

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



World Health
Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

Agenda Item 8

CX/PR 18/50/12
March 2018

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

50th Session
Haikou, P.R. China, 9-14 April 2018

DISCUSSION PAPER

DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE REVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL ESTIMATE OF SHORT-TERM INTAKE EQUATIONS (IESTI)

(Prepared by the EWG chaired by the Netherlands and co-chaired by Australia and Uganda)

Remit

1. The 49th Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR49) (2017) agreed to establish an electronic working group (EWG), chaired by the Netherlands and co-chaired by Australia and Uganda with the following Terms of Reference¹ (TOR):

- (i). To provide information on the history, background and use of the IESTI equations.
- (ii). To review and provide illustrative comments on advantages and challenges that arise from the current IESTI equations and their impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals and trade.
- (iii). To gather relevant information on bulking and blending, as well as other information or data as outlined in Table 3 Appendix 2 of CX/PR 17/49/12 in order to feed into the risk assessors work through the JMPR Secretariat.
- (iv). On the basis of the above considerations develop a discussion paper providing recommendations for consideration at CCPR 50.

2. The EWG was joined by 34 countries, the European Union (EU), and 5 observer organisations.² Initially, all documents addressing TOR (i) – (iv) were developed by the Netherlands, Australia and Uganda. Comments provided by the members of the EWG were addressed by the drafting team. Progress on these documents will be discussed below.

Reading guide

3. The current document (initially intended to address TOR (iv)) briefly summarizes the ongoing work on reviewing the IESTI and includes information on related activities outside the EWG. This document was revised based on the comments provided by one organisation. Given the fact that TOR (ii) and (iii) are still in progress, as will be explained below, the current document does not yet provide the discussion as intended by TOR (iv). It does presents the history of the work, the progress on TOR (i) – (iii), a summary of other developments and finally a number of recommendations.

4. In Appendix 1, TOR (i) is addressed by providing information on the history, background and use of the IESTI equations.

5. It was envisaged to address TOR (ii) and (iii) in additional appendices. However, these TOR's could not yet be fully addressed (see Progress of EWG-2). In order to be transparent about the work in progress, the draft documents that were developed by the EWG to address TOR (ii) and (iii) will be distributed as Conference Room Documents (CRDs).

6. At the end of the current document recommendations to the Committee are formulated.

¹ Rep17/PR para. 161

² See Appendix 3 for the list of participants of the EWG

Introduction

7. The issue of reviewing the IESTI equations was first introduced at CCPR48 (2016). The reason being, that JMPR called for an evaluation of the IESTI in its Meetings in 2006³, 2007⁴, and 2010⁵. In response to this the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the Dutch WHO Collaborating Centre on Chemical Food Safety (RIVM⁶) organised a 2-day Scientific Workshop, preceded by a stakeholder meeting, in September 2015 to seek the views of international experts on the IESTI methodology. FAO and WHO co-sponsored this event, which took place in Geneva (for short: the 2015 Geneva workshop).

8. The workshop identified several elements, which could improve the scientific basis for the IESTI equations for further consideration by JMPR. The workshop also made other recommendations related to risk management and risk communication for consideration by CCPR. The report of the 2015 Geneva workshop was published as an EFSA event report in December 2015⁷. An advanced draft of the report was provided to the JMPR 2015 Meeting for its consideration.

9. The JMPR 2015 discussed the draft EFSA event report and recommended that a WHO/FAO working group be established to compare the use of current and proposed equations and to present the outcome to the CCPR in due course.

10. CCPR48 discussed a paper prepared by The Netherlands and Australia on the recommendations from the Geneva Workshop and JMPR 2015.

11. The Committee's discussion indicated general support for the proposal to explore the potential impact of possible changes to the IESTI equations and highlighted the need to clearly define the issues to be addressed, how they had developed and what should be done. Delegations also acknowledged that, after being in place for more than a decade, it was timely for JMPR to review the IESTI procedure and for CCPR to address the need to harmonize approaches for risk assessment, risk management and risk communication⁸.

12. A CCPR EWG (EWG-1) was established by CCPR48 with the following TOR⁹:

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. The recommendations of the international EFSA/RIVM workshop cosponsored by FAO and WHO and the discussions in CCPR48 should be taken into account.

13. A discussion paper addressing this TOR was presented in 2017 to CCPR49 (CX/PR 17/49/12). An in-session working group meeting was held, and the results from this meeting were also presented to the Committee. It was concluded that EWG-1 could not fully accomplish its work because of the divergent views on the need to revise the IESTI equations. However, there was general support to continue the discussion on the review of the IESTI equations. The current CCPR EWG (EWG-2) was then established. Furthermore, the Committee agreed with the following recommendations to FAO/WHO¹⁰:

- (i). To review the basis and the parameters of the IESTI equations;
- (ii). To benchmark the outcomes of IESTI equations to a probabilistic distribution of actual exposures; and
- (iii). To present the outcome to CCPR.

14. Codex members and observers are referred to the discussion paper submitted to CCPR49 (CX/PR 17/49/12) and the CCPR49 Report (REP17/PR, paras. 147 -163) for a full account of background and discussions.

