

**REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATE
TO THE 53RD SESSION OF THE
CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES**

**July 4 – 8, 2022
Virtual**

BACKGROUND SUMMARY

The 53rd Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR53) met virtually July 4 – 8, 2022 with report adoption taking place on July 13, 2022. Dr. Guibiao Ye, Division Director, Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs (ICAMA) of the People’s Republic of China, served for the first time as Chair. The Session was attended by 82 Member countries, one Member organization (the European Union (EU)), and Observers from 16 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 (FSIS), along with additional members of the U.S. Delegation representing the U.S. Codex Office (USCO) and the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) of the USDA; the Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM) and the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN) of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA); Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4); and several non-government advisors.

HIGHLIGHTS

The United States is satisfied with the outcomes of CCPR53 and believes many of its objectives were met. The 53rd Session of CCPR agreed to:

- **Advance 318 Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs)** for final adoption by the 45th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC45), scheduled for November 2022. Three of the five new compounds reviewed by the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) in 2021 were nominated by the United States. New use MRLs for 30 compounds were reviewed by JMPR during its 2021 Extraordinary Meeting (May 2021). USDA/FAS was instrumental in working with the JMPR Secretariat to support this Extraordinary Meeting and help advance MRLs that would have otherwise been delayed.
- **Propose that CAC 45 revoke all Codex MRLs (CXLs) for chlorpyrifos**; however, chlorpyrifos will be maintained on the periodic review schedule for the 2024 JMPR and a sponsor confirmed its commitment to provide the necessary data for periodic evaluation.
- **Retain existing CXLs for several compounds that have been designated as unsupported**, including: amitraz (122), fenbutatin oxide (109), carbaryl (8), 2- phenylphenol (56), dinocap (87), methamidophos (100), bitertanol (144), fenthion (39), and parathion-methyl (59), with the understanding that JMPR advice on these compounds will be requested before CCPR54 (2023)

and that compounds designated as unsupported may be subject to revocation at a future session of CCPR.¹

- **Advance revisions to the *Classification of Food and Feed (CXA 4-1989)*** to CAC45 for final adoption. The revisions include amendments to Class D (Processed Feed Commodities of Plant Origin) related to the addition of certain citrus fruits pulps (dried) and oils (edible) and soya flour. CCPR53 also agreed to re-establish the Electronic Working Group (EWG), chaired by the United States and co-chaired by the Netherlands, with the following Terms of Reference (TOR): (i) continue work on Class B and Class E classifications and representative commodities; (ii) review the portion of the commodity to which the MRLs apply for Group 006 (Assorted tropical and sub-tropical fruits - inedible peel) (as proposed by Ecuador) and Group 023 Oilseeds (as proposed by Australia); and (iii) make recommendations on the possible revocation of the *Guidelines on portion of commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analyzed* (CXG 41-1993).
- **Harmonize with the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF) definition for edible offal.** It also **agreed to the proposed definitions** by the Joint JMPR and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)/World Health Organization (WHO) Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA) Working Group on Residue Definition **for meat, muscle and fat**, including definitions for the portion of the commodity to which MRLs apply and which is analyzed for fat and muscle.
- **Advance the *Guidelines for compounds of low public health concern that may be exempted from the establishment of Codex MRLs or do not give rise to residues*** to CAC45 for final adoption at Step 8.
- Establish an EWG, chaired by the United States and co-chaired by Costa Rica, France, Germany and Uganda, that will **request and summarize information on the need to enhance the operational procedures of CCPR/JMPR and on potential opportunities and challenges.** Information collected by the EWG will help shape future discussions on how to enhance JMPR and its evaluation procedures.

A more detailed meeting summary of some of the key topics from the 53rd Session of CCPR is given below. The final report of CCPR53 will be posted on the Codex Website at <https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings/detail/en/?meeting=CCPR&session=53>.

NEXT SESSION OF CCPR

The 54th Session of CCPR is tentatively scheduled for June 26 – July 1, 2023, in China.

