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- Incentives for Industry
- JMPR/Codex Process Initiatives
- Capacity Building
- Global Minor Use Foundation
Crop Grouping Efforts

- Two action items from the 2007 Global Minor Use Summit were to:
  - Work to increase the number of Codex maximum residue levels (MRLs) for specialty crops and minor uses.
  - Support Codex in revising Codex Classification of Food and Animal Feeds, including consideration of the concept of representative commodities.
Importance of Crop Grouping to Minor Uses and Specialty Crops

- Revision of the Codex Classification of Animal Foods and Feeds (and selection of representative commodities)
  - Many differences in MRLs result from differences in crop grouping systems and different use of representative crops.
  - Trying to obtain as much global input into the revision as possible.
  - Very important for developing countries—may get MRLs for their crops by simply including them in the classification system.
International Crop Grouping Consulting Committee (ICGCC)

- There are over 200 members, representing 36 countries on the ICGCC.

- The ICGCC Chairperson prepares crop group petitions. (Bill Barney - barney@aesop.rutgers.edu)

- The ICGCC workgroup reviews and comments on the petitions.

- Finalized petitions are submitted to U.S. EPA and Codex Representative for consideration.
Importance of Crop Grouping to Minor Uses and Specialty Crops

- During the 40th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) there was agreement that principles and guidance on the selection of representative crops for the extrapolation of MRLs to commodity groups should be considered by the working group.

- Theory of representative commodity is that residue field trial data generated to support the establishment of a Codex MRL for the representative commodity of the crop group would support the establishment MRLs for all commodities in the group.
Representative Commodities

- Fruiting Vegetable Group 12A:
  Proposed Representative: Tomato

- Residue field trial data on tomato would be used to establish a MRL for all commodities in the group.

- Data on tomato would result in MRLs for 9 additional crops including bush tomato, cherry tomato, cocona, currant tomato, garden huckleberry, goji berry, ground cherries, sunberry, and tomatillo.
Progress in Crop Grouping

- Proposed revisions have been sent to the Codex Electronic Working Group for the following groups:
  - Bulb vegetables
  - Berries and small fruit
  - Edible fungi
  - Fruiting Vegetable (except cucurbits)
  - Oilseeds
  - Citrus fruits
  - Pome fruits
  - Stone fruits
  - Tree Nuts
  - Herbs
  - Spices
Advance by Commodity Types

- CCPR first agreed that revised individual commodity groups should not be adopted until all the revisions had been completed.

- However, during the 42nd Session of the CCPR it was determined that it would be possible to advance some commodity groups of certain "Commodity Types" as they are completed.
Fruit Types - Scheduled for Completion in 2011

- Proposals for tropical and sub-tropical fruits – edible peel and inedible peel are scheduled to be submitted to the Codex Electronic Working Group in the Fall of 2010 for consideration at the 43rd meeting in April, 2011.

- After tropical fruits are proposed later in 2010, it is expected that at the 2011 CCPR meeting the fruit types will be concluded.
Principles and Guidance on the Selection of Representative Crops

- Once all of the fruit types are complete CCPR has agreed to consider advancing the fruit types to Step 8 for adoption.

- The Electronic Working Group will also revise the principles and guidance on the selection of representative crops for the extrapolation of MRLs to commodity groups to address groups for fruit types for consideration during the 43rd Session.
Global Zoning

- Another action item from the 2007 Global Minor Use Summit was to compare residues between regions to support the concept of global zoning.

- A global residue study is ongoing.

- The objective of this study is to test the influence of various geographic locations on pesticide residues in field grown tomato when subjected to standardized application parameters.
Ongoing Global Residue Trial

- Field grown tomato, four active ingredients, 22 countries in 27 locations.
- Uniform application equipment.
- U.S. EPA lab analyzing all residue samples.
Possible Outcomes

- Is it possible to identify global zones for data generation?

- Are there data sharing possibilities between countries in which residue field trial data from a zone in one country may be used to support data requirements for a zone with similar geography and climate in another country?
Incentives for Industry

- Regulatory incentives
  - Reduction in fees
  - Data protection

- Global joint reviews
Global Joint Reviews

- Global Joint Review: several national authorities evaluate a pesticide active ingredient at the same time— they receive the same submission, develop a joint schedule, and divide the work; at the conclusion each makes its own independent regulatory decision with the goal of harmonization of endpoint selection and MRL establishment.

