

European Union comments on Circular Letter CL 2023/26-PR

Request for comments on the establishment of the schedules and priority lists of pesticides for evaluation / re- evaluation by the joint FAO/WHO expert meetings on pesticide residues (JMPR)

*European Union Competence.
European Union Vote.*

The European Union (EU) would like to thank the Electronic Working Group (eWG) on Priorities chaired by Australia for the preparation of CL 2023/26-PR and its appendices, as well as the work done to incorporate the requests from members and sponsors.

B. FINALISING THE 2024 PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Paragraph 7

The EU notes that although eight compounds have been listed, for several compounds it is not clear whether these will be reviewed in 2024. The EU notes that as the experience from previous years has shown that although there are always several compounds scheduled for a periodic review in that specific year, the review is often postponed or not possible to finish (e.g., ethoxyquin and guazatine) for several reasons for one or more years. Therefore, one option could be to list a certain number of substances e.g., 20 substances for the year 2024 in order to ensure that there will be a stock of substances from which a minimum of five substances¹ for 2025 could be selected for the review, plus already another 5 substances for 2026. In programming more substances at the onset, a continuous flow of periodic reviews will be ensured for the coming years.

In addition, substances with unclear support should get a reserve status in Table 2A (Priority lists of periodic reviews – 2024 & beyond) and Table 2B (Periodic review list (compounds listed under 15-year rule but not yet scheduled or listed)). Those with a reserve status will be re-evaluated once the data will become available or the reserve status should be deleted and the compound should be deleted from the Codex List of pesticides at the latest after 25 years after last evaluation.

The table below, which was presented last year at the CCPR53 shows that from the substances planned for a periodic review in a given year only roughly half get evaluated. This might indicate that old active substances are of less importance for sponsors, contrary to what has been said in the previous discussions under agenda item 13 on enhancement of the operational procedures of CCPR and JMPR:

“Thirdly, we believe the review program is delayed beyond the usual frequency. While not as key to trade enablement as CXLs for new compounds and uses, the periodic review program is an important element in updating standards to compliance with current safety requirements accounting for the

¹ [Report of the 49th session of the Codex Committee on Residues](#)

availability of new data on the compound or risk assessment approaches employed by the JMPR expert panels”².

Year	New compounds		New uses and other evaluations		Periodic reviews		Ratio (new compounds : new uses: periodic reviews) which were evaluated
	Planned (plus reserve)	Evaluated	Planned	Evaluated	Planned (plus reserve)	Evaluated	
2018 ³	7 (+2)	8	20	19	5	2	4:9.5:1
2019 ⁴	7 (+1)	8	14 (+3)/20 *	16/19*	7	4	2:8.75:1
2021 ⁵	6 (+5)	6	30 ⁶	3/30*	6 (+2)	2	2:16.5:1

The EU has signalled a public health concern for the substance phosmet by submitting a concern form for this substance. Consequently, the EU believes that phosmet should be prioritised over other compounds in Table 2A and should be urgently scheduled for a periodic review in 2024.

Paragraph 8

The ongoing retention of unsupported compounds on the CCPR List of Pesticides and maintenance of existing Codex maximum residue limits for pesticides (CXLs) is not a solution to solve the problems with an increasing backlog of substances for periodic review.

Such decisions should be taken along the rules set in the Procedural Manual and considering the work done in the eWG on Unsupported compounds. Decisions should be taken in due course because the first compounds will become outdated due to missing full toxicological re-evaluation after 25 years.

The EU notes that the most urgent compounds are those for which concern forms have been lodged.

As reiterated in previous years, the EU considers that maintaining CXLs that are not supported by submission of toxicology, residue, and other relevant data violates the requirements laid down in the Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues.

² [CCPR 52nd Session, Comments submitted by CropLife . CRD11 page 2](#)

³ [Report of the 49th session of the Codex Committee on Residues, Appendix XIV](#)

⁴ [Report of the 50th session of the Codex Committee on Residues, Appendix XIII](#)

⁵ [Report of the 51st session of the Codex Committee on Residues, Appendix X](#)

⁶ Initial proposal was to evaluate 20 substances and keep 10 in reserve but as the assessments were postponed to 2021, 8 additional substances were taken from the list “2021 new use-other”.

F. PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS

Paragraph 14

The EU has recently sent a public health concern for the substance phosmet. Consequently phosmet should be transferred from Table 2B to Table 2A.

Paragraph 15

The EU is in favour of deleting compounds from the CCPR pesticides list that are no longer supported by a manufacturer and for which a public health concern has been identified. The withdrawal of the corresponding CXLs will reduce the number of substances for which a periodic review is needed. Therefore, Amitraz PHC (122), Bitertanol (144), Carbaryl (8), Dinocap (087), Fenbutatin oxide (109), Fenthion (39), Methamidophos (100) and Terbufos (167) should be removed from the CCPR pesticides list.

General comment on the 2022&23 CCPR Schedule of Evaluations by the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Meetings on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)

The EU notes that at present only three substances and the reserve compound are supported for periodic review in 2022 and 2023. This once again proves that additional substances should be included in the periodic review schedule so that at least minimum of five substances could be assessed.