ANNEX I

ACCEPTABLE DAILY INTAKES, RESIDUE LIMITS AND SUPERVISED TRIALS MEDIAN RESIDUES PROPOSED AT THE 1996 MEETING

The Table of recommendations includes maximum Acceptable Daily Intakes (ADIs) and Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs). It should be noted that MRLs include <u>draft</u> MRLs and <u>Codex</u> MRLs (CXLs). The MRLs recommended by the JMPR on the basis of its estimates of maximum residue levels enter the Codex procedure as draft MRLs. They become Codex MRLs when they have passed through the procedure and have been adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

In general, the recommended MRLs listed for compounds which have been reviewed previously are additional to, or amend, those recorded in the reports of earlier Meetings. For compounds reevaluated in the CCPR periodic review programme however, both new and previous recommendations are listed because such re-evaluations are regarded as replacing the original evaluation rather than supplementing it.

Some ADIs may be temporary: this is indicated by the letter T and the year in which reevaluation is scheduled in parenthesis below the ADI. All recommended MRLs for compounds with temporary ADIs are necessarily temporary, but some recommendations are designated as temporary (TMRLs) until required information has been provided and evaluated, irrespective of the status of the ADI. Such recommendations are followed by the letter T in the table. (See also the list of qualifications and abbreviations below.)

In response to recommendations of a Joint FAO/WHO Consultation on Guidelines for predicting the Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues held in York, the UK, in 1995, the 1996 Meeting has extended its estimations of residues to include calculations of the median residues found in supervised trials (STMRs) in order to provide a basis for the estimation of the dietary intake of the pesticides reviewed. The estimated STMRs are included in the Table of ADIs and MRLs. Further details of the response of the Meeting to the York Consultation are given in Section 2.2.1 of this report, and information about an informal workshop held in The Hague, The Netherlands, in April 1996 to consider the implementation of its recommendations by the JMPR in Section 2.2.3. The report of this Workshop is reproduced as Annex III.

Attention is drawn to Section 3.1 of the report of the present Meeting: 'Definition of the residues of fat-soluble compounds'. Residues of such compounds are distinguished in the Table of Recommendations by the parenthetic note '(fat-soluble residue)' on a line below the residue definition.

The following qualifications and abbreviations are used.

* following At or about the limit of determination recommended MRL

* following name New compound of pesticide

** following name Compound reviewed in CCPR periodic review programme of pesticide Е Extraneous Residue Limit (ERL). F following The residue is fat-soluble and MRLs for milk and milk products are derived as explained in the introduction recommendations to Part 2 of the Guide to Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues and for milk to Volume II of the Codex Alimentarius. (fat) following The recommendation applies to the fat of the meat. recommendations for meat Po The recommendation accommodates post-harvest treatment of the commodity. PoP following The recommendation accommodates post-harvest treatment recommendations of the primary food commodity. for processed foods (classes D and E in the Codex Classification) **STMR** Supervised Trial Median Residue (see explanation on previous page). STMR-P An STMR for a processed commodity calculated by applying the mean concentration or reduction factor for the process to the STMR calculated for the raw agricultural commodity. The ADI is temporary, and due for re-evaluation in the year T following ADIs indicated. T following MRLs The MRL is temporary, irrespective of the status of the ADI, until required information has been provided and evaluated. V following The recommendation accommodates veterinary uses.

W in place of an The previous recommendation is withdrawn. MRL

recommendations for commodities of animal origin

If a recommended MRL is an amendment, the previous value is also recorded. The absence of a figure in the "Previous" column indicates that the recommendation is the first for the commodity or group concerned.

The Table includes the Codex Classification Numbers (CCNs) of both the compounds and the commodities listed, to facilitate reference to the Guide to Codex Maximum Limits for Pesticide Residues and other Codex documents.

Commodities are listed in alphabetical order. This is a change from earlier practice where commodities were listed in the order of the "Types" in the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds, and in alphabetical order within each Type. The change was made to facilitate checking and comparison with the CCPR Tables of MRLs, which are in alphabetical order.

ACCEPTABLE DAILY INTAKES (ADIs), MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS (MRLs) AND SUPERVISED TRIALS MEDIAN RESIDUES (STMRs) $^{\rm 1}$

Pesticide (Codex ref. No.)	ADI (mg/kg bw)	Commodity			Recommended MRL or ERL (mg/kg)		
		CCN	Name	New	Previous		
Acephate	0.03	VB 0400	Broccoli	2	_1	0.11	
(095)		VB 0041	Cabbages, Head	2	_1	0.33	
		VB 0404	Cauliflower	2	_1	0.11	
		VO 0448	Tomato	1	_1	0.38	
			Tomato, canned			$0.19 P^2$	
			Tomato, canned juice			0.35 P	
			Tomato, bulk paste			1.52 P	
			Tomato, canned puree			0.68 P	
			Tomato, wet pomace			0.23 P	
			Tomato, dry pomace			0.38 P	
		Notes:	¹ Previous recommendation withd ² STMR-P				
Aldicarb	0.003	VR 0589	Potato	0.5	0.5 T	0.077	
(117)			Potato chips			0.056 P ¹	
			Potato fries			0.045 P	
			Potato, microwaved			0.065 P	
			Potato, baked			0.050 P	
		Residue Notes:	(for MRLs & STMRs): Sum of aldicarb, its sulfoxide and ¹ STMR-P	l its sulfone, expres	ssed as aldicarb.		
Bifenthrin	0.02	GC 0654	Wheat	0.5 Po	0.05*	0.255	
(178)		CM 0654	Wheat bran, unprocessed	2 PoP	-	0.89 P ¹	
		CF 1211	Wheat flour	0.2 PoP	-	0.076 P	
		CF 1212	Wheat wholemeal	0.5 PoP	-	0.21 P	
		Residue Notes:	(for MRLs & STMRs): bifenthrir	ı (fat-soluble residu	ue)		
Carbaryl** (008)	0.003	Notes:	Previous ADI was 0.01 mg/kg by Periodic review was only for toxic				
Carbofuran** (096)	0.002	Notes:	Previous ADI was 0.01 mg/kg by Periodic review was only for toxic				
Chlorfenvinphos**	0.0005	VB 0400	Broccoli	W	0.05		

