

**DRAFT Report of the U.S. Delegate
52nd Session of the
Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues
July 26-30 and August 3, 2021
(Virtual)**

Introduction

The 52nd Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR52) was held virtually July 26 - 30 and August 3, 2021. 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 82 Member countries, one Member organization (the European Union), and Observers from 14 international organizations. The United States was represented by U.S. Delegate David Miller of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Alternate Delegate Alexander Domesle of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food Safety and Inspection Service, along with additional members of the U.S. Delegation representing the U.S. Codex Office, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS), Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4), and nongovernment stakeholders.

Highlights

- CCPR52 concluded its first virtual session successfully and advanced **402 Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs)** for final adoption by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) at its next session, (CAC44, scheduled for November 2021). Four of the eight new compounds reviewed by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) in 2019 were nominated by the United States.¹
- CCPR52 **revoked MRLs for Bromide ion (47), Bromopropylate (70), Dichloran (83), and Fenarimol (192)** due to public health concerns and lack of sponsor support. Two other compounds - Amitraz (122) and Fenbutatin Oxide (109) - were also considered for revocation, but the Committee supported the proposal from the United States to retain both compounds and allow a sponsor to be identified by the next meeting so that they can support periodic review under the 4-year rule (i.e., sponsors have a 4-year period to submit data packages to JMPR to support its periodic review evaluation).²
- The Committee reached consensus on the **classification work on crop groupings** for *primary feed commodities of plant origin and processed food commodities of plant origin*. Specifically, the Committee agreed on the working principles for transferring commodities from Class D (Processed Feed Commodities of Plant Origin) to Class C (Feed Commodities of Plant Origin) and revisions to the table on examples of representative commodities. The United States as co-chair led the advancement of this work on the classification of food and feed.

¹ JMPR was unable to convene a 2020 meeting to make final recommendations due to the COVID19 pandemic. JMPR reviews from 2020 and beyond will be reviewed during the next session of CCPR in 2022.

² Amitraz (122) was identified as a pesticide with Public Health Concern.

- The Committee completed its ***exploratory work on the International Estimate of Short-Term Intake (IESTI) equations*** and agreed to suspend any additional work until JMPR can provide additional scientific guidance on FAO/WHO's benchmarking of the IESTI equations.
- The Committee drafted a ***guidance document on criteria for identifying compounds of low public health concern that could be exempted from the establishment of Codex residue limits (CXLs)***. The Committee advanced the guidelines to Step 5 for interim adoption by CAC44 (2021), allowing for another round of comments and discussion in CCPR, and re-established the electronic working group (EWG), chaired by Chile and co-chaired by the United States and India, to continue this work and address feedback from Codex Members/Observers.
- Delegations expressed divergent views on the ***management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns***. The Committee re-established the EWG, chaired by Chile and co-chaired by Australia and Kenya, to further discuss management options and their implementation by CCPR.
- The Committee continued work on the development of ***principles and procedures to facilitate the participation of the JMPR in the international parallel review of new compounds***. The Committee supported a proposal to develop a case study based on nominations from industry and re-established the EWG, chaired by Canada and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Kenya, to develop a discussion paper on the criteria for selecting a global project manager.

Meeting Summary

The following report summarizes issues of interest to the United States. Complete details of CCPR52 may be found in the final meeting report which is or soon will be posted on the Codex Alimentarius website at: <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings-reports/en/>.

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

Dr. Soren Madsen (WHO representative) and Madame Yongzhen Yang (FAO representative) informed the Committee of activities relevant to CCPR, including:

1. Development of a new FAO Food Safety Strategy for 2022-2031 to support Members and improve food safety by providing scientific advice and strengthening food safety capacities for sustainable and resilient agri-food systems.
2. An FAO study entitled, *Understanding International Harmonization of Pesticide Maximum Residue Limits with Codex Standards: A Case Study on Rice*. The FAO study has been published online [here](#) and raises concerns that the limited adoption of Codex MRLs by some countries could lead to disruptions in international trade.
3. Updates to the WHO guidance document, *Environmental Health Criteria 240, Principles and Methods for the Risk Assessment of Chemicals in Food*. Key updates are available on the WHO website [here](#). Updates include:
 - [Section 4.5 Genotoxicity](#)

- [Chapter 5: Dose-Response Assessment and Derivation of Health-Based Guidance Values](#)
- [Chapter 6: Dietary Exposure Assessment of Chemicals in Food](#)
- [Section 9.1.4.2 Enzymes](#)

Additional details on these topics can be found in CCPR52 Agenda Item 4(a) Summary Document entitled, "[Matters arising from FAO and WHO](#)".

