EU, Ghana, Kenya, Philippines, United Kingdom, Uruguay, USA)

16 CX/PR 22/53/12; CL 2022/38-PR; CX/PR 22/53/12-Add.1 (Canada, Egypt, EU, Ghana, Kenya and Philippines)

- A less formal or burdensome procedure should be followed for the selection of the global project manager and that nominations could be made by JMPR, CCPR or Codex member countries.
- The project would span over 2 JMPR meetings and therefore the project manager could serve for this period. However, it was emphasized that the pilot project and selection of a global project manager could not proceed without a new compound being nominated and supported by a sponsor for parallel review.
- Serving in a voluntary capacity was not new to Codex or scientific advice bodies, and JMPR had measures in place to deal with conflict of interest.
- Conducting a pilot project might be able to better define the role of the project manager and lead to further improvement of the procedure including the selection criteria of the global manager.
- There was awareness of the resource limitations and therefore any activity in relation to the parallel review had been crafted in such a way to not add to the workload of JMPR while recognising that if the review process does take more than two years, it may use valuable resources

Conclusion

CCPR agreed:

(i) to endorse the criteria for selection of a global project manager;

(ii) to append the criteria for selection of a global project manager to the document *Engagement of JMPR in parallel reviews of new compounds: procedures and principles* as an internal document for reference purposes (Appendix X);

(iii) that the EWG on Priorities should continue to call for compounds for the parallel review as the best mechanism for seeking actors for the pilot project; and

(iv) to encourage sponsors to nominate compounds for the parallel review in coordination with the Chair of the EWG of Priorities and the FAO/WHO JMPR Secretariats for consideration by CCPR.

MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW (Agenda Item 11)[17]

199. Chile, as Chair of the EWG, also on behalf of co-Chairs Australia, India and Kenya, introduced the item, recalled the background to the work, the mandate of the EWG, explained the work process in the EWG, key points of discussion, conclusions and recommendations.

200. The EWG Chair further explained that in order to facilitate discussion, Chile together with the co-Chairs, had analysed comments received in reply to CL 2022/39-PR and had prepared a revised proposal which was discussed in the virtual pre-meeting held on 28 June 2022. She informed CCPR of the discussions in the pre-meeting, the conclusions and recommendations as presented in CRD09. She noted that members and observers had expressed their support for the management proposal presented in Section 1 of Appendix I in CRD09 as well as the options for data support presented in Section 2; and supported to re-establish an EWG to further develop and refine the management proposal for consideration by CCPR54. She explained that the main changes made to the document, other than editorial changes, were to clarify:

- the scope, i.e. what was meant by unsupported compounds without public health concern and a footnote was added to clarify this; and
- consultation with JMPR vis-à-vis available data.

201. CCPR considered the recommendations for the consideration of unsupported compounds without public concern scheduled for periodic review as follows:

- The revised proposal for the management of unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review described as presented in CRD09, Appendix I, Section 1.
- 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 CRD09, Appendix I, Section 2.
- The establishment of an EWG to further develop and refine the management proposal for consideration by CCPR54 (2023).

[17] CX/PR 22/53/13; CL 2022/39-PR; CX/PR 22/53/13-Add.1 (Canada, Chile, Egypt, EU, Ghana, Kenya, Philippines, United Kingdom, USA, IFTs)

Discussion

202. CCPR noted the support for the work as presented in CRD09, and to re-establish the EWG as proposed by the virtual pre-meeting, and noted the additional comments made or questions raised as follows:

- Concerns were expressed about the revocation of CXLs for compounds without public health concerns. It was preferred that JMPR reviewed updated information of GAP and propose new MRLs rather than deletion of the CXLs of compounds without public health concerns. The national registration database could provide updated information to JMPR for the re-evaluation of such compounds to simplify the procedure for the periodic review. Many unsupported compounds without public health concerns were used and registered in agriculture-producing countries and internationally harmonized MRLs were useful tools to facilitate trade and reduce the gap between developing and developed countries.
- The procedure seemed very complex, and its feasibility was questioned, for example, in relation to the engagement with the JMPR Secretariat. The further work in the EWG should consider feasibility of the procedures.
- Acknowledging the importance of the work, it was not clear if the current proposal would be sufficient to reduce the heavy and growing backlog of evaluations for substances for which periodic review was overdue; and that concrete action was urgently needed to address this problem. A stringent approach was supported for deleting compounds from the system that were no longer supported by the manufacturer and consequent withdrawal of the corresponding CXL would contribute to reducing the number of substances for which a periodic review was due.