¹See explanation on pp. xv and 617

Pesticide (Codex ref. No.)	ADI (mg/kg bw)	Commodity		Recommended MRL or ERL (mg/kg)		STMR (mg/kg)
		CCN	Name	New	Previous	
(014)		VB 0402	Brussels sprouts	W	0.05	
		VB 0041	Cabbages, head	W	0.05	
		VR 0577	Carrot	W	0.4	
		VB 0404	Cauliflower	W	0.1	
		VS 0624	Celery	W	0.4	
		FC 0001	Citrus fruits	W	1	
		SO 0691	Cotton seed	W	0.05	
		VO 0440	Egg plant	W	0.05	
		VR 0583	Horseradish	W	0.1	
		VA 0384	Leek	W	0.05	
		GC 0645	Maize	W	0.05	
		MM 0095	Meat (from mammals, other than marine mammals)	W	0.2 (fat) V	
		ML 0107	Milk of cattle, goats and sheep	W	0.008 F V	
		VO 0450	Mushrooms	W	0.05	
		VA 0385	Onion, bulb	W	0.05	
		SO 0697	Peanut	W	0.05	
		VR 0589	Potato	W	0.05	
		VR 0494	Radish	W	0.1	
		GC 0649	Rice	W	0.05	
		CM 1205	Rice, polished	W	0.05	
		VR 0497	Swede	W	0.05	
		VR 0508	Sweet potato	W	0.05	
		VO 0448	Tomato	W	0.1	
		VR 0506	Turnip, Garden	W	0.05	
		GC 0654	Wheat	W	0.05	
			for MRLs & STMRs): chlorfenvinph Periodic review was only for residues		and Z- isomers (fat-	soluble residu
2,4-D** (020)	0.01	I	ADI refers to acid equivalent. Previous ADI was 0.3 mg/kg bw. Periodic review was only for toxicolo	gy		
DDT (021)	0.02 (PTDI ¹	MM 0095	Meat (from mammals other than marine mammals)	5 (fat) E	1 (fat) E	
		[(for MRLs & STMRs): sum of $p,p \notin EDDD$) fat-soluble residue) provisional tolerable daily intake. Se			<i>p</i> \$TDE (<i>p,p</i> \$
Diazinon ¹	0.002	PO 0840	Chicken, Edible offal of	0.02*		0
(022)	0.002	PE 0840	Chicken eggs	0.02*	-	0
(022)		PM 0840	Chicken meat	0.02*	-	0
		MM 0814	Goat meat	2 (fat) V	-	0.3 (fat) 0.02 (who
		MO 0098	Kidney of cattle, goats, pigs and sheep	0.03 V	-	0.01
		MO 0099	Liver of cattle, goats, pigs and sheep	0.03 V	-	0.01