Report on Items of General Consideration by the 2019 JMPR

The JMPR Secretariat provided relevant information to the Committee on the 2019 JMPR Regular Meeting, regarding:

- Update to Chapter 5 of the *Environmental Health Criteria (EHC) 240: Dose–Response Assessment and Derivation of Health-Based Guidance Values*
- Combined exposure to multiple chemicals
- Guidance for the evaluation of genotoxicity of chemical substances in food
- Results for probabilistic modelling of acute dietary exposure to evaluate the IESTI equations
- Need for a guidance on toxicological interpretation due to the shift from maximum tolerated dose (MTD)-based to kinetically-derived maximum dose (KMD)-based evaluation of pesticide residues
- Comments on chlorpyrifos
- Possible need for amendments to the *Environmental Health Criteria (EHC) 240 Guidance on Appropriate Use of Toxicological Historical Control Data (HCD) Use of Monitoring data* for the estimation of maximum residue levels

Additional details on these topics can be found in Section 2.0 of the [2019 JMPR Evaluation Report](#).

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

The CCPR agreed to forward 402 MRLs to the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) for final adoption (at Step 5/8) at its next session in November 2021. These MRLs are associated with 21 pesticides; 262 of the MRLs are for plant commodities³ while 141 are for animal commodities. Four of eight new

³ One of the Codex MRLs that was recommended for advancement by CCPR 2021 was an MRL of 0.2ppm for azoxystrobin in guava. The data to support this recommendation was part of the USDA-FAS capacity-building project on MRL harmonization and conducted in collaboration with the IR-4 Project and the Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture (Agricultural Pesticide Committee, chaired by Dr. Mohamed Megeed). The project was jointly funded through the State Department’s Chemical Security Program and USDA’s Emerging Markets Program. The aim of the project was to gain Codex MRLs for specialty crops of mutual interest to both U.S. and Egyptian farmers. Although the United States already has an MRL for this crop/pesticide combination, the U.S. data were insufficient for Codex minimum data requirements, so the Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture conducted additional trials to supplement the U.S. data for a joint submission to Codex. Prior to the start of the residue study, field training and laboratory analysis training was provided to Egyptian scientists involved in the project. Six residue field trials, using Syngenta fungicide Amistar Top (azoxystrobin + difenoconazole), were completed in 2015, with the final report submitted to JMPR in December 2016. The Ministry of Agriculture’s Central Agricultural Pesticide Laboratory analyzed the guava samples for residues of azoxystrobin and difenoconazole, and wrote the Analytical Summary Report. Difenoconazole will be reviewed by CCPR in 2022.

compounds reviewed by JMPR in 2019 were nominated by the United States. Crop Group and Subgroup MRLs accounted for 118 of the 402 MRLs forwarded for adoption.

The accelerated procedure and criteria for decision-making were once again used with great success at this session; all MRLs recommended for adoption by the CAC were advanced using the accelerated Step 5/8 procedure. The European Union (EU), Norway and Switzerland recorded reservations on 182 of the 402 MRLs recommended by the JMPR; therefore, a large number of MRLs may not have advanced at CCPR52 but for the concern form procedure, which requires that Members submit, for JMPR review, documentation justifying the scientific basis for concerns with the JMPR evaluation.

The Committee returned 13 MRLs for chlorothalonil, bifenthrin, fenpyroximate, fluesulfone, and pyflubumide to Step 7 for JMPR to await additional information. The Committee also recommended revocation of 104 previously adopted CXLs (Codex MRLs) associated with 22 pesticides. Among these, 87 of the MRLs proposed for revocation are for plant commodities and 17 are for animal commodities. 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 good agricultural practice (GAP). Finally, 37 draft MRLs for eight pesticides were withdrawn from further consideration.