Progress of EWG-2

TOR (i). To provide information on the history, background and use of the IESTI equations.

15. This was addressed by EWG-2 by drafting the document that is presented in Appendix 1. The document is the result of two rounds of input from the EWG-members. In round 1, comments were provided by thirteen countries / organisations. In round 2, comments were provided to the revised document by two countries/organisations.

³ http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/agphome/documents/Pests_Pesticides/JMPR/JMPRrepor2006.pdf

⁴ http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/agphome/documents/Pests_Pesticides/JMPR/Report07/report2007jmpr.pdf

⁵ http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/agphome/documents/Pests_Pesticides/JMPR/Report10/JMPR_2010_contents.pdf

⁶ RIVM is a Dutch acronym for the Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment

⁷ Event Report of the EFSA/RIVM Scientific Workshop, co-sponsored by FAO and WHO, 'Revisiting the International Estimate of Short-Term Intake (IESTI equations) used to estimate the acute exposure to pesticide residues via food', 8/9 September 2015, Geneva, Switzerland.

<http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/907e>

⁸ Rep16/PR par 190/191

⁹ Rep16/PR par 193

¹⁰ Rep17/PR para 147 – 160 discussion; para 161 new ToR, para 162-163 request to FAO/WHO

TOR (ii). To review and provide illustrative comments on advantages and challenges that arise from the current IESTI equations and their impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals and trade

16. The initial document addressing this TOR was reviewed by ten EWG-members in the first round and three members in a second round. It was noted by several members of the EWG that not all issues to be covered by TOR (ii) were fully addressed in the document. However, no further progress could be made on this document by lack of the scientific advice from FAO/WHO mentioned above. It was noted by the EWG that scientific advice from FAO/WHO to CCPR would need to go through JMPR first. Since JMPR meets in September, and JMPR 2017 did not report on a review of the basis and the parameters of the IESTI equations, nor on a benchmark of the outcomes of IESTI equations to a probabilistic distribution of actual exposures, it is anticipated that no results on these issues will be available yet for CCPR to discuss in April 2018.

17. It was therefore suggested by the EWG members that work on TOR (ii) could be continued by re-establishing the EWG, to prepare a discussion paper for further consideration at CCPR51.

TOR (iii). To gather relevant information on bulking and blending, as well as other information or data as outlined in Table 3 Appendix 2 of CX/PR 17/49/12 in order to feed into the risk assessors work through the JMPR Secretariat.

18. This TOR was also addressed by a draft document which was intended as a request for data submission on bulking and blending by the members of the EWG. However, no data were submitted so far. Several EWG members requested more information on the type of data that was called for. Furthermore, it was suggested by several members of the EWG that more extensive data submission could be generated by sending an advanced draft of this document in a Circular Letter (CL) to Codex contact points (CCPs). Also, it was suggested that the document would benefit from further discussion in a physical meeting.

19. The draft documents that were developed by EWG-2 to address TOR (ii) and (iii) will be distributed as Conference Room Documents (CRDs) in order to be transparent about the work in progress.

Other developments

20. On 1 October 2017, at the Third Global Minor Use Summit (GMUS3) in Montreal, Canada, a pre-GMUS3 Meeting on the IESTI Equations and Minor Crops took place. The IESTI meeting identified a broad range of views in regard to the review of the IESTI equation and noted the complexity of the task given the many variables in the equation. The meeting agreed to continue working cooperatively to examine all issues raised and to support the probabilistic assessment of residue monitoring data provided by member countries. Meeting participants agreed that case studies such as those possible from the probabilistic assessment of existing compounds and uses would inform future discussion.

21. Furthermore, a series of four papers on the impact of possible changes to the IESTI as proposed at the 2015 Geneva Workshop¹¹ was prepared by an *ad hoc* working group¹² consisting of scientists from the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES), the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA), the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR), the United Kingdom Health and Safety Executive Chemicals Regulation Division (CRD), the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), and the Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). These papers, along with two papers on the quantitative uncertainty of the estimated short-term intake by scientists from the Hungarian National Food Chain Safety Office, will be published in a special issue of the Journal of Environmental Science and Health in June 2018¹³. Preliminary results of these studies were already presented at a side-event at CCPR 2016. It is expected that this special issue of the Journal of Environmental Science and Health will inform further discussions by JMPR in 2018 and by CCPR.

Recommendations

22. The Committee is invited to consider the recommendations below.

23. It is proposed that the Committee establish an in-session WG to meet in the margins of the plenary meeting to discuss the recommendations in order to facilitate their consideration by CCPR.

¹¹ The Geneva 2015 workshop recommended replacing the current IESTI equations (see Appendix 1) by the following:
New IESTI equation replacing case 1 and case 3 of the current IESTI equation:

$$IESTI = LP_{bw} \times MRL \times CF \times PF$$

New IESTI equation replacing case 2a and case 2b of the current IESTI equation:

$$IESTI = LP_{bw} \times MRL \times v \times CF \times PF$$

¹² Under the umbrella of the WHO Collaborating Centre on Chemical Food Safety at RIVM, The Netherlands.

¹³ The online version of the special issue may already be available by end of March.