203. CCPR further noted that the above questions and concerns could be addressed in the EWG.

Conclusion

204. CCPR agreed to re-establish an EWG on unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review chaired by Chile and co-chaired by Australia, India and Kenya, working in English with the following ToRs:

(i) To further develop and refine the management proposal for unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review presented in the Section 1 of Appendix I of CRD09;

(ii) To further develop the recommendations of Section 2 of Appendix I of CRD 09, to explore further options for efficient data support that could be addressed by Codex, FAO/WHO, JMPR, governments and the industry to assist countries in the preparation of data packages required to conduct periodic reviews;

(iii) That proposals should take into consideration the information presented in CX/PR 22/53/13, CRD09 and the written comments submitted and those received during the plenary meeting; and

(iv) Based on the above considerations, to present a management proposal for consideration and adoption by CCPR54.

NATIONAL REGISTRATIONS OF PESTICIDES (Agenda Item 12)[18]

205. Germany, as Chair of the EWG, speaking also on behalf of the co-Chair, Australia, presented the item and recalled the background to the work in particular the discussions on how to balance the evaluation of "new" and "old" compounds eligible for periodic reviews vis-à-vis public health concerns related to "old" compounds and the growing request for evaluation of "new" compounds or additional evaluations of existing compounds not yet eligible for periodic reviews. As part of these efforts, CCPR agreed to seek documented evidence from member countries of national registrations and approved uses for compounds subject to periodic review by means of an excel spreadsheet.

206. The EWG Chair further explained the work process in the EWG, the conclusions and recommendations. It was noted that the spreadsheet covered 25 active substances and all groups of crops; that members from all continents had filled in the spreadsheet however with a strong component from EU countries, and in particular indicated that no uses were reported for ethoxyquin and aldicarb. He further highlighted issues raised in comments received regarding difficulties to complete the spreadsheet, discrepancies between national and Codex classifications of crops / crop grouping and that being able to complete the spreadsheet electronically might help. In this regard, he also mentioned that a simplified spreadsheet could further assist by, for instance, removing the reference to representative and processed commodities, addressing less compounds while providing room for more authorized uses.

207. The EWG Chair proposed that CCPR consider the recommendations of the WG as follows:

[18] CX/PR 22/53/14

- Consider on the general approach to the development of the NRD of pesticides including a view whether a sufficient number of responses is available to support the periodic review of unsupported compounds with or without public health concern which are no longer be supported by the manufacturer.
- Consider whether a smaller number of crops and/or compounds in the database may help to fill the database.
- Provide suggestions to help filling the database.

Discussion

208. CCPR noted the continued support for the work and the development of the NRD.

209. In particular, the following additional comments were made:

- The database could serve as a useful tool for the establishment of Codex MRLs as well as the periodic review for unsupported compounds with or without public health concern where there is no supporting data/ information. CCPR was thus requested to set up a mechanism to operationalize the NRD in the management of unsupported compounds (see Agenda Item 11) to reduce trade issues from no CXLs and to facilitate fair trade.
- For the database spreadsheet, plants and crop items should be reclassified to be in line with the newly revised Classification of Food and Feed. If there are many plants and crops other than the listed items, additional blank cells should be available for countries to enter detail on such plants and crops. In addition, processed commodities in Class D and E, which do not directly expose to pesticides should be excluded from database spreadsheet.
- There were uses for aldicarb and ethoxyquin.
- The NRD could give an overview of what is the situation of national registration of pesticides and provide an overview of the situation of unsupported compounds.

210. In response to clarification on how to provide information the Codex Secretariat clarified that a circular letter would be issued which would include an excel file to be filled in by countries in consultation with their national registration system. The compounds to be included in the CL would be decided by the Chair of the EWG on the NRD in consultation with the Chairs of the EWG on priorities and EWG on unsupported compounds.