The United States generally supported the MRL recommendations made during the 2019 JMPR Meeting, but advanced three concern forms in advance of CCPR52 for metconazole (Wheat), fluensulfone (Pome and Citrus Juice), and afidopyropen, and identified potential technical issues with JMPR's evaluations. In response, JMPR agreed to reconsider its evaluation of metconazole and fluensulfone and will provide additional information at the next session (CCPR53, in 2022). The third concern form for afidopyropen was withdrawn during CCPR52 based on plenary discussion with the JMPR Secretariat and other Codex Members because it was not a concern for the CXLs that were recommended by JMPR for this chemical.

The complete list of the MRL actions recommended by CCPR52 are contained in the appendices to the official Committee report and will be published on <http://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings-reports/en/> when finalized.

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 the crop groups. The United States has chaired/co-chaired this working group since the beginning and has provided much of the documentation for the proposed crop groups. The Committee considered proposed amendments for the following crop groups and subgroups:

- *Class C: Primary Feed Commodities. Type 11: Primary Feed Commodities of Plant Origin, All Groups*
- *Class D: Processed Food Commodities of Plant Origin. All Types and Groups, with details provided below.*
- Table 7 and 8 of Principles and Guidelines for the Selection of Representative Commodities for the extrapolation of MRLs for Pesticides to Commodity Group (CXG 84-2012)

The Committee endorsed EWG recommendations for Class C and Class D and corresponding representative commodities information provided in Table 7 and Table 8 of CXG 84-2012 for Class C and Class D, respectively. The recommendations were advanced to Step 5/8 for final adoption by CAC44

(2021). The Committee also re-established the EWG, chaired by the United States and co-chaired by the Netherlands, with the following terms of reference:

- (i) Consider the issue of okra and its appropriate representative commodity grouping taking into account monitoring data submitted;
- (ii) Continue to work on edible animal tissues (including edible offal) in collaboration with the Codex Committee on Residues in Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF) EWG on edible animal tissue (see Agenda Item 7e); and
- (iii) Initiate consideration of Class B, Primary Food Commodities of Animal Origin and Class E, Processed Foods of Animal Origin.

Discussion Paper on the Opportunity to Revise the Guidelines on the Use of Mass Spectrometry for the Identification, Confirmation and Quantitative Determination of Pesticide Residues

CCPR51 (2019) established an EWG, co-chaired by Iran and Costa Rica, to consider whether to merge the *Guidelines on the Use of Mass Spectrometry for the Identification, Confirmation and Quantitative Determination of Residues* (CXG 56-2005) and the *Guidelines on Performance Criteria for Methods of Analysis for the Determination of Pesticide Residues in Food and Feed* (CXG 90-2017) into a single guidance document. Iran, as Chair of the EWG, updated the committee on the EWG's progress and indicated that the EWG was unable to complete its terms of reference. The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG to continue its work on the terms of reference established previously by CCPR51:

- (i) To determine if CXG 90-2017 adequately covers mass spectrometry and if so, to propose revocation of CXG 56- 2005.
- (ii) If there are provisions from CXG 56-2005 that could be relevant but not included in CXG 90-2017, to investigate the feasibility of merging the two documents, and:
 - a) if appropriate, to present a proposal for new work, and
 - b) if possible, to present an outline of the merged guidelines for consideration at CCPR53 (2022).

Discussion Paper on the Possible Revision of the IESTI Equations

The Committee originally established an exploratory EWG on IESTI during CCPR48 (2016) to identify advantages and challenges that might arise from the possible revision of the current IESTI equations and the impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals, and trade. CCPR review of the reports of four previous EWGs, all chaired by the EU, are summarized below:

- CCPR49 (2017), following further discussion about the possible review of the IESTI equations, agreed to renew the exploratory EWG to perform further exploratory work and 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.