24. Furthermore, in order to assist the Committee in considering recommendations related to TOR (ii) and (iii), Conference Rooms Documents will be made available in advance to the plenary meeting (see paragraphs 5 and 19 above).

Recommendation 1: TOR (i)

It is **recommended** that CCPR agree on the document on history, background and use of the IESTI equations (Appendix 1) in order to fulfil TOR (i).

Recommendation 2: TOR (ii)

It is **recommended** to further develop the document that provide a review and illustrative comments on advantages and challenges that arise from the current IESTI equations and their impact on risk management, risk communication, consumer protection goals and trade once FAO/WHO provide a review on the basis and the parameters of the IESTI equations, and a benchmark of the outcomes of the IESTI equations to a probabilistic distribution of actual exposures.

Recommendation 3: TOR (iii)

It is **recommended** to further develop the document to gather data on bulking and blending, as well as other information or data as outlined in Table 3 Appendix 2 of CX/PR 17/49/12 that can be distributed by means of a circular letter to Codex members and observers to ensure wide participation in data gathering.

Recommendation 4: TOR (iv)

Furthermore, it is proposed to re-establish the EWG 1) to continue work on the issues covered by the current EWG TOR (ii) and (iii), 2) to interact with the JMPR Secretariat on the expected scientific advice and 3) to prepare the discussion paper for consideration at CCPR51 (2019), taking into account the possible report by JMPR 2018 on the review of the IESTI.

Appendix 1: History, background and use of the IESTI equations (TOR (i))

Introduction

1. This document was drafted in response to a request from CCPR49 (Rep17/PR par 161) to provide information on the history, background and use of the IESTI equations.

History

2. The MRL is the maximum concentration of a pesticide residue (expressed as mg/kg) to be legally permitted in or on food commodities and animal feeds. MRLs are based on Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) data and foods derived from commodities that comply with the respective MRLs are intended to be toxicologically acceptable (CAC, 2016).

3. Initially, the toxicological acceptability of the MRL was determined by estimating a life-time exposure to the residue and comparing this with the Acceptable Daily Intake (ADI). However, in the early 1990s, it became apparent that, in some cases, residues of a chemical could pose risks due to a single or a few days of exposure. Research on residues of acutely toxic pesticides (organophosphates and carbamates) in individual fruits and vegetables revealed random occurrences of comparatively high residue levels. Some individuals who consume significant amounts of such foods will occasionally eat the “hot” commodity unit (Hamey and Harris, 1999; Harris, 2000).

4. At an international level, a deterministic methodology was developed to address the calculation of the acute, or short-term, dietary exposure to pesticides, the International Estimate of Short-Term Intake (IESTI) of the pesticide residue (for a chronological history of the acute RA methodology see Hamilton & Crossley, 2004; WHO, 2009). In characterizing any risks possibly related to the short-term pesticide dietary exposure, the calculated intake, i.e. the IESTI, is thereafter compared with the established toxicological threshold for acute toxicity (Acute Reference Dose-ARfD) of the chemical (EFSA, 2007). The current IESTI equations as used by JMPR are available at the WHO GEMS-Food website¹⁴. Acute dietary exposure assessments may be also be performed using distributional (probabilistic) methodologies. Currently, JMPR is not using those.

5. At its 1999 meeting (JMPR, 1999), JMPR performed acute dietary exposure assessments for the first time. For pesticides with low acute toxicity, JMPR concluded that “an ARfD is unnecessary” and that assessing the acute exposure is irrelevant. For all other substances, when sufficient data are available, an ARfD is established and compared to the IESTI. In the IESTI method, the estimates are performed for each crop separately; as it is considered that it would be unlikely that an individual will consume, within a meal or 24 h, two large portions (LP) of different commodities that contain the same pesticide at the highest residue level. This methodology has been further refined by subsequent JMPR meetings. The equations as currently used by JMPR are shown later in this document¹⁵. It is important to note that the IESTI equations are designed for prospective dietary risk assessment in the framework of MRL setting, using residue data derived from supervised field trials conducted at the critical GAP (cGAP). Hence, the equations were not designed for calculating the actual exposure of a given population (retrospective dietary risk assessment), which depends on monitoring data. The Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) concluded that foods derived from commodities that comply with the respective MRLs are intended to be toxicologically acceptable and that where the IESTI exceeds the ARfD for a pesticide/food combination, the JMPR report should describe the particular situation that gives rise to that acute intake concern. The JMPR shall indicate the possibilities to refine the IESTI. As long as JMPR notes an ARfD exceedance, the MRLs are not advanced to a higher Step of the Codex Procedure¹⁶.

Use of the equations

6. Briefly, the steps taken for the MRL-setting and the role of IESTI in the process, are described below and visualized in Figure 1 (FAO, 2006 FAO 2016b):

1. First, residue definitions suitable for enforcement and for risk assessment need to be determined. This requires the examination of many studies: chemical properties such as isomer composition, hydrolysis and photolysis; metabolism in laboratory animals, livestock and crops; methods of analysis; and toxicity of metabolites.