211. A question was raised on next steps and how to deal with the two compounds for which there were no registrations in other countries and/or if there were new compounds that were unsupported or new compounds that need to be added to the list to get information about whether there are registrations in member countries.

212. The EWG Chair clarified that information was needed for those substances that were not scheduled, and where there was no interest from a sponsor. When looking into the priority list these substances were growing from year to year and the question was when to step into the process to ask members whether they were willing to support a substance. If there are unsupported substances, i.e. no industry supporting it, but members have a need for the substance, then at this point the registration database would give an indication of how many members have a problem when a substance was no longer supported and how many uses were behind such a substance. On the basis of this information, the EWG dealing with unsupported compounds could prepare a list of priorities based on the information provided by the database. He further indicated that, in his view, the process should start when a compound reaches 15 years without a full re-evaluation in order to give countries time to respond to the requirements of the periodic review and that the situation of such compounds could be monitored through the EWG on unsupported compounds to take timely actions in this regard.

Conclusion

213. CCPR agreed to re-establish the EWG chaired by Germany and co-chaired by Australia, working in English with the following ToRs:

(i) Amend the national registration database by correcting mistakes, deleting unnecessary entries and providing more information to fill the database.

(ii) Coordinate with the EWGs on priorities and on unsupported substances without public health concerns in order to facilitate the work of the EWG on supported substances without public health concern after the next CCPR meeting.

(iii) Ask members to fill in the NRD for unsupported substances nominated by means of a CL.

(iv) To report the results in CCPR54.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX SCHEDULES AND PRIORITY LISTS OF PESTICIDES FOR EVALUATION BY JMPR (Agenda Item 13)[19]

214. Australia, as Chair of the EWG on Priorities, introduced the item on Codex Schedules and Priorities and the revised Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides.

2023 Schedule for JMPR evaluations

215. The EWG Chair referred to CRD02 containing the Schedules and Priority Lists for 2023 and beyond. The EWG Chair noted the list of 6 compounds proposed for the 2023 Schedule of new compounds, that national registrations had been confirmed for all of the compounds and that this schedule is full.

216. For the 2023 Schedule of new uses and other evaluations, 15 nominations were presented, with evidence of national registrations provided for 14 compounds.

217. For the 2023 periodic review evaluations, 4 compounds and 2 reserve compounds were proposed. A member noted that parathion-methyl (59) appeared to be unsupported. The Observer from CropLife International confirmed that they would not support the review of this compound. A proposal was made to have 2-3 additional compounds should be placed on the periodic evaluation list as reserve compounds. The EWG Chair confirmed that this could be done. The Observer from AgroCare confirmed its commitment to provide the necessary data for periodic evaluation of chlorpyrifos (17).

218. The EWG Chair reminded the Committee that CCPR had agreed to the 4-year rule for metalaxyl (138)/metalaxyl-M (212) (multiple CXLs), trifloxystrobin (213) (citrus fruits group), fipronil (202) (all CXLs) and fenpyroximate (193) the 4-year rule will apply (multiple CXLs). Also, the JMPR will consider alternative GAP for bifenthrin (178) on lettuce, head (see Agenda Item 6).

219. The Observer from CropLife International referred to their comments in CRD26 and requested an update from JMPR on the likelihood of clearing the existing backlog at the 2022 JMPR for outstanding compounds from the 2020 to 2022 schedules. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that it was difficult to provide a list of those compounds that would be evaluated in 2022 for reasons related to availability of experts, but that there were 9 new compounds, 32 new uses and other evaluations and 6 periodic reviews outstanding. The JMPR Secretariat stated it would complete the evaluations as soon as possible and would appreciate an opportunity to clear the outstanding evaluations.

Public Health Concerns

220. CCPR was advised that the concern form relating to reviews of benomyl (69), carbendazim (72) and thiophanate-methyl (77) would likely be resolved by the periodic re-evaluation of carbendazim which was scheduled for 2022 by CCPR52. The public health concern raised by the EU for terbufos (167) was noted and would be considered by JMPR at its next meeting. The Observer from CropLife International informed CCPR that a manufacturer had indicated it would support the periodic review of terbufos.