Pesticide (Codex ref. No.)	ADI (mg/kg bw)	Commodity		Recommended MRL or ERL (mg/kg)		STMR (mg/kg)		
	JW)	CCN	Name	New	Previous			
		MM 0097	Meat of cattle, pigs and sheep	2 (fat) V	W^1	0.3 (fat) 0.02 (whol muscle)		
		ML 0106	Milks	0.02 F V	\mathbf{W}^{1}	0.02		
	Residue Notes:	`	STMRs): diazinon (fat-soluble residue)	og IMPD				
Dimethoate** (027)	0.002	Notes:	Withdrawal of existing CXL proposed by 1993 JMPR. Notes: ADI is for the sum of dimethoate and omethoate expressed as dimethoate Previous ADI was 0.01 mg/kg bw. Periodic review was only for toxicology					
Disulfoton (074)	0.0003		0.003 mg/kg bw.	.о _Б)				
Dithiocarbamates		AM 0660	Almond hulls	$20^1 \underline{\text{mb}}^2$, zm	20			
(105)		TN 0660	Almonds	0.1* <u>mb</u> , <u>zm</u>	0.1*			
		TN 0672	Pecan	0.1* T <u>zm</u>	-			
		FP 0009	Pome fruits	5 <u>mz, mt,</u> pb, <u>th, zm</u>	5			
		FS 0012	Stone fruits	7 ³ T th, <u>zm</u>	-			
		FB 0275	Strawberry	5 <u>th</u>	-			
		1	Based on trials with mb maneb, mairam. Underlined compounds are those on mainly based. The estimated maximum residue leading in the plant on plums and cherries is 1 m	which estimates of evel for dithiocarb g/kg, but a TMRI	of maximum resid			
Eanarimal	0.01	-	accommodate uses of ziram on stone					
Fenarimol	0.01	AD 0226	Amala managa day		of 7 mg/kg is rec			
(192)		AB 0226	Apple pomace,dry	5	of 7 mg/kg is red			
		VS 0620	Artichoke, Globe	5 0.1	5 T 0.1 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327	Artichoke, Globe Banana	5 0.1 0.2	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney	5 0.1 0.2 0.02*	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281	Artichoke, Globe Banana	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.05 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281 MM 0812	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver	5 0.1 0.2 0.02*	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver Cattle meat	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05 0.02*	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.05 T 0.02* T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281 MM 0812 FS 0013	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver Cattle meat Cherries Dried grapes (= Currants,	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05 0.02*	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.02* T 0.02* T 1 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281 MM 0812 FS 0013 DF 0269	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver Cattle meat Cherries Dried grapes (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas)	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05 0.02* 1 0.2	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.02* T 0.02* T 1 T 0.2 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281 MM 0812 FS 0013 DF 0269 FB 0269	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver Cattle meat Cherries Dried grapes (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas) Grapes	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05 0.02* 1 0.2 0.3	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.02* T 1 T 0.2 T 0.03 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281 MM 0812 FS 0013 DF 0269 FB 0269 DH 1100	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver Cattle meat Cherries Dried grapes (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas) Grapes Hops, dry	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05 0.02* 1 0.2 0.3 5	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.02* T 0.02* T 1 T 0.2 T 0.3 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281 MM 0812 FS 0013 DF 0269 FB 0269 DH 1100 VC 0046	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver Cattle meat Cherries Dried grapes (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas) Grapes Hops, dry Melons, except Watermelon	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05 0.02* 1 0.2 0.3 5 0.05	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.02* T 1 T 0.2 T 1 T 0.2 T 0.3 T - 0.05 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281 MM 0812 FS 0013 DF 0269 FB 0269 DH 1100 VC 0046 FS 0247	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver Cattle meat Cherries Dried grapes (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas) Grapes Hops, dry Melons, except Watermelon Peach	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05 0.02* 1 0.2 0.3 5 0.05 0.05	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.02* T 1 T 0.2 T 0.05 T 0.3 T - 0.05 T 0.5 T			
		VS 0620 FI 0327 MO 1280 MO 1281 MM 0812 FS 0013 DF 0269 FB 0269 DH 1100 VC 0046 FS 0247 TN 0672	Artichoke, Globe Banana Cattle, kidney Cattle, liver Cattle meat Cherries Dried grapes (= Currants, Raisins and Sultanas) Grapes Hops, dry Melons, except Watermelon Peach Pecan	5 0.1 0.2 0.02* 0.05 0.02* 1 0.2 0.3 5 0.05 0.05 0.05	5 T 0.1 T 0.2 T 0.02* T 0.02* T 1 T 0.2 T 0.05 T 0.05 T 0.05 T 0.05 T 0.05 T			

Pesticide (Codex ref. No.)	ADI (mg/kg bw)	Commodity		Recommended MRL or ERL (mg/kg)		STMR (mg/kg)	
	OW)	CCN	Name	New	Previous		
	Residue	(for MRLs &	STMRs): fenarimol				
Ferbam**	0.003 Notes: group ADI for ferbam and ziram.						
(Dithiocarbamates, 105)			Previous ADI was 0.02 mg/kg bw,		nd ziram.		
Flumethrin* (195)	0.004	MM 0812	Cattle meat	0.2 (fat) ¹ V	-	0.01 (fat) 0.005 (whole muscle)	
		ML 0812	Cattle milk	0.05 F V	-	0.01	
			Honey	0.005*	-	0.005	
	Residue Notes:	¹maximum	STMRs): flumethrin (fat-soluble residue) residue in whole meat (muscle) re commended MRL is on carcase fat		uses was 0.01		
Haloxyfop	0.0003	AL 1021	Alfalfa forage (green)	W	Prov. ¹		
(194)		FI 0327	Banana	0.05*	Prov. ¹	0	
		MO 0812	Cattle, Edible offal of	W	Prov. ¹	-	
		MF 0812	Cattle fat	W	Prov. ¹		
		MM 0812	Cattle meat	W	Prov. ¹		
		ML 0812	Cattle milk	W	Prov.1		
		FM 0812	Cattle milk fat	W	Prov.1		
		PO 0840	Chicken, Edible offal of	0.1	Prov.1	0.01	
		PE 0840	Chicken eggs	0.01*	Prov. ¹	0.01	
		PM 0840	Chicken meat	0.01*	Prov. ¹	0.01	
		FC 0001	Citrus fruits	0.05*	Prov.1	0	
		SO 0691	Cotton seed	0.2	Prov. ¹	0.09	
		OC 0691	Cotton seed oil, crude	0.5	Prov.1	$0.1 P^2$	
		AM 1051	Fodder beet	0.3	Prov.1	0.02	
		AV 1051	Fodder beet leaves or tops	W	Prov.1		
		FB 0269	Grapes	0.05*	Prov. ¹	0	
		SO 0697	Peanut	0.05	Prov.1	0.03	
		VP 0063	Peas (pods and succulent = immature seeds)	0.2	1	0.02	
		FP 0009	Pome fruits	0.05*	Prov. ¹	0	
		VD 0070	Pulses (dry)	0.2	Prov. ¹	0.03	
		VR 0589	Potato	0.1	Prov. ¹	0.04	
		SO 0495	Rape seed	2	Prov. ¹	0.17	
			Rape seed meal			0.15 P	
		OC 0495	Rape seed oil, crude	5	Prov. ¹	0.36 P	
		OR 0495	Rape seed oil, edible	5	Prov. ¹	0.28 P	
		CM 1206	Rice bran, unprocessed	0.02*	Prov. ¹	0.02 P	
		CM 0649	Rice, husked	0.02*	Prov. ¹	0	
		CM 1205	Rice, polished	0.02*	Prov. ¹	0	
			Soya bean			0.03 (Pulses (dry)	
			Soya bean meal			0.03 P	
		OC 0541	Soya bean oil, crude	0.2	Prov. ¹	0.02 P	
		OR 0541	Soya bean oil, refined	0.2	Prov. ¹	0.02 P	

