



## Report of the United States Delegate to the 50th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

April 9-14, 2018

Haikou, China

### Introduction

The CCPR held its 50th Session in Haikou, China from April 9-14, 2018. Professor Xiongwu Qiao, Director of the Shanxi Academy of Agricultural Sciences, served as Chair, assisted by Dr. Guibiao Ye, Director of the CCPR Secretariat, Institute for Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of Agriculture of the People's Republic of China (ICAMA). The Session was attended by 52 Member countries; one Member organization (the European Union); and Observers from 13 international organizations. The United States was represented by U.S. Delegate Mr. David Miller of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and Alternate Delegate Dr. John Johnston of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food Safety and Inspection Service, along with five additional governmental and seven non-governmental advisors.

### Highlights

The Committee concluded a highly productive session, advancing 386 Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) for final adoption by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) at its next session (CAC 41, July 2018). The United States was responsible for the nomination of five of the nine new compounds reviewed by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) in 2017 for which MRLs were recommended for adoption. The Committee also reached consensus on the Classification work on crop groupings for *Nut, Seed, and Sap Commodities, Herb and Spice Commodities, and Primary Feed Commodities of Plant Origin*. The United States had a leadership role as co-chair in bringing this work to a successful conclusion. The Committee continued to discuss (for the third consecutive session) potential new work on the IESTI (International Estimate of Short Term Intake) equation and the electronic Working Group (eWG) was re-established to continue its exploratory work on more limited Terms of Reference (ToR) which the previous eWG had not completed. Three additional eWGs were formed to prepare discussion papers for the next session, as described further below.

The following summarizes issues of particular interest to the United States. Complete details of the 50th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR50) may be found in the final meeting report which will soon be posted on the Codex Alimentarius Web site at: <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings-reports/en/>.

### Meeting Summary

#### **Matters of Interest Arising From the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and World Health Organization (WHO)**

The Representatives of WHO, Dr. Philippe Verger, and FAO, Madame Yongzhen Yang, informed the Committee about activities other than the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) that are relevant to the work of CCPR, including:

- **Improvement of chronic dietary exposure assessment.** The JECFA and JMPR Secretariats established an expert working group to elaborate and to propose realistic model(s) to assess the dietary exposure to compounds used both as pesticides and veterinary drugs. The results from international models currently in use were compared with national estimates from 13 countries.
- **Status of FAO/WHO IESTI benchmarking using acute probabilistic dietary exposure assessment methods.** FAO/WHO received national pesticide residue data and food consumption data that will be used to perform a probabilistic assessment of the acute exposure for 47 pesticides. The United States, Brazil, Canada, and the European Union submitted data. FAO and WHO established a scientific review committee to ensure the quality and the transparency of the assessment, which will be conducted by an independent consultant. Results should be available in 2019 to support the ongoing review of issues related to the IESTI equation.
- **Global Food Consumption Databases and ongoing activities to support countries in generating and using data for risk analysis purposes.** Reliable information on food consumption, collected at the individual level, is needed to estimate dietary exposure to chemicals and biological agents in the general population and in vulnerable population groups. To address the issue of insufficient access to such data, FAO and WHO have continued the work



(initiated in 2014) on two tools to develop global food consumption databases: (1) the [FAO/WHO Chronic Individual Food Consumption Database](#) and (2) the [FAO/WHO Global Individual Food Consumption Data Tool](#). Additional details on these topics can be found in CCPR-50 Agenda Item 4(a) Summary Document entitled, "[Matters of Interest Arising from FAO and WHO in addition to 2017 JMPR Activities](#)."

### **Report on Items of General Consideration by the 2017 JMPR**

The JMPR Secretariat provided relevant information to the Committee on the 2017 JMPR Regular Meeting , regarding:

- Special studies on microbiological effects of pesticide residues in foods
  - Use of historical control data
  - Further consideration of the process for establishing group MRLs: Update on the use of the revised commodity classification for vegetables
  - Field use pattern anticipated residue comparison model
  - Update of the IESTI model used for the calculation of dietary intake: New large portion data
- With regard to the anticipated residue comparison model, delegations noted that it enables JMPR to utilize residue data from field trials that are not based on critical Good Agricultural Practices (cGAP). While there was general support for the proposed modeling approach, delegations indicated that validation is needed to ensure that the model is suitable for estimating MRLs.