Unsupported compounds

221. The EWG Chair advised that there were several compounds from previous schedules of periodic reviews which were not evaluated by JMPR and appear to be unsupported: amitraz (122), fenbutatin oxide (109), carbaryl (8), 2-phenylphenol (56), dinocap (87), methamidophos (100), bitertanol (144), fenthion (39) (scheduled for periodic review in 2022) and now parathion-methyl (59) (currently scheduled for periodic review in 2023).

222. The EWG Chair recommended that the list of unsupported compounds could be forwarded to the future work program of the EWG on Unsupported Compounds. Some members, supported by an observer, stated that clear rules were needed for unsupported compounds and were in favour of deleting compounds from the CCPR pesticides list that were no longer supported by a manufacturer.

223. The EWG Chair reminded the Committee that at CCPR52 two compounds, amitraz and fenbutatin-oxide, were retained assuming a sponsor could be found. No sponsor has committed to sponsor these compounds. The EWG Chair requested that the remaining unsupported compounds (bitertanol (144), dinocap (87), methamidophos (100), fenthion (39), 2-phenylphenol (56) and carbaryl (8)) be discussed in the EWG on Schedules and Priorities in the coming year. There were some technical issues related to some of these compounds that should be considered before deciding their fate, including that dinocap has an isomer, meptyldinocap, with existing CXLs and that methamidophos is a metabolite of acephate (95) which also has CXLs. The EWG Chair advised that there could be flow-on impacts and trade implications of removing CXLs for these unsupported compounds while related compounds have CXLs. JMPRs advice would be sought on these technical issues before CCPR54. The Committee agreed to this proposal.

19 CX/PR 22/53/15

Nominations for Parallel Review pilot

224. The EWG Chair advised CCPR that no nominations had been received for a compound for the Parallel Review pilot and recalled the discussion on this matter under Agenda Item 10 where members/observers were encouraged to nominate new compounds for parallel review.

Recommendations

225. In light of the current evaluation backlog, the EWG Chair recommended that the current 2023 Schedules and Priority lists not be endorsed at this session, but further refined through the EWG in the coming year. This would allow time for JMPR to catch up on evaluations of outstanding compounds.

226. CCPR endorsed continuation of the electronic working group to prepare the Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides for the next session of CCPR in 2024, working in English and chaired by Australia. This EWG will also call for nominations to the Parallel Review pilot.

Conclusion

227. CCPR agreed to:

(i) hold back the proposed Schedule of Pesticides for evaluation by the 2023 JMPR;

(ii) prepare information for CCPR54 on the technical implications of removing certain unsupported compounds from the CCPR Pesticide List; and

(iii) re-convene the EWG on Schedules and Priorities, chaired by Australia and working in English. The EWG will be tasked with providing a report on the Schedules and Priority lists for consideration at the next meeting of CCPR and calling for nominations to the Parallel Review pilot.

REVIEW OF MASS SPECTROMETRY PROVISIONS IN THE *GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF MASS SPECTROMETRY FOR THE IDENTIFICATION, CONFIRMATION AND QUANTITATIVE DETERMINATION OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES* (CXG 56-2005) AND THE *GUIDELINES ON PERFORMANCE CRITERIA OF PESTICIDE RESIDUES IN FOOD AND FEED* (CXG 90-2017) (Agenda Item 14)[20]

228. Iran, as Chair of the EWG, and also on behalf of the co-Chair India, presented the item, recalled the background to the work, explained the mandate and work process followed by the EWG and the recommendations for consideration by CCPR. The EWG Chair explained that there was consensus to revoke CXG56 due to the lack of enough information about mass spectrometry (MS) related to the identification, confirmation and quantitative determination of pesticide residues and that new techniques such as tandem MS as well as high resolution MS were not covered by this guideline. She further explained that CXG90 sufficiently covered mass spectrometry as well as other more modern techniques and that only a few members of the EWG had proposed transfer of some provisions from CXG56 to CXG90. The EWG had therefore not made specific proposals for the revision of CXG90, but that this Guideline could be revised in future if necessary.