Pesticide (Codex ref. No.)	ADI (mg/kg bw)		Commodity	Recommended MRL or ERL (mg/kg)		STMR (mg/kg)
	.,	CCN	Name	New	Previous	
		AV 0596	Sugar beet leaves or tops	W	Prov. ¹	
			Sugar beet pressed pulp			0.008 P
			Sugar, refined			0.002 P
		SO 0702	Sunflower seed	0.2	Prov. ¹	0.05
	Notes:	¹ Provision	STMRs): haloxyfop esters, halox haloxyfop al estimates of maximum residue l ded for use as MRLs.		-	out were not
Maleic hydrazide** (102)	0.3	Notes:	Previous ADI was 5 mg/kg bw. Periodic review was only for toxico	ology		
Methamidophos	0.004	VB 0041	Cabbage, Head	0.5	_1	0.01
(100)		VB 0404	Cauliflower	0.5	_1	0.01
		FS 0247	Peach	1	_1	0.16
			Peach, washed fruit			0.10
			Peach, juice (100% basis)			$0.11 P^2$
			Peach, jam			0.10 P
			Peach, canned fruit			0.08 P
		VO 0448	Tomato	1	_1	0.12
Mevinphos**	Notes:	² STMR-P Recomment	n by 1994 JMPR Inded MRLs are based on residues to the Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw.		ethamidophos or ace	phate
(053)	0.0008	² STMR-P Recomment Notes:	nded MRLs are based on residues to Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg b Periodic review was only for toxico	ow.	ethamidophos or ace	phate
-		² STMR-P Recomment Notes:	nded MRLs are based on residues the Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg b	ow.	ethamidophos or ace	phate
(053) Phorate	0.0008	² STMR-P Recomment Notes:	nded MRLs are based on residues to Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg b Periodic review was only for toxico	ow.	ethamidophos or ace	phate
(053) Phorate (112)	0.0008	2STMR-P Recomment Notes: Notes:	nded MRLs are based on residues the Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be Periodic review was only for toxical previous ADI confirmed	ow. ology		phate
(053) Phorate (112) Propoxur	0.0008 0.0005 0.02	2STMR-P Recomment Notes: Notes: VL 0482	nded MRLs are based on residues to Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg by Periodic review was only for toxico Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato	ow. plogy	3	phate
(053) Phorate (112) Propoxur	0.0008 0.0005 0.02	² STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589	nded MRLs are based on residues to Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg by Periodic review was only for toxico Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato	ow. plogy	3	0.12
(053) Phorate (112) Propoxur (075)	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue	² STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs):	nded MRLs are based on residues to Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg by Periodic review was only for toxical Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato propoxur	0.5 0.02*	3 0.1*	
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): 1 FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649	nded MRLs are based on residues to Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg by Periodic review was only for toxical Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked	0.5 0.02*	3 0.1*	0.12
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): 1 FB 0269 FP 0009	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg b Periodic review was only for toxice Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut	0.5 0.02*	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): 1 FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649	nded MRLs are based on residues to Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg by Periodic review was only for toxico Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): 1 FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI was only for toxico Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet Apple juice	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹ 0.02 P
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): 1 FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Periodic review was only for toxicon previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet Apple juice Apple puree	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹ 0.02 P 0.04 P
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): 1 FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet Apple juice Apple puree Grape pomace, wet	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹ 0.02 P 0.04 P 0.36 P
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue 0.02	² STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): J FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649 TN 0678	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet Apple juice Apple puree Grape pomace, wet Wine	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹ 0.02 P 0.04 P
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue 0.02 Residue	² STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): J FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649 TN 0678	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet Apple juice Apple puree Grape pomace, wet	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1 0.05	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹ 0.02 P 0.04 P 0.36 P
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide* (196)	0.0008 0.0005 0.002 Residue 0.02 Residue Notes:	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): 1 FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649 TN 0678 (for MRLs &	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet Apple juice Apple puree Grape pomace, wet Wine STMRs): tebufenozide (fat-soluble residue)	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1 0.05	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹ 0.02 P 0.04 P 0.36 P 0.03 P
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide* (196) Teflubenzuron*	0.0008 0.0005 0.02 Residue 0.02 Residue	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): p FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649 TN 0678 (for MRLs &	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Periodic review was only for toxicon previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet Apple juice Apple puree Grape pomace, wet Wine STMRs): tebufenozide (fat-soluble residue)	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1 0.05	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹ 0.02 P 0.36 P 0.03 P
Phorate (112) Propoxur (075) Tebufenozide* (196)	0.0008 0.0005 0.002 Residue 0.02 Residue Notes:	2STMR-P Recommer Notes: Notes: VL 0482 VR 0589 (for MRLs): 1 FB 0269 FP 0009 CM 0649 TN 0678 (for MRLs &	Acute RfD 0.003 mg/kg bw. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI was 0.0015 mg/kg be. Previous ADI confirmed Lettuce, Head Potato Propoxur Grapes Pome fruits Rice, husked Walnut Apple pomace, wet Apple juice Apple puree Grape pomace, wet Wine STMRs): tebufenozide (fat-soluble residue)	0.5 0.02* 0.5 1 0.1 0.05	3 0.1*	0.12 0.16 0.03 0.003 0.4 P ¹ 0.02 P 0.04 P 0.36 P 0.03 P