Additional details on these topics can be found in Section 2.0 of the [2017 JMPR Evaluation Report](#).

### **Proposed Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) for Pesticides in Food and Feed**

The CCPR agreed to forward 386 MRLs (at Step 5/8) to the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) for final adoption at its next session. These MRLs are associated with 39 pesticides; 248 of the MRLs are for plant commodities, while 138 are for animal commodities. Five of the nine new compounds reviewed by JMPR in 2017 were nominated by the United States. Crop Group and Subgroup MRLs accounted for 44 of the 386 MRLs forwarded for adoption.

The accelerated procedure and criteria for decision-making were again used with great success, and most of the MRLs were advanced using the accelerated 5/8 procedure. The European Union (EU), Norway and Switzerland conveyed reservations on over 68 of the 386 MRLs recommended by the JMPR; therefore, a majority of those MRLs may not have been advanced if not for the concern form procedure.

The Committee returned 11 MRLs for two pesticides to Step 7 for further consideration; JMPR is seeking additional information to support these MRLs. The Committee also recommended revocation of 127 previously adopted CXLs (Codex MRLs) associated with 11 pesticides. Of these, 69 of the MRLs proposed for revocation are for plant commodities; 34 are for animal commodities. Proposed revocations are typically due to CXLs being replaced based on review of additional data; uses no longer supported; or CXLs deemed by JMPR to have potential dietary intake concerns with no alternative good agricultural practice (GAP). Finally, 11 draft MRLs for six pesticides were withdrawn from further consideration.

JMPR also provided an initial response to the two concern forms the United States submitted to the CCPR for consideration by the 2018 JMPR:

- For *2,4-D*, the United States requested JMPR to reconsider the decision not to recommend an MRL for cottonseed. While the JMPR appears to have performed a thorough review of the data, no MRL was proposed in the JMPR report and no reason was provided for the lack of such a recommendation. In response, JMPR indicated that it will review the issue and respond accordingly.
- For *Picoxystrobin*, the United States requested that JMPR reconsider the decision not to recommend an MRL for oilseed rape. The 2017 JMPR review concluded that there were an insufficient number of field trials at the GAP to estimate an MRL for oilseed rape. The 2012 JMPR report, however, reviewed and summarized eighteen residue trials with the correct application use pattern and additional GAP or near-GAP trials. JMPR advised that this concern would be considered by the 2018 JMPR.

### **Revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds**



The revision of the *Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds* is part of an ongoing effort to revise all of the crop groups. The United States has chaired/co-chaired this working group since the beginning of the effort and provided much of the documentation for the proposed crop groups. The Committee considered proposed amendments for the following crop groups and subgroups: *Type 04 Nuts, Seeds and Saps*; *Type 05 Herbs and Spices*; and *Type 11 Primary Feed commodities of Plant Origin*.

*Proposed Revision of the Classification of Food and Feed – Type 04 Nuts, Seeds, and Saps*

Type 04 includes Group 022 Tree nuts (Step 7), Group 023 Oilseeds and oilfruits (Step 7), Group 024 Seed for beverages and sweets(Step 7), and Group 025 Sap producing trees (Step 4). The committee endorsed recommendations to: (i) include Chilean hazelnut in Group 022 Tree nuts. (ii) maintain perilla seed in Group 023 Oilseeds and not to transfer it to Group 028 Spices; (iii) include coconut, inflorescence sap and Palmyra palm, inflorescence sap in Group 025 Tree saps, without the creation of separate subgroups and modify the commodity descriptor to indicate that sap can also be collected from the inflorescence of the trees; (iv) remove specific provisions for chestnuts in the portion of the commodity to which the MRLs apply (and which is analyzed) in Group 022 Tree nuts as the general provision for tree nuts is also applicable to this commodity; (v) not to include soya bean and cupuacu (*Theobroma grandiflorum*); (vi) maintain Subgroup 023D “Other Oilseeds in Group 023 Oilseeds and oilfruits; and (vii) not to include additional synonym scientific names for shea nut.