229. The EWG Chair proposed that CCPR consider the revocation of CXG56 to avoid overlap with CXG90 for the reasons explained above.

230. CCPR considered the recommendations of the EWG, and noted the support to revoke CXG56, but also the views that:

- some aspects in CXG56 (e.g. derivatisation) were still relevant and should be taken up in CXG90;
- the EWG should continue to consider revision of CXG90 vis-à-vis provisions for mass spectrometry which had been part of its mandate agreed by CCPR52;
- that if CXG90 were revised/amended that there should also be consultation with CCMAS.

231. Following the explanation by the EWG on the adequacy of CXG90 with regard to mass spectrometry CCPR agreed with the recommendations of the EWG.

Conclusion

232. Following the explanation by the EWG Chair , on the adequacy of CXG90 with regard to mass spectrometry, CCPR agreed:

(i) to revoke the *Guidelines on the use of mass spectrometry for the identification, confirmation and quantitative determination of pesticide residues* (CXG 56-2005); and

(ii) that the *Guidelines on performance criteria of pesticide residues in food and feed* (CXG 90-2017) could be revised in future and that any member could make a proposal for such revision in light of new developments in science and technology in this area.

[20] CX/PR 22/53/16

MONITORING THE PURITY AND STABILITY OF CERTIFIED REFERENCE MATERIAL OF MULTI-CLASS PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE (Agenda Item 15)[21]

233. India, as Chair of the EWG, also on behalf of the co-Chair Iran, introduced the item and recalled the request from some members regarding limitation of the use of CRMS after the expiry date leading to high recurring costs for laboratories and trade disruption, and thus the need for harmonized guidance on monitoring of purity and stability of CRMs of multi-class pesticides during prolonged storage. She explained the discussions since CCPR51 and the subsequent work in the EWG established by CCPR52, the mandate, the key points of discussions and work process in the EWG as well as the recommendation for new work on a guidance on monitoring the purity and stability of CRMs of multi-class pesticides during prolonged storage as presented in the project document. Such guidance would enable the safe and successful use of CRMs after the expiry date when verification is performed as per the international guidance provided by Codex. Detailed protocols for re-certifying CRMs would be determined in the guidance. Use of expired CRMs with verified purity would have economic impact by saving the purchasing cost of fresh CRMs especially by developing countries.

234. CCPR considered the new work proposal and noted support for the work, but also additional comments/proposals as follows:

- The use of CRM is important for quality control of analysis not only for pesticide residues but also for other chemicals, therefore the guidelines should be considered by CCMAS before final adoption so that Codex could take a consistent approach for the use of CRM beyond expiring date.
- The analytical value for CRM is certified only when the situations, such as storage period and condition, are within the prescribed conditions. Once the storage period is over, the analytical value cannot be considered as certified.
- CRMs are usually used for tests that have clear and strict requirements on the accuracy of results, such as import and export inspection, method comparison and proficiency testing, etc. for studies and determinations such laboratory quality control, precision testing, laboratory personnel and inter-instrument variability, working standards or quality control standards (QCMs) may be used. The ISO 80 guideline specifies the in-house preparation of QCMs, and it is recommended that CCPR consider ISO 80 and other related documents in discussion of this topic.
- It should be borne in mind accredited laboratories work in accordance with ISO 17025 and that one of the requirements of the standard is to use CRMs. Using expired CRMs is considered as a non-conforming to ISO 17025 and would mean that the chain with regard to traceability would have been broken.
- Any work in Codex should take into account the ISO standards and other internal guidelines and be harmonized with those and ensure that it does not contradict guidance from other international fora.
- The guidelines were needed especially for food control laboratories and that the rationale for the work was well expressed. CRMs were costly and their use after the expiry date without compromising the quality of results would be beneficial for countries. The guidelines should provide a clear assessment of the effectiveness of storage conditions/methods to ensure the stability/purity of these materials beyond the expiry date in order to use them safely.

235. In view of the above comments, views were expressed on whether the scope of the work should rather be focused on RMs as opposed to CRMs or should be expanded to include also RMs as these were more widely used in quality control analysis. It was pointed out that CRMs are those certified by recognized metrological organizations, usually very expensive and not so much used due to their high cost and limited availability as opposed to reference materials (RMs) which hold a certification of analysis (CoA) and are widely used by laboratories in accordance with ISO 17025. RMs may not pose the issues raised above as compared to CRMs vis-à-vis of guidance available from recognized international organizations such as ISO.