Pesticide (Codex ref. No.)	ADI (mg/kg bw)	Commodity		Recommended MRL or ERL (mg/kg)		STMR (mg/kg)		
	,	CCN	Name	New	Previous			
		VR 0589	Potato	0.05*	-	0		
	Residue (for MRLs & STMRs): teflubenzuron (fat-soluble residue)							
Thiram**	Notes: Fi	irst evaluatior	n of residue and analytical aspects. T Apple juice	oxicology was	evaluated in 1994.	0.55 P ¹		
(Dithiocarbamates, 105)	0.01		Apple juice Apple pomace, wet			1.9 P		
(Diffilocarbalilates, 103)			Apple pomace, dry			6.93 P		
		FS 0013	Cherries	1	_	0.72		
		FS 0014	Plums (including Prunes)	1	_	0.72		
		FP 0009	Pome fruits	5	5	1.9		
		FB 0275	Strawberry	5	-	2.1		
	Notes:	¹ STMR-P Periodic re	eview was only for residues.					
Ziram**	0.003	AM 0660	Almond hulls	10 T	20	10.6		
(Dithiocarbamates,		TN 0660	Almonds	0.1* T	0.1*	0.04		
105)			Apple juice			0.204 P		
			Apple pomace, wet			2.81 P		
			Apple pomace, dry			3.82 P		
		TN 0672	Pecan	0.1* T	-	0.04		
		FP 0009	Pome fruits	5 T	5	2.1		
		FS 0012	Stone fruits	7 T	-	2.2		
		Notes: §	for MRLs: see dithiocarbamates for STMRs: ziram group ADI for ferbam and ziram. Previous ADI was 0.02 mg/kg bw, a	lso for ferbam s	and ziram			

ANNEX II

PREVIOUS FAO AND WHO DOCUMENTS

1. FAO/WHO. Principles governing consumer safety in relation to pesticide residues. Report of a meeting of a WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues held jointly with the FAO Panel of Experts on the Use of Pesticides in Agriculture. FAO Plant Production and Protection Division Report, No. PL/1961/11; WHO Technical Report Series, No. 240.

FAO/WHO. Evaluations of the toxicity of pesticide residues in food.
 Report of a Joint Meeting of the FAO Committee on Pesticides in Agriculture and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Meeting Report, No. PL/1963/13; WHO/Food Add./23.

3. FAO/WHO. Evaluations of the toxicity of pesticide residues in food.

Report of the Second Joint Meeting of the FAO Committee on Pesticides in Agriculture and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Meeting Report, No. PL/1965/10; WHO/Food Add./26.65.

4. FAO/WHO. Evaluations of the toxicity of pesticide residues in food. FAO Meeting Report, No. PL/1965/10/1; WHO/Food Add./27.65.

5. FAO/WHO. Evaluation of the hazards to consumers resulting from the use of fumigants in the protection of food. FAO Meeting Report, No. PL/1965/10/2; WHO/Food Add./28.65.

6. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Joint report of the FAO
 1967a Working Party on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert
 Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Agricultural Studies, No. 73; WHO

Technical Report Series, No. 370.

7. FAO/WHO. Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food. FAO/PL:CP/15; 1967b WHO/Food Add./67.32.

8. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues. Report of the 1967 Joint Meeting of the FAO Working Party and the WHO Expert Committee.

FAO Meeting Report, No. PL:1967/M/11; WHO Technical

Report Series, No. 391.

9. FAO/WHO. 1967 Evaluations of some pesticide residues in food. 1968b FAO/PL:1967/M/11/1; WHO/Food Add./68.30.

10. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1968 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Working Party of experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Agricultural Studies, No. 78; WHO

Technical Report Series, No. 417.

11. FAO/WHO. 1968 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food. 1969b FAO/PL:1968/M/9/1; WHO/Food Add./69.35.

12. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1969 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Working Party of experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Agricultural Studies, No. 84; WHO

Technical Report Series, No. 458.

13. FAO/WHO. 1969 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food.

1970b FAO/PL:1969/M/17/1; WHO/Food Add./70.38

14. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1970 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Working Party of experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert

Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Agricultural Studies, No. 87; WHO

Technical Report Series, No. 474.

15. FAO/WHO. 1970 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food.

1971b AGP:1970/M/12/1; WHO/Food Add./71.42.

16. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1971 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Working Party of experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert

Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Agricultural Studies, No. 88; WHO

Technical Report Series, No. 502.

17. FAO/WHO. 1971 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food.

1972b AGP:1971/M/9/1; WHO Pesticide Residues Series, No. 1.

18. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1972 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Working Party of experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert

Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Agricultural Studies, No. 90; WHO

Technical Report Series, No. 525.

19. FAO/WHO. 1972 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food.

1973b AGP:1972/M/9/1; WHO Pesticide Residues Series, No. 2.

20. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1973 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Working Party of experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert

Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Agricultural Studies, No. 92; WHO

Technical Report Series, No. 545.

21. FAO/WHO. 1973 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food.

1974b FAO/AGP/1973/M/9/1; WHO Pesticide Residues Series, No.3.

22. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1974 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Working Party of experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert

Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Agricultural Studies, No. 97; WHO

Technical Report Series, No. 574.

23. FAO/WHO. 1974 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food.

1975b FAO/AGP/1974/M/9/11; WHO Pesticide Residues Series, No.4.

24. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1975 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Working Party of experts on Pesticide Residues and the WHO Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Series,

No.1; WHO Technical Report Series, No. 592.

25. FAO/WHO. 1975 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food.

1976b AGP:1975/M/13; WHO Pesticide Residues Series, No. 5.

26. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food. Report of the 1976 Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues and the Environment and the

WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues.