- CCPR50 (2018) completed a review of the history, background, and use of the IESTI equation, but was unable to complete discussion on the advantages and challenges of the current IESTI equation. The exploratory EWG was renewed to further review this topic and provide information on bulking and blending .
- CCPR51 (2019) was unable to complete its review of the advantages and challenges of the current IESTI equation, pending results from the ongoing FAO/WHO probabilistic benchmarking assessment of the IESTI equations using real-world national residue monitoring and food consumption data. Given that FAO/WHO's assessment is needed to understand the advantages and challenges of the current IESTI equation, the Committee agreed to renew the exploratory EWG to further review the current IESTI equations and collect further information on bulking and blending practices.

At CCPR52, the Committee agreed that the EWG completed its exploratory work to review the parameters of the IESTI equations and characterize the advantages and challenges of the current IESTI approach. The Committee also concluded that the EWG was able to collect information on bulking and blending practices and will provide this information to JMPR to inform discussions on whether the list of commodities for which the exposure calculation is performed according to IESTI Case 3 needs to be revised.

While there was consensus that most of the EWG's work has been completed, there remained divergent viewpoints on FAO/WHO's benchmarking assessment of the current IESTI equations and whether additional exploratory work is warranted. The United States, supported by a number of Codex Members and Observers, indicated that published findings of the FAO/WHO showed that the current equations already provide a high level of protection. The United States further highlighted that the FAO/WHO benchmarking of the IESTI equation culminated in a 2020 publication in the *Journal of Food Control* by Crépet et al., (2021),⁴ which was led by a scientist from the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupation Health and Safety (ANSES) and included consultation with an international group of dietary exposure assessment experts from Canada, Korea, Australia, The Netherlands, the UK, and the United States. Crépet et al., (2021) supported the FAO/WHO findings previously discussed at CCPR51 (2019) and concluded "our results indicate that, with only a few exceptions, most of the CXLs established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission would provide a high level of protection even if risk managers do not request a specific level of protection from risk assessors."

The United States and other delegations (e.g., Australia, Canada, Japan, Kenya, New Zealand, Thailand) supported the conclusion that the current IESTI equations are valid for risk assessment and that no further work is required at this time. In contrast, the EU expressed the view that the findings reported by Crépet et al., were not robust enough for CCPR to make the risk management conclusion that the current IESTI equations are sufficiently protective. The EU therefore supported the renewal of the exploratory EWG to continue work but did not elaborate on the specific terms of reference.

While there were divergent viewpoints on the FAO/WHO benchmarking, there was consensus that the scientific assessment of the FAO/WHO approach was within the remit of JMPR and JMPR guidance and recommendations should be considered before reaching a conclusion. JMPR plans to review the EWG

⁴ Crépet, A., Luong, T. Minh, Baines, J., Boon, P. E, Ennis, J., Kennedy, M., Massarelli, I., Miller, D., Nako, S., Reuss, R., Yoon, H. Jung, & Verger, P. (2021). An international probabilistic risk assessment of acute dietary exposure to pesticide residues in relation to codex maximum residue limits for pesticides in food. *Food control*, 121, doi: 10.1016/j.foodcont.2020.107563. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0956713520304795>

discussion paper and provide its views to CCPR53 (2022) under the agenda of *General Considerations of the JMPR Report*. The Committee agreed to suspend the work of the EWG to await scientific guidance from JMPR to determine if any future exploration of the IESTI equations is needed. (Note: no new work has been approved on this issue; the Committee in the past created EWGs for exploratory purposes.)

Discussion Paper on JMPR Participation in International Parallel Review of a New Compound

Canada, as Chair of the EWG, provided a summary of the EWG's work and highlighted key principles and procedures proposed to facilitate the participation of the JMPR in parallel reviews of a new compound. Based on the proposed principles and procedures, the Committee agreed to develop a pilot project and encouraged sponsors to nominate compounds for the parallel review pilot in coordination with the Chair of the EWG/Priorities and the FAO/WHO JMPR Secretariats for consideration by CCPR53 (2022). The Committee also agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Canada and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Kenya, to "develop a discussion paper outlining the criteria for selecting a global project manager. This project manager would be responsible for overseeing the parallel review in close collaboration with the JMPR Secretariat, JMPR reviewers, national authorities involved in the parallel review as well as the manufacturer of the nominated pesticide."