¹⁴ http://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/chemical-risks/gems-food/en/

¹⁵ First two paragraphs adapted from ‘Principles and methods for the risk assessment of chemicals in food’, EHC 240, 2009, Chapter 6

¹⁶ Risk Analysis Principles applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, Section IV

2. The central part of the whole process is evaluating the available supervised trials data to produce MRLs suitable for Codex adoption and STMR and HR values suitable for use in risk assessments. Many factors affecting residue levels must be considered – application rate, number of applications, formulation and timing and pre-harvest interval.
3. The critical GAP (Good Agricultural Practice), which is the use of the pesticide that will result in the highest residues in supervised trials, is determined. This is based on authorized uses as indicated on approved labels. In the end, the MRL should cover the critical GAP.
4. The results from the selected trials will be used for the proposal of an MRL, using the OECD calculator. This results in MRLs either equal to or higher than the highest residue ((HR¹⁷). It is noted that the HR is used in the IESTI equations because 1) the HR relates to the edible portion, and 2) the HR relates to the total residue of toxicological concern (including metabolites and/or degradates).
5. The IESTI equations (see page 12) are used in order to estimate the short-term dietary intake, resulting from the cGAP.
6. The calculated short-term intake is compared with the toxicological threshold (ARfD). If the IESTI is lower than ARfD, the MRL is considered acceptable. If the IESTI is higher than the ARfD, the MRL proposal is usually rejected by CCPR, and the cGAP will not be covered by the MRL. In such cases, an MRL might be set for other uses of the pesticides (e.g. lower doses, longer preharvest interval (PHI), lower application rate, different timing), which may result in lower residue levels, and consequently, in an IESTI lower than the ARfD. Please note that procedurally, JMPR proposes all MRLs it derives to CCPR, even if the IESTI exceeds the ARfD. However, a note indicating that the ARfD is exceeded accompanies such a proposal. It is up to CCPR to decide¹⁶ on the acceptability of the MRL proposals.
7. Once an MRL is established, the labeled use pattern is a critical component of the process to ensure food safety in international trade.

7. It is recommended to refer to the FAO Training Manual (FAO 2016b) for a more detailed description of the evaluation process. In the Training Manual, ample examples and exercises are included.




Figure 1: JMPR evaluation of residue data and recommendation of MRLs (adapted from FAO, 2006).

¹⁷ For the residue definition see details in the next Chapter.

8. The MRLs are calculated with the OECD MRL calculator (OECD, 2011). Codex members which use Codex MRLs, implicitly use the IESTI equations. In Australia and the EU, the IESTI equations are used to estimate the short term dietary intake from pesticides for both authorisation of use and MRL setting. Furthermore, in the EU it is also used by food safety inspection services for risk assessment, when a batch is found to contain a residue level that exceeds the MRL¹⁸. In this case, the IESTI is used to decide whether a recall is needed, and whether the other EU member states need to be alerted.

9. Although the same IESTI equations are used, the input parameters (residues, variability factors, unit weights, large portions) differ among international bodies (JMPR, EFSA) and individual countries. Because of differences in these input parameters, the outcome of acute risk assessments may differ for a single crop-pesticide combination in different parts of the world. A current distinction is that JMPR uses variability factors of 1 or 3, but that EU also uses 5, and 7 resulting in an increased exposure estimate for some commodities.

Further background on the International Estimate of Short-Term Intake (IESTI)

IESTI parameter definitions

10. In this section the concept developed for calculating the IESTI is described. The IESTI is designed to assess dietary intake on the basis of the residue definition for dietary intake. All users of the IESTI apply the following definitions:

bw	Mean body weight (in kg), provided by the country from which the LP was reported. The bodyweight represents the mean body weight of the population group of the dietary survey from which the LP was derived (e.g. general population, adults, children).
HR	Highest residue in composite sample of edible portion found in the supervised trials performed according to GAP used for estimating the maximum residue level (in mg/kg). A composite sample is a sample that is composed of multiple units of the same commodity
HR-P	Highest residue in a processed ¹⁹ commodity, calculated by multiplying the highest residue in the raw commodity by a processing factor (in mg/kg).
LP_{person}	Highest large portion reported (in principle the 97.5th percentile of consumers only), in kg of food per person per day.
STMR	Supervised trials median residue in the edible portion of a food commodity (in mg/kg), derived from the same set of supervised field trials (composite samples) as the HR.
STMR-P	Supervised trials median residue in processed commodity calculated by multiplying the STMR in the raw commodity by a processing factor (in mg/kg).
U_e	Unit weight of the edible portion (in kg), usually provided by the country that provided the LP.
U_{RAC}	Unit weight of the raw agricultural commodity (RAC), in kg, usually provided by the country that provided the LP.
v	Variability factor, the factor applied to the composite residue to estimate the residue level in a high-residue unit.

The parameter definitions are described in more detail below.

