



## Report of the U.S. Delegate, 46th Session, Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues

### *Introduction*

The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) held its 46<sup>th</sup> Session in Nanjing, China, from May 5-10, 2014. Professor Xiongwu Qiao, Vice-Director of the Shanxi Academy of Agricultural Sciences served as Chair, assisted by Dr. Hongjun Zhang, Director of CCPR Secretariat, Institute for Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of Agriculture (ICAMA). The Session was attended by 59 Member countries, one Member organization and Observers from 10 international organizations. The United States was represented by Ms. Lois Rossi of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as Delegate to CCPR and Dr. Parthapratim (Pat) Basu of the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service as Alternate Delegate, along with three governmental and eight nongovernmental advisors.

The following summarizes issues of particular interest to the U.S. Delegation. Complete details of the 46th Session (2014 Meeting) may be found in the official meeting report, on the Codex Alimentarius website at: <http://www.codexalimentarius.org/meetings-reports/en/>

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

The FAO Secretariat to the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) explained ongoing activities related to pesticide management including the completion of the revised International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management, development of a pesticide registration tool kit and capacity development for feed safety. The JMPR Secretariat also announced a willingness to hold a second JMPR meeting in 2015 in order to reduce the backlog of the JMPR, provided funding is available. The WHO Secretariat then discussed the new data that have been collected on individual food consumption for chronic exposure which were added to the FAO/WHO Chronic Individual Food Consumption Database – Summary Statistics (CIFOCCss).

### *Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs)*

343 MRLs for 32 pesticides were advanced for final adoption by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) at its next session (July 2014), including 11 new compounds (3 of these were nominated by the United States). The accelerated procedure, along with the criteria for decision-making, were used with great success: 342 of the 343 MRLs were advanced using the accelerated 5/8 procedure. Reservations were made for 72 of these MRLs and therefore, would not have been advanced if not for the concern form procedure. 40 of the 342 MRLs are for crop groups. Two of these MRLs (sulfoxaflor - dry bean and carrot), were advanced in response to the submission by the U.S. Delegation of a concern form along with additional information on cultural practices to the 2013 JMPR.

An additional 27 MRLs for six pesticides were returned to Step 7 while the JMPR awaits additional information. Nineteen MRLs for seven pesticides were returned to Step 4 for various reasons, for example, due to risk concerns raised by member countries or the need for more information on Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) that aligns with the GAP considered by JMPR.

104 CXLs (previously adopted MRLs) for 14 pesticides were recommended for revocation. These are typically 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 GAP. The U.S. Delegation was successful in requesting that the proposed revocation of the MRL for bentazone (dry pea) be delayed under the four-year-rule in order for the United States to submit additional field trial data that reflects the registered use in the United States. Bentazone is an important tool for U.S. dry pea growers.

### *Discussion Paper on the Applicability of Codex Maximum Residue Limits for Citrus Fruits to Kumquats*

The Delegation of Japan presented its findings of the short-term dietary exposure assessment conducted to determine whether the inclusion of kumquats for existing MRLs for citrus fruits would pose a dietary intake concern. The U.S. Delegation provided available consumption data for kumquats to the Japanese Delegation as part of this effort. The paper concluded that inclusion of kumquats for chemicals with existing MRLs for citrus fruits or lemons and limes would not pose a risk concern. The paper therefore proposed that “excluding kumquats” be



removed from the Codex MRL database for MRLs for citrus fruits or lemons and limes. The paper also recommended that the Committee consider the advancement of draft MRLs for citrus fruits or for lemons and limes with the understanding that these MRLs also apply to kumquats.

Based on the outcome of the assessment, the CCPR agreed it was appropriate to remove the phrase “excluding kumquats” from the existing MRLs for citrus fruits or lemons and limes with the exception of dimethoate. Including kumquats into the citrus group for dimethoate will be reconsidered when this chemical goes through periodic review in 2019. Additionally, the MRLs for citrus fruits or lemons and limes considered during the 2014 CCPR meeting for diquat, fenbuconazole, and difenconazole would also apply to kumquats. The U.S. Delegation welcomed the inclusion of kumquats in the citrus fruit group since this is in-line with the U.S. crop groups for citrus fruit.

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

The Electronic Working Group (eWG) on the Classification of Food and Feed, chaired by the Netherlands and co-chaired by the United States, presented proposed amendments to the Revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds. The Committee considered proposed amendments to the Revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds for cucurbits, fruiting vegetables, legume vegetables and pulses.

As part of this ongoing effort, the U.S. Delegation provided documentation including a monograph for each commodity proposed for addition to the Group 011 Fruiting Vegetables, Cucurbits as well as a justification as to why two subgroups, Cucurbits - melon and Cucurbits - squash/cucumber, were appropriate. The information gathered for the proposal made by the United States was based on extensive work with the International Crop Group Consulting Committee (ICGCC). The Cucurbit Vegetable Workgroup of the ICGCC consisted of 62 U.S. crop or regulatory experts from agricultural commodity groups, universities, the agrichemical industry, the IR-4 Project, USDA and EPA; as well as 79 international crop or regulatory experts representing 28 countries.