¹ An unsupported compound is a pesticide that is due for re-evaluation (i.e., periodic review) for which neither a Codex Member Country/Observer nor a manufacturer has committed to submit the data required for evaluation by the JMPR.

MEETING SUMMARY

INTERNATIONAL ESTIMATE OF SHORT-TERM INTAKES (IESTI) EQUATIONS
To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? No Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No
United States Objective The United States objective was met since JMPR reaffirmed its 2019 conclusion that the current IESTI equations are sufficiently conservative and ensure a high level of consumer protection. The United States did not believe this exploratory work was necessary from the time it was originally proposed in 2016, since the equations already incorporate highly conservative assumptions, and any potential revisions to the IESTI Equations to make them more conservative would have only resulted in the potential loss of MRLs without additional benefit to consumer health.
Outcome/Conclusion The JMPR Secretariat presented the detailed section on the IESTI equations included in the JMPR 2021 report and confirmed the JMPR 2019 conclusion that the current IESTI equations used as part of JMPR risk assessments are fit for the purpose of ensuring consumer protection and provide confidence that adoption of recommended MRLs is not expected to result in a public health concern. The United States found the scientific evaluation and conclusions of the JMPR satisfactory and agreed that no further work is necessary.
Other Comments The EU expressed disagreement with the conclusion and informed the Committee that further work on the subject would be undertaken within the EU.

MRLS FOR PESTICIDES IN FOOD AND FEED (AT STEPS 7 AND 4)
To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? Yes Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No
United States Objective The United States objective was met as we generally supported the MRL recommendations made during the 2021 JMPR Regular and Extraordinary Meetings.
Outcome/Conclusion The Committee agreed to advance 318 MRLs to the CAC for final adoption (at Step 5/8) at its next session in November 2022. These MRLs are associated with 36 pesticides; 261 of the MRLs are for plant commodities while 57 are for animal commodities. Three of the five new compounds reviewed by JMPR in 2021 were nominated by the United States. Crop Group and Subgroup MRLs accounted for 50 of the 318 MRLs forwarded for final 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 EU, Norway, and Switzerland recorded reservations on 180 of the 318 MRLs recommended by the JMPR; therefore, a large number of MRLs may not have advanced at CCPR53 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. Some of the reservations recorded by the EU, Norway and Switzerland were related to environmental concerns which seems to be a new justification they are applying.

The Committee returned one MRL for metalaxyl to Step 7 for JMPR to await additional information and 43 MRLs to Step 4 for metalaxyl, bifenthrin, and fipronil. The Committee also recommended revocation of 159 previously adopted CXLs associated with 18 pesticides. 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, 28 draft MRLs for five pesticides were withdrawn from further consideration.

The complete lists of the MRL actions recommended by CCPR53 are contained in the appendices to the official Committee report and will be published on <https://www.fao.org/fao-who-codexalimentarius/meetings/detail/en/?meeting=CCPR&session=53> when finalized.

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

To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? Yes

Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes, with the exception of issues related to the establishment of MRLs for okra.

Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No

United States Objective

The revision of the *Classification of Food and Feed* is part of an ongoing effort to revise all the crop groups. The United States, who has chaired/co-chaired this work from the start, has provided much of the documentation for the proposed crop groups and strongly supports this work.

Discussion in Relation to United States' Objectives

Establishment of MRLs for Pesticides for Okra--CCPR52 (2021) requested that the EWG make recommendations on representative commodities from which MRLs for okra could be extrapolated and whether monitoring data could be used to extrapolate MRLs for this commodity. The EWG considered three possible options but was unable to reach consensus prior to CCPR53. The options discussed were: **Option 1:** Include a footnote to the current Subgroup 12B reading: "Only data from chili pepper can be used to set a CXL"; **Option 2:** Create a separate Subgroup 12D Okra with chili pepper as the representative commodity; **Option 3:** Create a separate Subgroup 12D Okra (including martynia and roselle) with okra as the representative commodity.