Residue definition, HR, STMR

11. A pesticide residue is defined as the combination of the pesticide and its relevant metabolites, derivatives and related compounds to which the MRL, HR (highest residue in field trials) or STMR (Supervised Trials Median Residue) apply. In some instances two residue definitions are needed for one compound, one for enforcement and one for the dietary risk assessment. The residue definition for enforcement needs to be simple to allow practical routine monitoring and testing of food products for compliance with MRLs. Therefore, it is preferable not to include metabolites, if they are present as only a minor part of the residues, or if their analysis is cumbersome and expensive. The MRL historically was derived from the HR. Currently, it is derived from the mean residue or the HR using the OECD MRL calculator which takes into account a margin to cover statistical uncertainties. The OECD MRL calculator practically relies on the distribution including the mean, the HR and the statistical spread in the data to recommend an MRL. There are three algorithms options: the mean plus 4 standard deviations or 3 times the mean, or rounding from the HR. However, rounding from the HR is rarely the driver in practical implementation. The uncertainties in these values are mainly associated with the residue dataset available.

¹⁸ Codex MRLs are implemented in EU legislation and as such become EU MRLs, unless a reservation was made during the discussion at CCPR. EU Inspections relate to EU MRLs.

¹⁹ 'Processing' can either relate to removing inedible parts of a commodity, e.g. peeling a banana, or to further (industrial or household) preparation, e.g. milling of grain, cooking of spinach.

The minimum data requirements vary from usually three to four trials for minor or specialty crops²⁰ to a minimum of eight trials for major crops. Consequently, when only limited residue data are available or if there is a large spread in the data set, the resulting MRL recommendations can be substantially higher than the HR and the STMR. The residue definition for dietary intake purposes should include metabolites and degradation products, which significantly contribute to the toxicological burden of the parent irrespective of their source (FAO, 2016; WHO, 2009).




Figure 1 MRLs are derived using the OECD MRL calculator which relies on residue field trial data performed at the critical GAP (Figure taken from Crop Life International, presented in CCPR48, 2016).

12. In the IESTI calculation, the **highest residue (HR)** and the **Supervised Trials Median Residue (STMR)** are used as an input into the equations within the spreadsheets, and they refer to the residue as defined by the residue definition for dietary risk assessment present in the raw edible portion of the crop. In the absence of a HR or STMR for the raw edible portion, the HR or STMR of the Raw Agricultural Commodity (RAC) is used in the dietary risk assessment, typically adding conservatism. This situation is mostly encountered for commodities with an inedible peel, like banana and orange. The HR and STMR are estimated from supervised trials that have been conducted according to the critical GAP (see above).

Processing factor (HR-P, STMR-P)

13. The HR or STMR, derived from supervised trials performed in accordance to the critical GAP, are mostly based on the edible part of the raw commodity. However, some of the commodities may undergo processing prior to consumption. Processing can either relate to removing inedible parts of a commodity, e.g. peeling a banana, or to further (industrial or household) preparation, e.g. milling of grain, cooking of spinach. Adjustment to the residue in the food as consumed can be accomplished by using a peeling factor or processing factor (PF). A PF may be added to the IESTI equation to predict the residue in the raw edible portion or specified processed commodity if only data for the raw agricultural commodity are available. The processing factor is experimentally determined from processing studies. The IESTI calculations can be performed separately to estimate dietary exposure from consumption of the unprocessed or processed form of a food commodity, when relevant.

14. In the present situation, JMPR generally uses the residues as measured in the raw edible portions to estimate STMR and HR, instead of calculating the residue in the edible portion by applying a processing factor to the residue in the RAC.

The Large Portion (LP_{person})

15. The IESTI equation includes the large portion (LP) which is represented by the highest 97.5th percentile of consumption for a particular commodity selected from all available national dietary surveys.²¹ The large portion may be derived for the general population, which includes all relevant groups like toddlers/young children, women of childbearing age and adults. In addition, countries may derive separate LPs for specific age groups, and for example, vegetarians. The LP can be updated when new food consumption data become available.

²⁰ In the "Guidance to facilitate the establishment of MRLs for Pesticides for Minor Crops" crops for which consumption is below the threshold of 0.5% worldwide consumption, are divided in three categories. Depending on the category, the minimum number of trials are decided on a case-by-case basis (category 1) to up to 5 trials (category 3) (CX/PR15, Appendix XI).

²¹ Please note that the highest LP does not necessarily lead to the highest exposure (expressed as percentage of the ARfD), because the unit weights need to be taken into account. Different unit weights were reported for different countries. Therefore the selection of the most critical LP is based on IESTI calculations for each survey of a country, combining the LP with the U of that country.

16. At national level, the 97.5th percentiles (LP) are calculated by identifying all the days of consumption for each commodity under consideration. If the national survey is based on more than one day per subject, each day is considered independent even for the same consumer. This results in a distribution of “n” days of consumption (or consumer*day) values for which the 97.5th percentile of the distribution can be estimated.

17. At international level all national LPs are collected together with the associated number of consumer*days “n”. For each of the commodities, the most critical national LP is selected and used in the JMPR calculations. Since the highest LP *U value is chosen from among the considered countries, the equation will necessarily protect more than 97.5 percent of the total population since the parameters of the worst case country were selected.

18. The reliability of high percentiles is related to the number of observations used to calculate them. Percentiles calculated on a limited number of days of consumption should be treated with caution as the results may not be statistically robust. The Global Environmental Monitoring System (GEMS) Food Programme is regularly collects new available national food consumption data. Since 2011 the number of consumer*day n associated with the 97.5th percentile is also collected and available. In the IESTI equation the highest or most critical LP is considered. The LP should be regularly updated when new data become available. Updates are conducted as a result of a call for data from WHO or at any time that a country submits its new large portion data to WHO. It is noted that the GEMS-Food database relies strongly on the quality of the input data from the Codex member states. For quality purposes, some reliability checks are performed before the large portions are entered in the JMPR IESTI model.