The proposal presented to the CCPR by the eWG Chair divided the cucurbits into three subgroups: Cucurbits - edible peel, Cucurbits - inedible peel - melons, and Cucurbits - inedible peel - winter squashes. The United States did not support establishment of three subgroups and requested that delegations proposing changes to the original U.S. proposal provide their rationale as to why those changes are appropriate. Therefore, the Committee agreed to continue working on the revisions to the Cucurbit Vegetable Group taking into account representativeness of the subgroups, potential residues, and harmonization with other existing classifications schemes, in particular those proposed by the ICGCC.

There was also a difference of opinion regarding the proposed changes to the Legume Vegetable Group. Some Member Countries wanted the group divided into two subgroups: (1) legume vegetables with pods and (2) legume vegetables without pods. Other Member Countries proposed there be four subgroups: (1) beans with pods; (2) peas with pods; (3) succulent beans without pods and (4) succulent beans without pods. Therefore, the Committee agreed that work should continue on this group as well.

The Committee determined that the Pulse Group could advance to Step 5. Further, the Committee will request comments on the proposed revisions of the Cucurbit Fruiting Vegetable Group and the Legume Vegetable Group. The Committee agreed to reestablish the eWG, chaired by the Netherlands and co-chaired by the United States, in order to continue work on the Cucurbit Fruiting Vegetable Group and the Legume Vegetable Group and to propose draft Revisions to the Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds for additional crop groups. The United States will continue to participate in this activity and will provide documentation to support our position on these groups.

Currently there are four vegetable groups at Step 7 awaiting adoption: (1) *Brassica* (Cole or Cabbage) Vegetables, Head Cabbages and Flowerhead Cabbages; (2) Leafy Vegetables (Including *Brassica* Leafy Vegetables); (3) Stalk and Stem Vegetables; and (4) Root and Tuber Vegetables. These groups will be held at Step 7 awaiting finalization of the revision of the classification of all vegetable commodity groups. This is the same approach taken for the fruit commodity groups.



## *Proposed Draft Principles and Guidelines for the Selection of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of Maximum Residue Limits for Commodity Groups – Table 2*

Since there was no agreement on the Cucurbit Fruiting Vegetable Group and Legume Vegetable Group, the Committee agreed to wait until work on these groups was completed before discussing which commodities are the appropriate representative commodities for extrapolation. The Committee previously agreed that the vegetable commodity groups in Table 2 will be finalized together with the corresponding commodity groups in the Classification. This will allow both the vegetable commodity groups in the Classification and in Table 2 to be sent together for final adoption by the Commission and inclusion of Table 2 in the *Principles and Guidance for the Section of Representative Commodities for the Extrapolation of Maximum Residue Limits for Pesticides to Commodity Groups*. This is the same approach taken for the fruit commodity groups where the revision of the Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds for fruit types was forwarded to Step 8, and the Draft Principles and Guidelines including Table 1 on fruit commodities were updated to reflect accepted amendments and were forwarded to Step 8 by the 44<sup>th</sup> Session of CCPR (2012) and adopted by the CAC at its 35<sup>th</sup> Session (2012).

The use of crop groupings is very important in order to establish MRLs for many minor crops based on the residue data from the representative commodities. Finalizing the revision to the Classification for vegetable type crop groups along with the guidance on the selection of representative commodities will be very useful in order to establish additional MRLs for minor vegetable crops. Completion of the vegetable types is expected in 2016.

The Committee agreed to reconvene the eWG on the Revision of the Codex Classification of Food and Feed in order to identify other commodity groups for consideration by CCPR, to continue to amend the draft Table 2.

## *Methods of Analysis for the Determination Pesticide Residues*

Dr. Pat Basu, Alternate U.S. Delegate, chaired the in-session meetings and also agreed to continue as chair for the EWG for Methods of Analysis. The in-session work group prepared a revised version of the *Guidelines on the Performance Criteria Specific for Methods of Analysis for the Determination of Pesticide Residues*. The work group reached consensus on several parts of the guidance document but additional work, feedback, and consultation at the country level is still needed on some parts. Since additional work is still necessary, the eWG was re-established and the United States will serve as chair, with China and India as co-chairs. The eWG will also take into consideration the work completed on the guidelines on performance characteristics for multi-residue methods completed by the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF) and the Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling (CCMAS) to ensure consistency.