The United States supported Option 1 going into CCPR53, which was the EWG recommendation in CX/PR 22/53/6 that based on monitoring data provided by Canada and India, chili pepper (non-bell pepper) is the appropriate representative commodity for okra based on the low exceedances for okra and the sufficient conservatism in MRLs derived using the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) MRL calculator to be protective of actual residues in okra.

Outcome/Conclusion

Revisions that will be advanced to the CAC for final adoption include amendments to Class D (Processed Feed Commodities of Plant Origin) classifications related to the inclusion of additional commodities for certain citrus fruits pulps (dried) and oils (edible) and soya flour.

While CCPR53 was unable to reach consensus on an option for okra, CCPR agreed to request advice from JMPR on the three options and to forward all information/data considered by the EWG and all comments submitted to CCPR53 for JMPR consideration. It also agreed to request that members/observers submit any additional monitoring data/other information to JMPR to facilitate the consideration of this matter.

CCPR also agreed to re-establish the EWG on the revision of the Classification, chaired by the United States and co-chaired by the Netherlands, working in English only, to:

- (i) continue working on Class B and Class E of the Classification and prepare tables of representative commodities;
- (ii) consider the proposals on the portion of the commodity to which the MRLs apply, and which is analyzed for Group 006 Assorted tropical and sub-tropical fruits - inedible peel (as proposed by Ecuador) and Group 023 Oilseeds (as proposed by Australia); and
- (iii) review the *Guidelines on portion of commodities to which MRLs apply and which is analyzed* (CXG 41-1993) in comparison to the *Classification of Food and Feed* (CXA 4-1989) and consider revocation of CXG41 to avoid coexistence of the two documents addressing the same provisions. The EWG will consider integrating any provisions from CXG41 into the revised Classification and make a proposal for consideration by CCPR54.

GUIDELINES FOR COMPOUNDS OF LOW PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN THAT MAY BE EXEMPTED FROM THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CODEX MRLS OR DO NOT GIVE RISE TO RESIDUES

To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? Yes
Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes
Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No

United States Objective

The United States objective was to support advancement of the Guidelines to Step 8 for final adoption by CAC45. The United States served as co-chair and supported the work from the beginning because products of low public health concern, such as biopesticides, play an important role in plant protection. There is a concern that if they are not being viewed as "safe" or included as part of the Codex standards, then growers will be reluctant to incorporate these important tools into their farming practices.

Discussion in Relation to United States' Objectives

The guidelines were developed by an EWG chaired by Chile and co-chaired by the United States and India. The EWG was originally established by CCPR50 (2018) to establish harmonized concepts and criteria that can be used to identify pesticides that are of low public health concern and can be considered exempt from the establishment of CXLs. The final guidelines provide harmonized criteria for determining when an active substance or its authorized uses can be considered exempt from the need to establish an MRL. It is anticipated that the guidelines will be used by regulatory authorities that do not have established criteria for MRL exemptions.

Outcome/Conclusion

The Committee agreed to advance the Guidelines to Step 8 of the Codex step process for final adoption by CAC45 (2022).

COORDINATION OF WORK BETWEEN CCPR AND CCRVDF: JOINT CCPR/CCRVDF WORKING GROUP ON COMPOUNDS FOR DUAL USE - STATUS OF WORK
To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? No Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No
United States Objective As chair of the Joint CCRVDF/CCPR EWG, the United States' objective was to share background information on the scope and overall aims of the Joint EWG which is just launching its work.
Discussion in Relation to United States' Objectives The 81 st session of CCEXEC (2021) recommended that CCRVDF and CCPR make use of a joint EWG to advance work on cross-cutting issues and facilitate the establishment of single/harmonized MRLs for edible animal tissues for compounds that are used both as pesticides and as veterinary drugs. The EWG is chaired by the United States and recently requested the first round of comments on the following questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What work has been done cooperatively between CCRVDF and CCPR?2. What are areas where CCRVDF and CCPR could collaborate in the future?3. What mechanisms could be used to collaborate between CCRVDF and CCPR?
Outcome/Conclusion As the work of this Joint EWG is just beginning, the Committee agreed to support its activities and encouraged delegations to actively participate in the work of the Joint EWG.