The variability factor (v)

19. The concept of a variability factor was introduced to take into account the different concentrations of residues in individual units of a composite sample and the average residue concentration in the sample lot represented by the composite sample. The variability factor (v) was defined as the 97.5th percentile of the residue concentrations present in commodity units (RAC) divided by the mean residue concentration of the sample population: P97.5 residue in units / mean residue in units (Ambrus *et al.*, 2014; FAO, 2016).

IESTI Equations

20. Four different cases are distinguished for the calculations of the acute dietary exposure, depending on the unit weight of the RAC (U), the ratio of the food large portion (LP) to unit weight, and on whether or not the food product is blended. The four different equations are presented below.

Case 1

The residue in a *composite sample* (raw or processed) reflects the residue level in a portion of the commodity that would be consumed at one meal (whole fruit or vegetable unit weight (expressed as RAC) is below 25 g). Case 1 also applies to meat, liver, kidney, edible offal and eggs. For grains, oilseed and pulses commodities it applies when the estimates were based on post-harvest use of the pesticide, and hence, the residue is more homogeneously distributed.

$$\text{IESTI} = \frac{\text{LP}_{\text{person}} \times (\text{HR or HR} - \text{P})}{\text{bw}} \text{ in mg/kg bw}$$

Examples: dried fruits, berries and other small fruits, meat products.

Case 2

The one meal portion, such as a *single fruit or vegetable unit*, might have a higher residue than the composite (whole fruit or vegetable unit weight (expressed as RAC) is equal or above 25 g).

Case 2a

The unit weight of the edible portion (U_e) of the individual commodity is higher (or equal) than 25 g and lower than the large portion weight, i.e. a large portion contains more than one food item.

Example: a single pear (individual commodity) weighs more than 25 g, but a large portion of pears (e.g. 100 g) consists of 4 (more than one) pears.

$$\text{IESTI} = \frac{\{U_e \times (\text{HR or HR} - \text{P}) \times v\} + \{(\text{LP}_{\text{person}} - U_e) \times (\text{HR or HR} - \text{P})\}}{\text{bw}} \text{ in mg/kg bw}$$

The Case 2a formula is based on the assumption that the first unit contains residues at the [HR × v] level and the next ones contain residues at the HR level, which represents the residue in the composite from the same lot as the first one.

Case 2b

The unit weight (edible portion) of the individual commodity is higher (or equal) than 25 g, and also higher than the large portion weight. In other words, the large portion contains less than one whole food item.

Example: a single cabbage (individual commodity) may weigh around 1000 g (more than 25 g), but a large portion of cabbage can be much less, e.g. 150 g, and hence it consists of less than one cabbage.

$$\text{IESTI} = \frac{\text{LP}_{\text{person}} \times (\text{HR or HR} - \text{P}) \times \nu}{\text{bw}}$$

The Case 2b formula is based on the assumption that there is only one consumed unit and it contains residues at the $[\text{HR} \times \nu]$ level.

Case 3

Case 3 is for those *processed commodities* where, because of *bulking or blending*, the STMR-P represents the likely highest residue. Case 3 also applies to milk and to grains, oilseeds and pulses for which the estimates were based on pre-harvest use of the pesticide.

Examples: pre-harvestly treated cereal grains, flour, pulses, vegetable oils, fruit juices processed industrially

$$\text{IESTI} = \frac{\text{LP}_{\text{person}} \times (\text{STMR or STMR} - \text{P})}{\text{bw}} \text{ in mg/kg bw}$$

Residues below the LOQ

21. Sometimes residue field trials at cGAP report residues in the raw agricultural commodity at or below the LOQ for all samples. This may represent a zero-residue situation or a situation where residues are present but below the LOQ ($\leq \text{LOQ}$) and thus cannot be quantified. In such a situation it is unclear what the input in the IESTI equation should be: zero or the value of the LOQ.

22. The zero-residue situation is the situation where no residues are expected even if higher doses or shorter Pre-Harvest Intervals²² (PHI) are applied. If other crop field trials at higher doses or shorter PHI show residues above LOQ or metabolism studies indicate the possibility of residues at higher doses the zero-residue situation is not confirmed. A zero-residue situation could originate from the type of application (e.g. herbicide treatment below trees, seed treatment) or the timing of application (early in the growth season before the harvestable part of the crop has formed) or because degradation is very rapid and no relevant residues are found at any time.

23. The JMPR approach²³ in these situations is:

- a) For the situation where residues are found below LOQ, but the zero-residue situation is not confirmed at higher doses or lower PHI or in metabolism studies (situation a), the MRL is set at the LOQ and the dietary risk assessment is performed with STMR and $\text{HR} = \text{LOQ}$ ²⁴.
- b) For the situation where residues are found below LOQ and the zero-residue situation is confirmed at higher doses or lower PHI or in metabolism studies (situation b), the MRL is also set at the LOQ, but the dietary risk assessment is performed with STMR and $\text{HR} = 0$.