236. The EWG Chair clarified that the scope of the work was for CRMs of pesticides whether they are in solid or liquid state. She further clarified the need for harmonized guidelines and that in developing the guideline, a mechanism would be worked out on how a particular standard could still be used by laboratories, keeping mind that it should not affect the analysis. She also emphasized that all relevant international protocols, standards, and guidelines would be taken into account in the work.

[21] CX/PR 22/53/17

237. The EWG Chair also clarified why CRMs and not RMs were chosen for the guidelines. She explained that doing any analysis as per the requirement of any quality pesticide residue laboratory, they are required to use CRMs which have metrological traceability. CRMs had an expiry date which RMs did not have, and those studies had shown that CRMs even after the expiry date could still have the desired purity for up to 10 years and if they met certain criteria could still be used by laboratories hence the need for international harmonized criteria that could be provided by Codex.

238. In response to proposals made to consult with CCMAS, the Codex Secretariat clarified that from the procedural perspective, the proposal could be sent to CCMAS to see whether a more overarching document was needed in Codex, noting that use of CRMs was not limited to pesticides. However, since the proposal under discussion was specific for pesticides, the work fell within the remit of CCPR and could be developed by the Committee and that CCMAS could be informed of its development. At a later stage, should CCMAS decide to develop a more over-arching guideline, the work of CCPR should be taken into account and could serve as a basis for a more horizontal guidance developed by CCMAS. While CAC supported the development of more horizontal texts, Codex was also member-driven and if the proposal is made in CCPR it would focus on pesticides and that in this regard there was no need for consultation with CCMAS.

239. The FAO JMPR Secretariat commented that the use of CRMs of pesticides was important for the establishment and implementation of CXLs and achieving the goals of the Codex, i.e. protecting consumer health and facilitating trade. She suggested that the EWG should improve the paper and new work proposal by focusing on why the guidance was needed and was possible to be developed; how harmonization could be achieved and what criteria would be set up based on scientific justifications that would demonstrate that this approach would have no negative impact on public confidence and to the goals of Codex.

Conclusion

240. CCPR agreed:

(i) to re-establish the EWG, chaired by India and co-chaired by Iran, working in English to refine the discussion paper and proposal for new work taking into account comments made at the session and submitted in writing to the session and to build on and explain more clearly the rationale for the new work; and

(ii) to encourage all members and observers to participate in the EWG in particular those delegations who had made interventions during the session, in particular, China, Japan, Singapore, Egypt and IFT to actively participate in the EWG to facilitate the consideration of and decision-making on this matter at CCPR54.

MITIGATION OF TRADE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL INHIBITORS IN AGRICULTURE (Agenda item 16)[22]

241. New Zealand, as one of the authors of the discussion paper, introduced the item and highlighted the key issues raised in the document in relation to the use of environmental inhibitors to mitigate the impact of agriculture on the environment. The Delegation recalled that environmental inhibitors were compounds applied to crops or pastures or to animals to reduce production of greenhouse gases or reduce nitrate leaching into waterways (e.g. nitrogen and urease inhibitors) and that their regulatory oversight varies from country to country. He mentioned that these compounds are applied in a very similar manner to pesticides, such as herbicides applied to pasture or herbicides, fungicides, insecticides applied to ground crops. They have a very similar profile to pesticides, such as nitrification and urease inhibitors, and can potentially leave residues in food commodities that are traded internationally which may impact negatively on trade.

242. The Delegation highlighted that this issue was relevant to the first goal of the Codex Strategic Plan 2020-2025 i.e., *to address current, emerging and critical issues in a timely manner*, and that climate change was one of the issues that should be addressed in a timely manner. Therefore, it was important to have internationally harmonized MRLs for such compounds and CCPR/JMPR could provide, within their existing mechanisms, a place to consider these compounds when applied to crops to ensure food safety and facilitate trade. He further noted that this matter had been brought to the attention of CCRVDF25 (2021) and that CCRVDF/JECFA had agreed to address such compounds when they were administered directly to animals or via their feed.