FAO Food and Nutrition Series, No. 9; FAO Plant Production and Protection Series,

No. 8; WHO Technical Report Series, No. 612.

27. FAO/WHO. 1976 Evaluation of some pesticide residues in food.

1977b AGP:1976/M/14.

28. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1977. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues and the Environment and the

WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues.

FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 10 Rev.

29. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1977 evaluations.

1978b FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 10 Sup.

30. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1978. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues and the Environment and the

WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 15.

31. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1978 evaluations.

1979b FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 15 Sup.

32. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1979. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and

the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

Protection Paper 20.

33. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1979 evaluations.

1980b FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 20 Sup.

34. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1980. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and

the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

Protection Paper 26.

35. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1980 evaluations.

1981b FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 26 Sup.

36. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1981. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and

the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

Protection Paper 37.

37. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1981 evaluations.

1982b FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 42.

38. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1982. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and

the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

Protection Paper 46.

39. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1982 evaluations.

1983b FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 49.

40. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1983. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and

the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

Protection Paper 56.

41. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1983 evaluations.

1985a FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 61.

42. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1984. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and

the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

Protection Paper 62.

43. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1984 evaluations.

1985c FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 67.

44. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1985. Report of the Joint Meeting

1986a of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and

the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

Protection Paper 68.

45. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1985 evaluations. Part I -

1986b Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 72/1.

46. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1985 evaluations. Part II -

1986c Toxicology. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 72/2.

47. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1986. Report of the Joint Meeting

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and

the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

Protection Paper 77.

48. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1986 evaluations. Part I -

1986e Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 78.

49. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1986 evaluations. Part II -1987a Toxicology. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 78/2. 50. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1987. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and 1987b the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 84. 51. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1987 evaluations. Part I -1988a Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 86/1. 52. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1987 evaluations. Part II -Toxicology. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 86/2. 1988b 53. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1988. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment 1988c and the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 92. 54. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1988 evaluations. Part I -Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 93/1. 1988d 55. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1988 evaluations. Part II -1989a Toxicology. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 93/2. 56. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1989. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and 1989b the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 99. 57. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1989 evaluations. Part I -Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 100. 1990a Pesticide residues in food: 1989 evaluations. Part II -58. FAO/WHO. 1990b Toxicology. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 100/2. 59. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1990. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and 1990c the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 102. 60. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1990 evaluations. Part I -1991a Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 103/1. 61. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1990 evaluations - Toxicology. WHO/PCS/91.47. 1991b

Pesticide residues in food - 1991. Report of the Joint Meeting

Protection Paper 111.

of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and

62. FAO/WHO.

1991c

1996b

76. FAO/WHO.

1996c

Pesticide residues in food: 1991 evaluations. Part I -63. FAO/WHO. 1991d Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 113/1. 64. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1991 evaluations -Part II - Toxicology. WHO/PCS/92.52. 1992 65. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1992. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and 1993a the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 116. 66. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1992 evaluations. Part I -Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 118. 1993b 67. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1992 evaluations -Part II - Toxicology. WHO/PCS/93.34. 1993c 68. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1993. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and 1993d the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 122. 69. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1993. Toxicology evaluations WHO/PCS/94.4. 1994a 70. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1993 evaluations. Part I -Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 124. 1994b 71. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1994. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and 1994c the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 127. 72. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1994. Evaluations Part I - Residues. FAO Plant 1995a Production and Protection Papers 131/1 and 131/2 (2 volumes). 73. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1994. Evaluations Part II - Toxicology. WHO/PCS/95.2. 1995b 74. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1995. Report of the Joint Meeting 1996a of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 133. 75. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food: 1995 evaluations. Part I -

Residues. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 137.

environmental. WHO/PCS/96.48

Pesticide residues in food - 1995. Evaluations Part II - Toxicological and

77. FAO/WHO. Pesticide residues in food - 1996. Report of the Joint Meeting
of the FAO Panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and
the WHO Expert Group on Pesticide Residues. FAO Plant Production and
Protection Paper 140.

ANNEX III

Report of an informal workshop on data evaluation in the estimation of dietary intake of pesticide residues for the JMPR

INTRODUCTION

A Joint FAO/WHO Consultation on Guidelines for predicting the Dietary Intake of Pesticide Residues was held in York, United Kingdom from 2-6 May 1995. The main objectives of the Consultation were to review the existing guidelines and to recommend feasible approaches for improving the reliability and accuracy of methods for predicting dietary intake of pesticide residues. The final published report of this Consultation² became available in February 1996.

An informal Workshop was convened in the Hague, Netherlands from 11th-12th April 1996. Dr W. H. van Eck, of the Netherlands Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport served as chairman. The Workshop had been arranged at the request of the FAO Panel members in order to consider the consequences of the recommendations of the York Consultation for individual reviewers as well as for the JMPR.

The focus of the Workshop was on the issues relating to the reviews of residue data undertaken by the FAO Panel members.

A list of participants is given. The participants considered a number of working examples on quintozene, dithiocarbamates, parathion-methyl and fenpropimorph, which illustrated issues of interest to the FAO Panel.

OBJECTIVES

The chairman explained that the implementation of the York consultation recommendations would have practical consequences for the way the FAO Panel members carried out their evaluations, how those data would be presented and how consumer risk assessments would be carried out by the JMPR. Guidance was needed for the FAO Panel members as to how recommendations are to be implemented. In addition, criteria need to be established in order to ensure consistency and transparency in the work of the FAO Panel.