ENGAGEMENT OF JMPR IN PARALLEL REVIEWS OF NEW COMPOUNDS: CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE GLOBAL PROJECT MANAGER FOR THE PARALLEL REVIEW PROCESS

To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? No
Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes
Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No

United States Objective

The United States objective was to support efforts to enable JMPR participation in parallel/joint reviews of new compounds with national regulatory authorities. The advantage of JMPR's participation in global joint reviews is that it may accelerate the advancement of Codex MRLs and support global harmonization. The process will require the cooperation of reviewers and sponsors to select an appropriate compound for review and to share data. While a compound has not yet been nominated to pilot the parallel review process, the United States hopes one will be nominated in the near future.

Discussion in Relation to United States' Objectives

CCPR50 (2018) initiated exploratory work, chaired by Canada and co-chaired by Costa Rica and Kenya, to develop policies and procedures to enable participation of the JMPR in the international joint review of new compounds. The EWG developed criteria for selecting global project managers as part of the proposed parallel review process. This proposed role will be critical to the success of the parallel review process. The project manager will be responsible for oversight of parallel review process in collaboration with JMPR and reviewers from the national authorities involved in the global review.

Outcome/Conclusion

The Committee agreed to endorse the criteria for selection of a global project manager and to append the criteria for selection of a global project manager to the document "Engagement of JMPR in Parallel Reviews of New Compounds: Procedures and Principles" as an internal document for reference purposes (Appendix X of REP22/PR53).

The Committee further agreed that the EWG on Priorities should continue to call for nominations as the best mechanism for seeking candidate compounds for the pilot project. It also agreed to encourage sponsors to nominate compounds for the parallel review in coordination with the EWG Priorities Chair and the FAO/WHO JMPR Secretariats for consideration by CCPR.

MANAGEMENT OF UNSUPPORTED COMPOUNDS WITHOUT PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERN SCHEDULED FOR PERIODIC REVIEW

To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? No
Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? No
Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? Yes

United States Objective

The United States objective was to build consensus at CCPR and promote the development of a flexible management approach that balances the need for a robust listing of CXLs for global trade while ensuring that the risk assessments are based on the most relevant scientific and agricultural use information.

Discussion in Relation to United States' Objectives

In the CCPR review process, an unsupported compound is a pesticide that is due for re-evaluation (i.e., periodic review) for which neither a Codex Member Country/Observer nor a manufacturer has committed to submit the data required for evaluation by the JMPR. Due to the increase in the number of compounds that qualify for periodic review, CCPR50 (2018) established an EWG, chaired by Chile, and co-chaired by Australia, India and Kenya, to explore management options for unsupported compounds without public health concerns.

Over the last few sessions, the EWG has requested feedback from Codex Members and Observers but the Committee has been at an impasse on a way forward. The EWG most recently made the recommendation to CCPR53 that the EWG be re-established to further refine the management process and seek opportunities to make the process more flexible by exploring ways that CCPR can help support the development of data packages for unsupported compounds.

Outcome/Conclusion

The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG with the following TOR:

- (i) To further develop and refine the management proposal for unsupported compounds without public health concern scheduled for periodic review presented in the Section 1 of Appendix I of Conference Room Document (CRD)09;
- (ii) To further develop the recommendations of Section 2 of Appendix I of CRD 09, to explore further options for efficient data support that could be addressed by Codex, FAO/WHO, JMPR, governments and the industry to assist countries in the preparation of data packages required to conduct periodic reviews;
- (iii) That proposals should take into consideration the information presented in CX/PR 22/53/13, CRD09, written comments, and discussion during the plenary meeting; and
- (iv) Based on the above considerations, to present a proposal for consideration and adoption by CCPR54.