243. The Delegation recommended that environmental inhibitors that are used on plants and crops, could be submitted to CCPR through the regular priority system procedure and go through the regular safety risk assessment process by JMPR while meeting all the requirements for such evaluations as provided by the national registration agency of the concerned country(ies).

22 CX/PR 22/53/18

Discussion

244. Delegations generally agreed that the use of environmental inhibitors is becoming an important topic at international level and may need international harmonization to ensure food/feed safety and avoid trade returns and that this should be done in a timely manner.

245. However, there were some concerns expressed as follows:

- The use of environmental inhibitors was a cross cutting issue that may include veterinary drugs, fertilizers, feed additives, etc. which fell beyond the mandate of CCPR, hence any recommendations with regard to these compounds need to be in line with the ToR of the Committee.
- The definition of environmental inhibitors may need further clarification. The target effect and related impact of these compounds are different depending on the application type and whether the product applies to crops or animals consequently different national legal frameworks may apply, and various Codex committees might be relevant.
- The Codex definition of pesticides may not cover environmental inhibitors which are not intentionally used for plant protection purposes and whether CCPR might need to change the definition or its terms of reference to address these compounds.
- The workload of CCPR should be considered if such compounds would be addressed by the Committee.
- Care should be taken that such inhibitors did not cause more harm and problems and in the guise that it was being used to mitigate climate change.

246. In addressing some of the above points, New Zealand noted that climate change was a really important matter and environmental inhibitors used in agriculture were a good mitigation tool. As regards the definition of pesticides, he noted that this also includes categories such a plant growth regulators and as such it provided flexibility to accommodate the consideration of environmental inhibitors. The Delegation emphasized that when such compounds are used in animals, CCRVDF/JECFA already agreed to address their use within their established procedures. He further noted that the number of these substances were limited and would not impact significantly on the workload of CCPR/JMPR and that the data requirements would be very similar to pesticides. He recognized that there might not be a perfect fit for these compounds in the Codex system but that the existing Committees, in particular CCPR and CCRVDF, could provide a place to address the safety of these compounds within their established procedures.

247. Following a request for clarification on whether CCPR should consider amending the Codex definition for pesticides or its ToR to address these compounds, the Codex Secretariat clarified that, based on the explanation provided by New Zealand, the objective was neither to change the definition of pesticides nor the ToR of the Committee, but to find a place within Codex to accommodate the consideration of these compounds when used in/on crops in order to protect consumers health and ensure fair practices in trade. Such action was also in recognition of climate change and that addressing the use of environmental inhibitors, being an emerging issue, was consistent with Goal 1 of the Codex Strategic Plan. The Secretariat noted that as such, CCPR could provide a forum to address the safety of these compounds to avoid trade disruption on an ad hoc basis, through their established procedures, and based on the recommendations arising from the safety assessment performed by JMPR. She further noted that it was important for Codex in general and the Committee in particular to be responsive to emerging issues as was evident also by the discussion in CCEXEC and CAC on how to deal with emerging issues within the current available mechanisms. She further clarified that environmental inhibitors administered directly to animals or via feed could be considered by CCRVDF which at its last meeting noted that the definition for veterinary drug did not exclude those veterinary drugs used solely for environmental purposes and that other similar examples have already been considered in CCRVDF e.g. ethoxyquin with a feed additive use.

248. Delegations generally agreed to consider environmental inhibitors on a case-by-case basis when relevant to CCPR. It was noted that some compounds could fall under both veterinary drugs/pesticides and that the same approach used for dual compounds could apply i.e. they could be considered in the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF WG for advice.

Conclusion

249. CCPR agreed:

(i) that environmental inhibitors could be addressed on a case-by-case basis within its established procedures as described in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR;

(ii) that environmental inhibitors administered directly to animals or via feed could be considered by CCRVDF;

(iii) that in situations of multiple uses (e.g. dual-use compounds) the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG could address these compounds to ensure harmonized approaches and appropriate mechanisms for the establishment of single and harmonized MRLs; and

(iv) to inform CCEXEC and CAC that CCPR could consider environmental inhibitors on an ad hoc basis without changing the definition of pesticides, its procedures, or its ToR.