Discussion Paper on the Development of Guidance for Compounds of Low Public Health Concerns that could be Exempted from the Establishment of CXLs or Do Not Give Rise to Residues

Chile, as Chair of the EWG with Co-Chairs from the United States and India, summarized the EWG's work on the development of guidance for compounds of low public health concerns that could be exempted from the establishment of CXLs. Following discussion, the Committee advanced the guidelines for adoption to Step 5 for interim adoption by CAC44 (2021), circulation for additional comments, and discussion at CCPR53 (2022). The Committee also re-established the EWG, chaired by Chile and co-chaired by United States and India, with the following terms of reference:

- (i) To further develop the Guidelines taking into consideration the written comments submitted and those received during the pre-session working group meeting and plenary sessions.
- (ii) To provide examples of compounds to facilitate the development of the Guidelines. Examples will not remain in the final document, but they could be made available to Codex members on the Codex website.
- (iii) Based on the above considerations, to present a revised proposal with a goal of finalizing the Guidelines at CCPR53 (2022).

Discussion Paper on the Management of Unsupported Compounds without Public Health Concerns

Chile, as co-Chair of the EWG on the management of unsupported compounds without public health concerns, outlined proposals on how to manage unsupported compounds listed in Tables 2A (schedule and priority lists of periodic review) and 2B (periodic review list concerning pesticides that have been evaluated 15 years ago or more, but not yet scheduled or listed) of the *Codex Schedules and Priority List of Pesticides*. The two management options proposed included:

- **Option 2B:** Only those MRLs for which there are registrations listed in the national registration database will be retained and if so, to outline the amendments required in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR to operate this option.

- **Option 3:** Codex members and observers are granted 4 years to fulfill the data requirements to maintain the MRLs (i.e., 4-year rule). If members or observers are unable to address the data requirements, the MRLs will be revoked.

The Committee was unable to reach consensus on which management options to recommend. Codex Members that supported Option 2B highlighted that since this approach allows for the maintenance of CXLs for pesticides that are widely used and have no public health concern, it will facilitate international trade without introducing any additional public health risks to consumers. It also helps to reduce the existing gap between developed and developing countries, many of which may not have the same level of access to newer crop protection tools. Codex Members that supported Option 3 believed the current periodic reviews procedures should be retained to protect the health of consumers as well as enhance the reliability of Codex. They further noted that pesticides with very old CXLs (i.e., > 25 years since last periodic review) were likely to be phased out and were no longer subject to a re-evaluation process in many countries. As such, there may be new information on human health risks that would only be identified during the evaluation process, and JMPR can base its reviews on this updated risk assessment information.

Recognizing the divergent viewpoints, the United States supported efforts to develop a clear process for managing unsupported compounds and determining when CXLs are retained; selecting a management option would require balancing the need to maintain a robust list of CXLs that supports international trade while ensuring that risk assessments are not based on outdated information. Therefore, the United States indicated that MRLs should not be revoked unless clear public health concerns were raised and evaluated by JMPR, and further emphasized that this approach is consistent with previous deliberations by the CAC (CAC39, 2106, REP16/CAC, paragraph 173). Given that Option 3 might result in the loss of CXLs with no impact on public health, the United States indicated that it is necessary for CCPR to (i) further define the scope of the problem; (ii) understand the barriers that limit support; and (iii) propose solutions that might be adopted by CCPR to expand the capacity to generate data required by JMPR on unsupported compounds. The United States further indicated that these considerations need to be fully addressed before Option 3 could be considered by CCPR.

The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Chile and co-chaired by Australia, India, and Kenya, with the following terms of reference:

- (i) To further develop a management proposal for unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review based on Option 2B or 3:
 - a) Option 2B - Only those CXLs for which there are registrations listed in the national registration database (NRD) will be retained and if so, to outline the amendments required in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR to operate this option
 - or
 - b) Option 3 - Codex members and observers are granted 4 years to fulfill the data requirements to maintain the CXLs. (i.e., 4-year rule). If members or observers are unable to address the data requirements, the CXLs will be revoked
- (ii) The proposal should take into consideration the discussion paper, and the written comments submitted and those received during the plenary session.
- (iii) To further develop the recommendations to explore options for efficient data support that

could be addressed by Codex, FAO/WHO, JMPR, governments and the industry to further assist countries in adjusting to and/or implementing either option.