At present, it is very often unclear whether an MRL at the LOQ relates to a zero-residue situation.

Residues in animal commodities

24. Residues in feed may lead to detectable residues in animal tissues, milk and eggs, necessitating MRLs for those commodities. The residues that may arise in animal commodities are estimated based on the combined information from dietary burden calculations and livestock feeding studies (OECD No 73, 2013).

25. The estimation of the STMR (or median residue) in animal commodities is based on the mean livestock dietary burden and a feeding study. The mean livestock dietary burden is calculated based on the median residues in all feed items. The residue in tissues, milk and eggs corresponding to the mean livestock dietary burden is interpolated either manually from the two closest dose levels in the feeding study (including zero dose) or statistically based on linear regression using all dose levels in the feeding study, or a transfer factor can be used. The average residue level per dose level is taken from the feeding studies to estimate the STMR in muscle, fat, liver, kidney, milk and eggs.

²² PHI: the pre-harvest interval is the number of days between the last application of a pesticide and harvest of the crop

²³ Regional approaches (e.g. EU) may differ

²⁴ If residues can be confirmed to be at levels equal to or less than the limit of detection, US-EPA would generally use that as the benchmark, not the LOQ. The EU uses the LOQ even when a no-residue situation is confirmed.

26. The estimation of the HR (or highest residue) in animal commodities is based on the maximum livestock dietary burden and a feeding study. The maximum livestock dietary burden is calculated based on the highest residues in individual feed items, although median residues in feed items are used in case of bulking/blending (e.g. pre-harvest treated seeds, grains) and or processed commodities (e.g. fruit pomace). The residue in tissues, milk and eggs corresponding to the maximum livestock dietary burden is interpolated either manually from the two closest dose levels in the feeding study (including zero dose) or statistically based on linear regression using all dose levels in the feeding study, or a transfer factor can be used. The highest residue level per dose level is taken from the feeding studies to estimate the HR in muscle, fat, liver, kidney, and eggs.

27. The estimation of the MRL in animal commodities is based on the HR, derived as above. In case the residue definition for animal commodities for enforcement and dietary risk assessment is the same, the MRL can be derived from the highest residue for tissues and eggs and the mean residue for milk (both based on the maximum livestock dietary burden). It is noted that if the residue definition is different for enforcement and dietary risk assessment, a highest residue for tissues and eggs and a mean residue for milk (both based on the maximum livestock dietary burden) need to be derived according to each of the definitions.. Please refer to FAO2016a for further explanation.

28. The OECD MRL calculator (2011) is not used in estimating the MRL in animal commodities, since residues obtained in a feeding study generally are not used directly but are used to interpolate the residue at the maximum livestock dietary burden. The Codex MRL for animal commodities is based on rounding up of the highest residue to the nearest figure (e.g. 0.63 becomes 0.7). This policy is the same as used in the OECD MRL calculator: 0.01-0.015-0.02-0.03-0.04-0.05-0.06-0.07-0.08-0.09-0.1 etc. MRLs for milk are based on whole milk, even if the pesticide in question is fat soluble and MRLs for milk are derived by rounding up the STMR to the nearest figure. The Codex MRL for meat is based on muscle residues in case of non-fat soluble pesticides and based on fat residues in case of fat soluble pesticides. This approach is also applied by Australia and the USA. At EU level the MRL setting policy for meat has been changed recently: MRLs will be set for muscle and for fat.

29. The HR and STMR derived as above can now be used in the IESTI equation. The HR (fat) and HR (muscle) are used to estimate dietary exposure from meat by assuming 80% of the meat consumption is actually meat muscle consumption and 20% of the meat consumption is meat fat consumption (90% muscle, 10% fat in case of poultry meat).

30. Currently, the IESTI for milk is estimated using case 3 equations (STMR), while the IESTI for all other animal commodities is estimated using case 1 equations (HR). The STMR and HR are based on the residue definition for dietary risk assessment (for animal commodities). In both equations the variability factor is not used (or $v = 1$).