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

To Be Presented for Consideration at Next CAC? Yes

Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes

Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No

United States Objective

The United States actively participated and recommended to the EWG that the two documents were separate and not redundant, and that CXG56 was out of date and could use more detail. The United States suggested that merging the two documents could be beneficial if some of the background information in CXG56 would be included in CXG90.

Discussion in Relation to United States' Objectives

At CCPR50 (2018), Iran presented a proposal for new work on the revision of CXG56 and highlighted the gaps in the *Guidelines* that required addressing. CCPR acknowledged the relevance of the issue and agreed to establish an EWG to examine whether there is a need to revise CXG56 and harmonize with CXG90 and other relevant Codex documents. CCPR51 (2019) considered a proposal for exploring the merging CXG56 and CXG90 into one single document and, if feasible and appropriate, to proceed with the withdrawal of CXG56. At CCPR52 (2021) delegations generally supported revocation of CXG56 and the transfer of relevant provisions to CXG90 if appropriate to avoid duplication. However, since the EWG's full mandate had not been realized, the Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by Iran and co-chaired by India, to complete the TOR and present their findings at CCPR53.

Outcome/Conclusion

Following the discussion from CCPR53, the Committee agreed to recommend revocation of the *Guidelines on the use of mass spectrometry for the identification, confirmation and quantitative determination of pesticide residues* (CXG 56-2005). I also agreed that the *Guidelines on performance criteria of pesticide residues in food and feed* (CXG 90-2017) could be revised in future in light of new developments in science and technology.

MONITORING THE PURITY AND STABILITY OF CERTIFIED REFERENCE MATERIAL OF MULTI-CLASS PESTICIDES DURING PROLONGED STORAGE

To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? No

Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes

Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No

United States Objective

The United States supported the overall purpose of the discussion paper to develop guidance on the monitoring the purity and stability of certified reference material (CRM) of multi-class pesticides during prolonged storage, however some of the criteria were not sufficiently described in the discussion paper. For this reason, the United States supports further revision of the discussion paper for consideration at CCPR54.

Discussion in Relation to United States' Objectives

The EWG, chaired by India and co-chaired by Iran, presented their project document on guidelines for "Monitoring the purity and stability of certified reference materials (CRMs) of pesticides during prolonged storage" to harmonize concepts and to develop criteria to allow CRMs with valid purity and stability to continue to be used analyses of multi-class pesticides, pesticide residues in different food commodities, and environmental (soil, air, water) samples. The EWG recommended that CCPR further develop the guidelines to enable the safe and successful use of CRMs after the expiry date when verification is performed and to determine detailed protocols for re-certifying CRMs. The EWG suggested that the use of expired CRMs with verified purity would have an economic impact by saving the purchasing cost of fresh CRMs, especially by developing countries.

Outcome/Conclusion

The Committee agreed to re-establish the EWG, chaired by India and co-chaired by Iran, to refine the discussion paper by explaining more clearly the rationale for the new work, taking into account comments made at CCPR53 and submitted in writing prior to the session. It also encouraged all members and observers to participate in the EWG, in particular those delegations who had made interventions during CCPR53—China, Japan, Singapore, Egypt and the Institute of Food Technologists (IFT)—to facilitate consideration of and decision-making on this matter at CCPR54.

MITIGATION OF TRADE IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL INHIBITORS IN AGRICULTURE

To Be Presented for Adoption at Next CAC? No
Have the United States’ Objectives Been Met? N/A
Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No

United States Objective

The United States did not have a formal position on the discussion paper on the use of environmental inhibitors in agriculture, but was of the opinion that CCPR may not be the most appropriate forum for this issue.

Discussion in Relation to United States’ Objectives

New Zealand presented the discussion paper highlighting key issues related to the use of environmental inhibitors to mitigate the impact of agriculture on the environment. Environmental inhibitors are compounds applied to crops or pastures or to animals to reduce production of greenhouse gases or reduce nitrate leaching into waterways (e.g., nitrogen and urease inhibitors) and that their regulatory oversight varies from country to country.