The Committee agreed to forward all groups in Type 04 (Groups 022, 023, 024 and 025) to CAC41 for final adoption at Steps 8 and 5/8 (See [Appendix VII](#) of the 2018 Committee Report).

*Proposed Draft Revision of the Classification of Food and Feed—Type 05 Herbs and Spices*

Type 05 includes Group 027 Herbs and Group 028 Spices. The Committee endorsed recommendations to: (i) maintain the subgroups of 028I Dried chili peppers and 028H Citrus peel in Class A Primary commodities of plant origin; (ii) maintain milk thistle in Group 028 Spices; (iii) include caraway in Subgroup 028A Spices, seeds; and (iv) change the entries for oregano and marjoram to consolidate the entries for marjoram and to cross reference oregano to marjoram.

The Committee agreed to forward all groups in Type 05 (Groups 027 and 028) to CAC41 (July 2018) for final adoption at Step 8 ([Appendix VIII](#)).

*Proposed Revision of the Classification of Food and Feed –Type 11 Primary Feed Commodities of Plant Origin*

The Committee endorsed the recommendations to: (i) align the structure of Class C based on the water content of feeds (high water content (forage, fodder) versus low water content (straw, hay)) so as to facilitate crop grouping and extrapolation of MRLs; and (ii) group all feed commodities under Class C and consequently transfer processed feed commodities from Class D (Processed Food of Plant Origin) to Class C.

The Committee agreed with the structure for Class C – Animal Feed Commodities and that commodities to be included in the groups and subgroups would be further discussed in the eWG for consideration at CCPR51 ([Appendix X](#)).

The Committee agreed to re-establish the eWG, chaired by the United States and co-chaired by the Netherlands, with the following Terms of Reference:

- i. continue the work on the revision of Class C, Animal Feed Commodities, based on the structure provided in Appendix X;
- ii. consider the proposal to add subgroups to the groups that would include processed commodities;
- iii. consider new commodities for Class C;
- iv. initiate work on Type 12 Secondary food commodities of plant origin in Class D; and
- v. assign codes to miscellaneous commodities.

***Discussion Paper on the Possible Revision of the IESTI Equations***

During CCPR48 in 2016, the Committee agreed to establish an eWG, chaired by the Netherlands and co-chaired by Australia, to identify advantages and challenges that might arise from possible revision of the current IESTI



equations, and the impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals, and trade. Work from this eWG was discussed at CCPR49 (2017), at which time there was further discussion with regard to the possible review of the IESTI equations. Based on this discussion, the Committee agreed at CCPR49 to establish a new eWG to perform further exploratory work.

CCPR49 also requested FAO/WHO to review the parameters of IESTI and benchmark the current IESTI approach using probabilistic exposure assessment methods that incorporate data from member countries on food consumption and pesticide residue monitoring. The Committee called for the active participation of the JMPR Secretariat in the eWG to ensure proper focus and a liaison between risk managers and risk assessors.

The eWG was unable to complete the work in its TOR and so during the adoption of the Agenda at CCPR 50, the Committee agreed to form an in-session working group to discuss progress, the status of the eWG's [Discussion Paper](#), and possible TOR for a re-established eWG. This in-session working group also included updates from JMPR and FAO/WHO and a presentation from the U.S. Alternate Delegate, Dr. John Johnston, entitled, "[Potential Application of Processed Product Pesticide Residue Data to IESTI Process](#)." Dr. Johnston's presentation provided information on bulking and blending practices and pesticide residue monitoring data from the Pesticide Data Program of the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) of the USDA on orange juice and wheat. This presentation emphasized that real-world monitoring data show that residues are below both Codex MRL values and Short-Term Median Residue values derived from field trials.

The Committee agreed that the eWG had completed work on one element of its Terms of Reference, "to provide information on the history, background and use of the IESTI equations," and that this work will be provided as an appendix to the final report of CCPR50. The Committee also agreed to reestablish the eWG, but modified Terms of Reference (iii) to focus more specifically on information on bulking in blending. While the eWG will focus on information on bulking/blending, it was recognized that the information outlined in Table 3 of Appendix 2 of the 2017 CCPR document (CX/PR 17/49/12) is critical for the evaluation of IESTI and must be included in future activities of JMPR and CCPR.