- Industry submits the exact same (single) dossier, in the OECD format to all regulatory authorities.
Completed & Current Joint Reviews (At Least Trilateral)

- Progress to date:
  - Completed: 6
  - In Progress: 6
  - 2010 – 2012: 9 (planned submissions)

- Power of “Global” Process:
  - Chlorantraniliprole: Australia, Canada, Ireland, United Kingdom, U.S., New Zealand
  - Submitted 2007
  - Registered in Joint Review countries 2008
  - Codex MRLs established in 2009
  - Currently registered in over 50 countries
Global Joint Reviews

- Now standard way of doing business for new active ingredients.

- Expansion of countries involved (Brazil, Japan most recently; expect China and possibly Kenya in the near future).

- Inclusion of EFSA (European Food Safety Authority) in global joint reviews.

- Expansion of companies involved (9 currently involved).
JMPR/Codex Process Initiatives

- Streamline of review for priority chemicals
- JMPR review and use of OECD calculator
- Pilot project for new chemical
- Increase capacity for JMPR

- Two active Codex Electronic Working Groups for:
  - Minor Uses and Specialty Crops
  - Revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds co-chaired by the Netherlands and the United States
Codex: Issues and Progress

- In the past concerns were raised that the process for establishing Codex MRLs was:
  - Slow,
  - Abandoned by registrants, and
  - Standards not used by developed countries.

- Nevertheless Codex is:
  - Relied upon by developing countries and
  - Must be involved in international harmonization issues because it is the only truly international forum.
Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR)

- The CCPR has established the Codex Priority List of Pesticides for Review for New Compounds and Periodic Re-evaluations.

- Implementation of Step 5/8 process.

- Development of Concern form.

- At the April, 2010 CCPR Meeting 217 commodity MRLs for 21 pesticides were advanced to step 8. 211 were advanced using step 5/8 process.
Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR)

- Worksharing
  - Extensive use of work sharing established in JMPR as direct result of work sharing being used for joint reviews.
  - Examining the toxicological endpoints selected by governments that have already reviewed a chemical is now an established first step for JMPR.

- MRL Calculator
  - Routinely using NAFTA calculator as a tool.
  - Has resulted in much greater transparency in JMPR MRL recommendations.
  - JMPR will test new "OECD" calculator and has had significant input in its development.
CCPR agreed at the April 2010 meeting to a Pilot Project to explore JMPR recommending MRLs for global joint review chemicals before national governments or regional authorities.

- JMPR will work in parallel with the joint review team.

- Expect to pilot sulfoxaflor at 2011 JMPR.
Increase Capacity for JMPR

- During the April, 2010 CCPR meeting there was some discussion concerning the growing number of requests for establishment of Codex MRLs and lack of capacity of the JMPR to keep up with the requests.

- The growing demand reflects the success in recent years in speeding up the process of MRL establishment in Codex.

- A discussion paper on how to address JMPR resource issues will be written for consideration by the next session of the CCPR.
Capacity Building Efforts

- Another action item from the 2007 Global Minor Use Summit was to put more efforts into capacity building for developing countries to enhance their participation within Codex and ultimately for them to be able to contribute to the MRL standard setting process.

- The United States Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) was asked to help coordinate this effort.
Capacity Building Workshops

Since the Summit, FAS has held 5 capacity building workshops in Africa, Caribbean and Central America and more are planned.

Presentations and outcomes from all the workshops are expected to be posted on the IR-4 Minor Use Portal in the future (http://ir4.rutgers.edu/GMUS/GMUSportal2.htm).

Any suggestions for future capacity building topics or if you would like to provide support by presenting at a workshop please contact Jason Sandahl at Jason.Sandahl@fas.usda.gov
Possible Tool for the Future

- Creation of a Global Minor Use Foundation for Specialty Crops.

- Foundation for specialty crop research on a global scale to develop data for the establishment of MRLs.
Conclusion

- Much progress has been made on international initiatives but there is still work that can be done.

- Relationships built among national and regional authorities make additional progress faster and easier.