The delegate from New Zealand mentioned that these compounds are applied in a very similar manner to pesticides, such as herbicides applied to pasture or herbicides, fungicides, insecticides applied to ground crops. He also indicated that these compounds have a very similar profile to pesticides, such as nitrification and urease inhibitors, and can potentially leave residues in food commodities that are traded internationally which may impact negatively on trade. New Zealand concluded by emphasizing that it is important to have internationally harmonized MRLs for such compounds and that CCPR/JMPR could provide, within their existing mechanisms, a place to consider these compounds when applied to crops to ensure food safety and facilitate trade.

Outcome/Conclusion

The Committee agreed that environmental inhibitors could be addressed on a case-by-case basis within its established procedures as described in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by CCPR and that environmental inhibitors administered directly to animals or via feed could be considered by CCRVDF. The Committee further agreed that in situations of multiple uses (e.g., dual-use compounds) the Joint CCPR/CCRVDF EWG could address these compounds to ensure harmonized approaches and appropriate mechanisms for the establishment of single and harmonized MRLs. Finally, the Committee agree to inform the Executive Committee (CCEXEC) and the CAC that CCPR could consider environmental inhibitors on an *ad hoc* basis without changing the definition of pesticides, its procedures, or its TOR.

ENHANCING OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF JMPR AND CCPR ELIMINATE THE BACKLOG OF EVALUATIONS AND TO MEET THE FUTURE DEMAND OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CXLS

To Be Presented for Approval as New Work at Next CAC? Yes

Have the United States' Objectives Been Met? Yes

Likely to be raised for further discussion at the CAC? No

United States Objective

The United States appreciated the contributions of CropLife International (CLI) in developing a discussion paper on enhancing the operational procedures of JMPR and CCPR. Initially, the United States was concerned that the scope of work may be too broad for an EWG to complete prior to CCPR54 (2023). Therefore, the objective of the United States was to develop a more focused work proposal to present at CCPR53 to set the stage for future work on the enhancement and modernization of JMPR.

Discussion in Relation to United States' Objectives

CLI presented a discussion paper raising concerns that the current evaluation system is unable to keep up with the demand for all three areas of work undertaken by JMPR (i.e., evaluations on new active ingredients, new uses and other evaluations, and the resource-challenged periodic re-evaluations). The discussion paper then highlighted that it will be challenging to improve the existing system to meet current and future demands and recommended a multi-dimensional approach. In particular, CLI recommended that CCPR (i) request JMPR or the scientific panels of FAO and WHO undertake a review of processes and (ii) form an EWG to take on a range of topics related to JMPR's estimated workload, resource needs, and process improvements.

The United States recognized the merit of the proposed work, but also raised concerns about requesting that JMPR undertake a review of its operational procedures while it was currently working to reduce the backlog of evaluations that were delayed due to the global COVID-19 pandemic. In the discussion, the United States highlighted that further deliberation is needed between CCPR Members, Observer organizations, and JMPR. The United States proposed more targeted TORs to initiate discussion on the potential enhancements and to set the stage for future work on the enhancement and modernization of JMPR. These TOR were accepted by all Codex Members and Observers and will serve as the basis for exploratory work by CCPR.

Outcome/Conclusion

The Committee agreed to establish an EWG, chaired by the United States and co-chaired by Costa Rica, France, Germany and Uganda, operating in English and Spanish. The EWG's TOR are:

- (i) Develop a Circular Letter (CL) to request information from Members and Observers on the need to enhance CCPR/JMPR and the associated opportunities and challenges. In addition, the CL may invite Members and Observer organizations to consider a second and possibly subsequent workshops that would expand on and further develop some of the themes addressed in the virtual workshop sponsored by CropLife International on March 31, 2022, as described in CX/PR 22/53/20;
- (ii) On the basis of the responses to the CL, prepare a summary of submitted information and a discussion paper that summarizes findings for consideration at CCPR54 and later transmission to JMPR; and
- (iii) Coordinate work with related EWGs such as the EWGs on priority lists, the national registration database, and unsupported compounds.