The re-established EWG on IESTI will be chaired by the Netherlands and co-chaired Brazil and Uganda. Its terms of reference are:

- i. To review and provide illustrative comments on advantages and challenges that arise from the current IESTI equations and their impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals and trade;
- ii. To gather relevant information on bulking and blending, in order to feed into the risk assessors' work through the JMPR Secretariat; and
- iii. On the basis of the above considerations develop a discussion paper providing recommendations for consideration at CCPR51. (2019)

#### ***Establishment of Codex Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides***

The eWG Chair (Australia) provided a list of seven new compounds to be scheduled for JMPR evaluation, plus one reserve compound. In addition, there were 19 confirmed new uses and other evaluations listed in the proposed Schedule of New Uses and Other Evaluations for the 2019 extraordinary JMPR meeting, which has been called to address the backlog of pending reviews. During the Committee session, one further nomination was presented, for a full quota of 20. Four of these also require toxicological review. The JMPR Secretariat confirmed that a 'data call-in' would occur in May 2019.

The eWG Chair also reported that there are 13 confirmed new use and other evaluations listed in the proposed 2019 Schedule of New Uses and Other Evaluations (normal meeting) and four unconfirmed nominations, the latter four with reserve status. In addition, 13 compounds were listed for evaluation of monitoring data in support of spice MRLs. The sponsor of the compound cyclaniliprole indicated that revised labels would be provided in support of a re-evaluation of residue data initially undertaken in 2017.

With regard to periodic reviews, the eWG Chair reported that there were 10 compounds on the 2019 schedule and only four were supported by a sponsor (carbofuran / carbosulfan, dimethoate, tolclofos-methyl and clethodim). The eWG Chair indicated that the six remaining compounds (aldicarb, amitraz, azinphos-methyl, dicloran, fenarimol and phosalone) were unsupported and that most of these appear to be the subject of a public health concern. No data package was presented in support of the compound, bromopropylate (70), for the 2018 periodic review, and therefore it was added to the list of unsupported compounds.



Finally, the Committee indicated that a commitment of members/observers to provide support/data for the periodic review of the seven unsupported compounds was required prior to the next session. If there is support, the standard process will allow four years for data development and review. If there is no support, a recommendation will be put to the next CCPR to remove the seven compounds from the Codex Pesticide List and revoke the associated CXLs.

The Committee agreed to re-establish the eWG on Priorities, chaired by Australia and co-chaired by Germany.

### ***Information on National Registration Database of Pesticides***

In advance of CCPR50, a Circular Letter (CL 2018/17-PR), [Request for information national registration of pesticides](#) was issued. The primary objective of this database is to provide Codex Members and Observers with a source of information indicating whether a national registration and current product label exist for a chemical-commodity combination. The United States responded to the request by completing the spreadsheet accompanying the CL, using information on current tolerances (U.S. MRLs) available in the U.S. *Code of Federal Regulations*, derived from [GlobalMRL.com](#), which may have a corresponding active national registration.

While delegations generally supported further development of a national registration database, a number of issues were raised for consideration the eWG on Priorities, including observations that:

- information requested should fit the purposes of the database;
- information required should be simplified in order not to create unnecessary burden on Codex member countries; and
- access to the repository of data needs to be facilitated.

### ***Future Work***

The Committee agreed to form three new eWGs to prepare discussion papers for consideration at the next session on the following subjects:

- Assessment of the benefits, challenges and proposed possible solutions to the participation of the JMPR in an international joint review of a new compound (Chair: Canada, Co-Chairs: Costa Rica and Kenya)
- Guidelines on biological and mineral compounds used as pesticides of low public health concern (Chair: Chile, Co-Chairs: India and United States)
- Revision of the Guidelines on the use of mass spectrometry for the identification, confirmation and quantitative determination of residues (Chair: Iran, Co-Chair: Costa Rica)

### ***Other Highlights Relevant to the United States***

Other highlights of the 50th Session of the CCPR included a well-attended side event on the [Third Global Minor Use Summit](#) (GMUS-3) that was moderated by Dr. Dan Kunkel of the U.S. Delegation. During the side event, a summary of GMUS-3 was provided and future plans on topics related to CCPR and JMPR were discussed.

### ***Next Session***

The 51st session of CCPR will convene in May/April 2019 in China.