MODIFICATION OF THE PORTION OF COMMODITIES TO WHICH MRLs APPLY AND WHICH IS ANALYZED: GROUP 14 (ASSORTED FRUITS – INEDIBLE PEEL) (CXG 41-1993) (Agenda tem 17)[23]

250. CCPR noted that, as agreed under Item 1, this matter was considered under Agenda Item 7.

ENHANCING OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF JMPR AND CCPR TO ELIMINATE THE BACKLOG OF EVALUATIONS AND MEET THE FUTURE DEMAND OF ESTABLISHMENT CXLS (Agenda item 18)[24]

251. CropLife International presented the discussion paper recalling that in 2021 the Organization prepared a CRD highlighting the JMPR backlog of pending compound evaluations caused by the cancelation of the JMPR meetings in 2020 due to the COVID19 pandemic, which included proposed possible solutions to such backlog. The Observer further stressed that the challenge to resolve the backlog and improve the existing system to meet current and future demands required a multi-disciplinary approach with shared responsibilities among different stakeholders. The Observer further noted that some suggestions to address the backlog may be tackled within JMPR and CCPR.

252. For solutions that could be tackled within CCPR, CropLife International suggested the establishment of an EWG bur recognized that the proposed ToR was ambitious and might need further consideration by CCPR. The Observer reiterated its commitment to support the work of the EWG if established.

Discussion

253. CCPR noted general support for the issues raised in the discussion paper concerning the review of JMPR procedures and the reduction of the background of evaluations delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

254. However, it was noted that the work proposed by CropLife International was too wide and several aspects were beyond the capacities and control of JMPR and CCPR, making it more difficult to come to concrete outcomes in a reasonable timeframe. There were many challenges that needed to be resolved and there was not a single solution that could solve all of them immediately. Further discussion on possible solutions and their practical implementation, in particular view a view to decrease the backlog of periodic reviews and to address higher demand for the establishment of CXLs for new compounds and uses in future considering the new or emerging food safety issues that may come up in future as well as the new commodities that are being developed.

255. It was therefore recommended to (i) establish an EWG with a narrower focus mandate and (ii) request JMPR to develop a workplan during JMPR 2022 to reduce the existing backlog of evaluations that were delayed due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. This workplan should include a tabular summary of new compounds, new uses, and periodic reviews that have been scheduled for JMPR evaluation and provide updated information on their respective target year of evaluation. Based on this workplan, JMPR should make recommendations to CCPR on whether one or more extraordinary meetings are needed to help reduce the backlog.

256. The JMPR Secretariat clarified that JMPR was working at its full capacity and that a plan to reduce the backlog could be difficult to realise. The Secretariat recommended focusing on possible mechanisms to optimise the processes in the JMPR, and that after the necessary internal consultation, JMPR would report on its conclusions to CCPR54. CCPR concurred with this view and agreed that the development of a workplan could be reconsidered at a future stage.

23 CX/PR 22/53/19
24 CX/PR 22/53/20

Conclusion

257. CCPR agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by USA and co-chaired by Costa Rica, France, Germany and Uganda working in English and Spanish, with the following ToRs:

(i) Develop a CL to request information from Members and Observers on the need to enhance CCPR/JMPR and the associated opportunities and challenges. In addition, the CL may wish to invite Members and Observer organizations to consider a second or possibly subsequent workshops that would expand on and further develop some of the themes addressed in the virtual workshop sponsored by CropLife International on March 31, 2022, as described in CX/PR 22/53/20;

(ii) On the basis of the responses to the CL, prepare a summary of submitted information and a discussion paper that summarizes findings for consideration at CCPR54 and later transmission to JMPR; and

(iii) Coordinate work with related EWGs such as the EWG on priority lists, national registration database, unsupported compounds.

OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 19)

258. CCPR noted that no other business had been proposed for its consideration.

DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 20)

259. CCPR was informed that its 54th Session was tentatively scheduled to be held in China, in 2023, the final arrangements being subject to confirmation by the Host Country and the Codex Secretariats.