- (iv) Based on the above considerations, to present a management proposal for consideration by CCPR53 (2022).

National Registration Database of Pesticides

Germany, as Chair of the EWG, provided background on the development of the National Registration Database over the last three years and confirmed that the registration database provides members a key data resource that can be used to facilitate support of pesticides during periodic re-evaluation and determine the global registration status of unsupported compounds. CCPR52 supported maintenance of the National Registration Database for three years and agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Germany and co-chaired by Australia, with the following terms of reference:

- (i) Provide an improved National Registration Database with about 20 compounds every year.
- (ii) Compile the data from all respondents.
- (iii) Analyze the compiled data in view of the needs for the establishment of the Codex schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation by JMPR.
- (iv) Report back on the findings to CCPR53 (2022).

Discussion Paper on Monitoring the Purity and Stability of Certified Reference Material of Multi-Class Pesticides during Prolonged Storage

India and Argentina introduced a [discussion paper](#) on monitoring of purity and stability of certified reference material (CRM) of multi-class pesticides during prolonged storage for consideration. The Committee agreed with the discussion paper proposal and recommended that an EWG be established with the following terms of reference:

- (i) The EWG should further develop the discussion paper to consider the need, feasibility and relevance:
 - a) To develop harmonized guidelines/analytical protocol on the monitoring of purity and stability of CRMs of multi-class pesticides during prolonged storage, including intermediate and working standards.
 - b) To develop harmonized criteria for the use of CRMs beyond the expiry date as per certified analysis.
- (ii) Should there be support in the EWG to develop such work, a project document for the new work proposal will be submitted as an annex to the discussion paper for consideration by CCPR53 (2022).

Establishment of Codex Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides

Australia, as Chair of the EWG on Priorities, provided an update on the Codex schedules and priorities and the revised Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides. Key information is summarized below and includes: Confirmation of the 2022 Schedule for JMPR Evaluations and Unsupported Compounds

Designated for Deletion from the CCPR Priority List of Pesticides. Further information on the Priority Lists of Pesticides discussed at CCPR52 can be found [here](#).

Codex Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides – 2022 Schedule for JMPR Evaluations

- **New Compounds:** Six new compounds were confirmed on the proposed schedule, along with five reserve compounds.
- **New Uses and Other Evaluations:** Twenty nominations listed for new use and other evaluations, along with four reserve compounds.
- **Periodic Reviews:** Six compounds listed, along with two reserve compounds.

Codex Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides – Unsupported Compounds Designated for Deletion from the CCPR Pesticide List

The EU highlighted that there are several pesticides for which a public health concern has been identified by JMPR that are not supported by a manufacturer. The EU further noted that revoking the corresponding CXLs for these pesticides will reduce the number of substances for which a periodic review is needed. Therefore, the EU recommended that the Committee revoke CXLs for amitraz PHC (122), bromopropylate PHC (070), fenarimol PHC (192), dicloran PHC (083), bromide ion (047) and fenbutatin oxide. In response to the recommendations, the Committee agreed to revoke MRLs for bromide ion (47), bromopropylate (70), dichloran (83), and fenarimol (192). These compounds are not registered for agricultural use in the United States and do not have any established U.S. tolerances (MRLs) for food or animal feed. The remaining two compounds - amitraz (122) and fenbutatin oxide (109) - were also considered for revocation, but the Committee agreed with the U.S. proposal to retain both compounds and allow a sponsor to be identified by CCPR53 (2022) to support their periodic review.

Codex Schedules and Priority Lists of Pesticides – Conclusion and Re-establishment of the EWG

The Committee agreed to forward the proposed *Schedule and Priority Lists of Pesticides* for evaluation by the 2022 JMPR to CAC44 for approval and to re-establish the EWG on Priorities, chaired by Australia. The EWG will report on proposed schedules and priority lists for consideration at CCPR53 (2022).

Next Session

The 53rd session of CCPR will be hosted by China and is anticipated to be held in April/May 2022, subject to agreement between the host country and the Codex Secretariat on final arrangements.