The Workshop focused mainly on practical considerations of the application of the York consultation recommendations to the work of the FAO Panel. Discussion centred on the following issues:

- the criteria for the selection of residues trials data used to calculate the Supervised Trials Median Residue (STMR) level.
 - •.the presentation in the JMPR monographs of intake related information (eg. median residue levels).
- •.the approach for dealing with residues at the limit of determination (LOD), also referred to as the limit of quantitation (LOQ).
- practical considerations of the cases where the residue definition for consumer risk assessment is different from that recommended for enforcement
 - evaluation of data on edible portion and processing (combined supervised trials data with

²'Recommendations for the revision of the guidelines for predicting dietary intake of pesticide residues', Report of a FAO/WHO Consultation; World Health Organisation 1995.

processing information)

• identification of appropriate residue values for acute intake assessments

Guidelines were developed in order to give guidance to the FAO Panel reviewers. In addition, a few general recommendations were made. The Workshop recognised that additional guidelines will need to be developed by the JMPR in the future, as experience is gained by the reviewers.

GUIDANCE TO THE FAO PANEL REVIEWERS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE YORK CONSULTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Workshop recommended that:

Comparability

Residues data from countries are evaluated against the GAP in the country of the trials or a neighbouring country with similar climate and cultural practices.

In identifying the STMR, the trials values selected should be comparable with the maximum registered use (ie. maximum application rate, maximum number of treatments, minimum PHI) on which the MRL is based.

In establishing comparability of uses in the residue trials to the maximum registered use, the application rates in the trials should generally be no more than \pm 25 to 30% of the maximum application rate. Deviations from this should be explained in the appraisal. Similarly, \pm 25 to 30% should also be used as a guide for establishing comparability of PHI; however, in this case the latitude of acceptable PHIs will also depend on the rate of decline of residues of the compound under evaluation. Consideration as to whether the number of treatments reported in trials are comparable to the registered maximum number of treatments will depend on the persistence of the compound and the interval between applications. Nevertheless, when a large number of treatments are made in the trials (more than 5 or 6) the residue level should be considered very little influenced by further treatments unless the compound is persistent or the treatments are made with unusually short intervals.

In establishing comparability of residue trials data in which more than one parameter (i.e application rate, number of treatments or PHI) deviate from the maximum registered use, consideration should be given to the combination effect on the residue value which may lead to an underestimation or overestimation of the STMR. For example, a trial result should not normally be selected for the estimation of the STMR if both the application rate is lower (perhaps 0.75 kg/ha in the trial; 1kg ai/ha GAP) than the maximum rate registered and the PHI is longer (perhaps 18 days in the trial, 14 days GAP) than the minimum registered PHI, since these parameters would combine to underestimate the residue. When results are selected for the estimation of STMRs, despite combination effects, the reasons should be explained in the appraisal.

If the residue value arising from a use considered comparable with the maximum registered use is lower than another residue value from the same trial which is <u>within</u> GAP, then the higher residue value should be selected in identifying the STMR. For example, if the GAP specified a minimum PHI of 21 days and the residue levels in a trial reflecting GAP were 0.7, 0.6 and 0.9 mg/kg at 21, 28 and 35 days respectively, then the residue value of 0.9 mg/kg would be selected.

Trials with more than one residue value

In identifying the STMR only one data point should be take from each trial (ie. site location)

Where several residue values have been reported from replicate plots from a single trial (ie. site location) the highest residue should be selected for the purpose of identifying the STMR.

Where several residue values have been reported from replicate analyses of the same field sample taken from a single trial (ie. site location) the <u>mean</u> residue should be selected for the purpose of identifying

the STMR.

Rounding of results

In identifying the STMR from a residue trial the actual residue value should be used in the estimation of dietary intake without rounding up or down. This would even be the case where the actual results were below the practical limit of determination considered appropriate for enforcement purposes. Rounding of residue values is inappropriate since the STMRs are used at an intermediate stage in the dietary intake calculation.

Residue definition

The WHO Panel consider routinely indicating in their evaluations which metabolites should be included in the dietary risk assessment.

If it is recommended that the residue definition for the risk assessment is different from that for enforcement, then this is clearly stated in the appraisal.

Close communication should be established between the FAO Panel reviewers and the respective reviewers on the Toxicological and Environmental Groups, on questions such as which metabolites are of toxicological significance, prior to the JMPR meeting.

In tabulating the residue trials data the FAO Panel reviewer should indicate the levels of relevant metabolites separately from those of the parent compound, but in a way which would allow subsequent combination, in order to ensure that changes in the residue definition can be accommodated at the JMPR meeting.

In those cases where it is not possible to finalise the risk assessment at the JMPR (September, year 1) usually because of a change in residue definition, then the MRLs would still be recommended to the CCPR (by way of Codex circular letter for comment at step 3) and the compound would be rediscussed at the following years JMPR meeting (September, year 2). The recommended MRLs together with the conclusion of the risk assessment would be available for the next CCPR (April, year 3).

If two compounds, for which STMRs can be calculated, produce the same analyte in compliance monitoring (eg. CS_2 for dithiocarbamates) it is possible to separate the intake assessments, if required, because the intake assessment is no longer based on the MRL but is based on residue data specific to the individual compounds.

Combining of populations of data for the calculation of STMRs

In identifying the STMR, residue data reflecting different countries GAPs would normally be combined. However, if the trials data reflecting different countries GAPs appear to give rise to different populations of data then these data sets should not be combined. In these cases the STMR should be calculated from the population(s) of data which is (are) driving the MRL. In deciding whether the results of trials reflecting different countries GAPs give rise to different populations of residues data, the size of the database reflecting the different countries GAPs should be taken into account.