## *Revision of the Risk Analysis Principles*

The U.S. Delegate, Lois Rossi was once again asked to chair in-session meetings to finalize revisions to the *Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues*. Since the Codex Committee on General Principles (CCGP) will consider consistency of the risk analysis texts across committees in 2016, the Codex Secretariat indicated it was imperative the revisions be completed at this session. The in-session work group focused its work on sections where comments had been submitted in addition to editorial changes. Participants reached consensus and the Committee agreed to forward the revised *Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues* to the 37<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission (2014) for approval and inclusion in the *Procedural Manual*. This is a very positive outcome since this work has been ongoing since 2008.

## *Working Group to Facilitate the Establishment of Codex MRLs for Minor Use and Specialty Crops*

The eWG on Minor Uses and Specialty Crops continued work to further develop criteria to determine the minimum number of field trials needed for risk assessment to support the establishment of Codex MRLs for minor uses and specialty crops. The eWG has proposed criteria to determine the number of field trials to support minor use MRLs whereby global diet data (FAOSTAT Food Supply Quantity (g/capita/day)) and a fixed percentage (0.5%) would be used as the first tier and GEMS/Foods 17 Cluster Diets data used to further refine the criteria at the second tier. Using this approach, the eWG developed 3 categories to determine the appropriate number of residue field trials for minor crops.



There was an in-session meeting during the 46<sup>th</sup> CCPR and a proposal put forth where the list of crops considered major was revised based on the use of national consumption data. The United States as well as other delegations raised concerns regarding this proposed change since this would reclassify several commodities (e.g., lemons, pumpkins and kiwifruit) as major. The United States does not require eight field trials for these commodities and therefore is concerned this will result in fewer Codex MRLs for these commodities.

The Committee agreed to seek feedback from the 2014 JMPR on the criteria, methodology and crop lists and whether the proposed approach could be used as a starting point in determining the number of trials considered necessary in the setting of MRLs. The Committee also agreed to re-establish the eWG on Minor Uses and Specialty Crops in order to refine the list of commodities in Tables 1 and 2 (CRD 22) and develop criteria for a limited set of borderline crops such as lemons, pumpkins and kiwifruit. The eWG on Minor Uses and Specialty Crops will be chaired by France. The United States will continue to participate in the EWG for Minor Uses and Specialty Crops.

### *Nomination and Prioritization of Compounds to be Considered by the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)*

The Committee considered the nominations of compounds for 2015 listed in the report of the eWG on Priorities. The Chair of the eWG (Australia) noted that 12 new compound evaluations, 20 new use and other evaluations, and six existing compound re-evaluations are scheduled for review by JMPR in 2015. Four of the 12 new compounds (chlormequat, penconazole, lufenuron and phosphorous acid) were given reserve status. The chemicals given reserve status will be included for review if the second JMPR meeting is held in 2015 as well as at least two pesticides (spiromesifen and oxatiapiprolin) listed in the 2016 priority list.

All U.S. nominations for new compounds and additional uses of existing compounds were scheduled. The Committee noted that the new compound evaluations priority list for 2016 is currently at capacity with 12 new compounds scheduled and 19 new use and other evaluations are scheduled for review by JMPR in 2016. Therefore, any additional new chemicals will need to be nominated for review in 2017 and beyond.

### *Update on the Sulfoxaflor Pilot Project and the Progress of the National Global Joint Review*

During the 2010 Session, the CCPR approved the U.S. proposal for a pilot project, whereby JMPR would evaluate a chemical before finalization of any national review/registration. At the 45<sup>th</sup> Session (2013) the United States presented a paper reporting the outcome of the pilot project and the national global joint review associated with the pilot. The recommendation made by the United States to change the prioritization criteria to allow for this approach as an option for new chemicals was not adopted in 2013. Instead, as reported in 2013, the U.S. Delegation agreed to complete a critical analysis of the project and report during the 46<sup>th</sup> CCPR.

The U.S. delegation began to draft the critical review of the pilot project that was discussed during the 45<sup>th</sup> CCPR meeting. However, the FAO and WHO Secretariats indicated they were not prepared to provide the information outlined in CX/CAC10/33/7-Add. prior to the 46<sup>th</sup> Session (2014) of the CCPR. The CCPR Chair, therefore, requested that the U.S. postpone completing any type of critical review to be presented at the 46<sup>th</sup> CCPR.

In the meeting this year with the Chair and the JMPR Secretariats prior to the start of the CCPR meeting, Lois Rossi asked if the issue of the pilot project would be discussed during the 46<sup>th</sup> session of the CCPR and if the United States would be requested to complete the critical analysis for submission to the 47<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCPR (2015). Neither the Chair nor the JMPR Secretariats were prepared to discuss this issue further, and there was no request for the completion of the critical review. There was little to no support from the Chair or JMPR Secretariats for the implementation of this process as an option for the review of new active ingredients or for further discussion during the plenary, and the matter was not discussed.

### *Next CCPR*

The 47<sup>th</sup> Session is tentatively scheduled to be held in China in April 2015. The final arrangements were not announced.