Residues below the limit of determination

That as a general rule, where all residue trials data are <LOD, the STMR would be assumed to be at the LOD, unless there is scientific evidence that residues are "essentially zero". Such supporting evidence would include residues from related trials at shorter PHIs, exaggerated, but related, application rates or a greater number of applications, expectations from metabolism studies or data from related commodities.

Where there are two or more sets of trials with different LODs, and no determinable residues have been reported in the trials, then the lowest LOD should normally be used for the purpose of STMR selection (unless the residues can be assumed to be essentially zero as given above). The size of the trials database supporting the lowest LOD value should be taken into account in the decision.

Processing, cooking factors and edible portion residue data

In using data on the effects on residue levels of processing or cooking practices, the mean reduction or concentration factor should be applied to the STMR estimated for the raw agricultural commodity as already described. The STMR value estimated in this way for the processed commodity should be referred to as the STMR-P.

If data are available for the residues in the edible portion of the commodity (eg. banana pulp) then a STMR should be estimated directly using the edible portion residue values from maximum registered use trials (as opposed to using pesticide values for the whole commodity).

Acute dietary intake

The attention of the FAO Panel members is drawn to the recommendation that for the purpose of acute risk assessment the MRL, or the highest residue in the edible portion, should be used in estimating dietary intake.

Estimation of MRLs for products of animal origin

In estimating MRLs for products of animal origin, theoretical feed intakes for domestic animals should be calculated using the STMR for each feed item (derived from supervised trials comparable with the maximum registered use), rather than the MRL, together with the maximum feed incorporation rates. This is in conformity with past JMPR decisions.

Estimation of STMRs for commodity groups

Where there are adequate trials data the STMRs should, in principle, be identified for the individual commodities and these values used for the intake assessment. However, where the MRL has been established for a group of commodities (eg. pome fruit) a single STMR should be calculated for the group of commodities.

Presentation of STMRs in the JMPR monographs and report

The GAP(s) on which trials data have been selected for the purpose of identifying the STMR should be clearly identified in the monographs.

In tabulating trials data in the monographs the reviewer should ensure that in addition to the normal underlining of trials data that are within GAP (and therefore have been used for the MRL evaluation), the single residue values selected for the estimation of the STMR should be double underlined.

Information on the residue values on which the STMR is based should not only be identified in the tabulated trials data (see above) but a list of the residue values selected should be included in the appraisal, in numerical order, with the median residue underlined. Where the residue situation is complex (eg. a number of metabolites to be considered) these data may best be tabulated in the appraisal. In addition, the STMR values should be included in the recommendation table in the appraisal and in Annex 1 of the report.

The range for the rates and PHIs used in the selection of residue values for STMR should be clearly identified in the appraisal (eg. trials data with application rates from 1.8 - 3.0 kg ai/ha have been selected).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Workshop recommended that:

- a) The recommendations of the York Joint FAO/WHO Consultation are implemented in full into the work of the JMPR.
- b) The acronym "STMR" be used in the JMPR monographs and report for the Supervised Trials Median Residue level.

- c) The FAO Panel identify STMRs routinely for each commodity as part of all future evaluation of compounds in order to facilitate more realistic estimates of long-term dietary intake.
- d) The guidance given in section 3 above is used by the FAO Panel reviewers in their evaluations for the 1996 JMPR.
- e) The report of the York Consultation be considered by 1996 JMPR together with worked examples that demonstrate the FAO Panel guidance given in section 3.
- f) GAP information when submitted by either the manufacturer or member governments, clearly identify which of the rates and PHIs are statutory conditions of use or taken directly from the product label and which are estimates made by the manufacturer or member governments (eg. whether the application rates in kg ai/ha have been calculated from the kg ai/hl application concentrations).
- g) The concepts contained in the FAO Panel guidance, as given in section 3, be incorporated into the draft document currently entitled "FAO Guidelines in the evaluation of pesticide residues data and the estimation of the Maximum Residue Limits in Food and Feed".

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

As a result of the examination of a worked example for STMR estimation, the Workshop noted that significant residues of HCB may result in commodities following applications of quintozene. When quintozene is re-evaluated by the JMPR, consideration should be given to the risk associated with the residues of the impurity HCB.

The WHO informed the Workshop that in revising the Guidelines for the prediction of dietary intake of pesticide residues, they would include hypothetical worked examples of intake calculations in order to give further guidance to member governments.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS (in alphabetical order)

- Dr U. Banasiak, Chemistry Division, Federal Biological Research Centre for Agriculture and Forestry, Braunschweig, Germany.
- Mr S. J. Crossley, Pesticides Safety Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, York, United Kingdom (Report writer)
- Mr D. J. Hamilton, Resource Management Institute, Brisbane, Australia.
- Dr J. Herrman, International Programme for Chemical Safety, World Health Organisation, Geneva, Switzerland (WHO Joint Secretary to the JMPR)
- Mr F. Ives, Health Effects Division, Office of Pesticides Programmes, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., United States of America
- Dr F. Kopisch-Obuch, Pesticide Group, Plant Protection Service, Plant Production and Protection Division, FAO, Rome, Italy (FAO Joint Secretary to the JMPR)
- Mr G. Moy, GEMS/Food Co-ordinator, Food Safety Unit, Division of Food and Nutrition, WHO, Geneva, Switzerland
- Dr W. H. van Eck, Head of Food and Veterinary Policy, Directorate for Public Health, Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport, Rijswijk, The Netherlands (*Chairman*)
- Dr Y. Yamada, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, Food Quality and Standards Service, Food Quality and Standards Service, Food Policy and Nutrition Division, FAO, Rome, Italy