References

- Ambrus Á, Horváth Zs, Farkas Zs, Szabó I, Dorogházi E, Szeitzné-Szabó M. Nature of the field-to-field distribution of pesticide residues, 2014. *Journal of Environmental Science and Health*, 49, 4, 229-244.
- Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC), 2005. CX/PR 05/37/4. Discussion paper of the Thirty-Seventh Session of the Codex Committee On Pesticide Residues, The Hague, The Netherlands, 18-23 April 2005, on probabilistic modelling: MRLs: Health or trade limits? ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/meetings/CCPR/CCPR37/pr37_04e.pdf
- Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR), 2005. ALINORM 05/28/24. Report of the Thirty-Seventh Session Of The Codex Committee On Pesticide Residues, The Hague, The Netherlands, 18-23 April 2005. Agenda Item 6: Discussion Paper On Probabilistic Modelling: MRLs Health Or Trade Limits? www.fao.org/input/download/report/641/al28_24e.pdf
- Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR), 2006. ALINORM 06/29/24. Report of the Thirty-eighth session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues, Fortaleza, Brazil, 3-8 April 2006. ftp://ftp.fao.org/codex/Circular_Letters/CxCL2006/cl06_09e.pdf
- Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC), 2016. Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. Procedural Manual 25th edition. <http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/f53ef3d5-b31a-4dc3-a67a-4264186ddf1f/>
- Crop Life International, 2016. Perspectives on Proposed Changes to IESTI. Powerpoint presentation, Cheryl Cleveland, Ph.D., on behalf of Crop Life International Delegation. Presented April 2016 in CCPR.
- EFSA PPR Panel (EFSA Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues), 2005 Opinion of the scientific panel on plant health, plant protection products and their residues on a request from commission related to the appropriate variability factor(s) to be used for dietary exposure assessment of pesticide residues in fruit and vegetables. *The EFSA Journal*, 177: 1-61. <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/177.htm>
- EFSA PPR Panel (EFSA Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues), 2007. Opinion of the scientific panel on plant protection products and their residues on a request from the Commission on acute dietary intake assessment of pesticide residues in fruit and vegetables, adopted on 19 April 2007. <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/scdocs/scdoc/538.htm>
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 2006. Updating the Principles and Methods of Risk Assessment: MRLs for Pesticides and Veterinary Drugs. Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. ftp://ftp.fao.org/ag/agn/jecfa/bilthoven_2005.pdf
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 2016a. FAO manual on the submission and evaluation of pesticide residues data for the estimation of maximum residue levels in food and feed. 3rd ed. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 225,, Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5452e.pdf>
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 2016b. Evaluation of pesticide residues for estimation of maximum residue levels and calculation of dietary intake. Training Manual. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 224, Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5454e.pdf>
- Hamey PY, Harris CA, 1999. The variation of pesticide residues in fruits and vegetables and the associated assessment of risk. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*. Oct;30(2 Pt 2):S34-41.
- Hamilton DJ, Ambrus A, Dieterle RM, Felsot A, Harris C, Petersen B, Racke K, Wong S-S, Gonzalez R and Tanaka K, 2004. Pesticide residues in food – acute dietary intake. *Pest Management Science*, 60: 311-339.
- Hamilton DJ and Crossley S eds, 2004. Pesticide residues in food and drinking water: Human exposure and risks. John Wiley & Sons (Wiley Series in Agrochemicals and Plant Protection).
- Harris, C. (2000) How the variability issue was uncovered: the history of the UK residue variability findings. *Food Additives and Contaminants* 17 (7) 491-495.
- Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR), 1999. Progress on acute dietary intake estimation – International Estimate of Short Term Intake (IESTI). *In: Pesticide residues in food 1999. Report of the Joint Meeting of the FAO panel of Experts on Pesticide Residues in Food and the Environment and the WHO Core Assessment Group on Pesticide Residues*, Rome, Italy, 20-29 September 1999. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper: 10-11
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2011. OECD MRL Calculator: Statistical White Paper. Series on Pesticides No. 57. ENV/JM/MONO(2011)3.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), 2013. Guidance Document On Residues In Livestock, Series on Pesticides No. 73, ENV/JM/MONO(2013)8
- World Health Organization (WHO), 2009. EHC 240, Principles and methods for the risk assessment of chemicals in food, Chapter 6: Dietary exposure assessment of chemicals in food. http://www.inchem.org/documents/ehc/ehc/ehc240_index.htm

Appendix 2: List of Participants of the EWG

CHAIR:

Dr. Bernadette Ossendorp
 Head Department for Food Safety
 Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)
 bernadette.ossendorp@rivm.nl

VICE-CHAIRS

Mr. Ian Reichstein
 Director National Residue Survey, Residues & Food, Exports Division
 Australian Government, Department of Agriculture and Water Resources
 ian.reichstein@agriculture.gov.au

Dr. Jason Lutze
 A/g Executive Director, Scientific Assessment and Chemical Review
 Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA)
 Jason.lutze@apvma.gov.au

Mr. Geoffrey Onen
 Principal Government Analyst; head delegate at CCPR for Uganda
 Government Chemist and Analytical Laboratory
 onengff@hotmail.com

AGROCARE LATINOAMERICA (FORMERLY CALLED ALINA)

Lic. Amanda Francisco
 AgroCare Latinoamerica (formerly called ALINA)
 amanda@aenda.org.br

Lic. Laura B. Ruiz
AgroCare Latinoamerica (formerly called ALINA;
Latinamerican Association of the National
Agrochemical Industries)
lruiz@alinainternacional.org

ARGENTINA

Ms. Laura Bonomi
SENASA Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad
Agroalimentaria lbonomi@senasa.gov.ar

Mr. Daniel Mazzarella
 SENASA Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad
 Agroalimentaria
 dmazzare@senasa.gob.ar

Codex Contact Point Argentina
 codex@magyp.gob.ar

AUSTRALIA

Dr. Dugald Maclachlan
Director Residues and Food Safety Australian
Government, Department of Agriculture and Water
Resources
Dugald.maclachlan@agriculture.gov.au

Codex Contact Point Australia
 codex.contact@agriculture.gov.au

BELGIUM

Mr. Wim Hooghe
 Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Safety
 and Environment wim.hooghe@health.belgium.be

Codex Contact Point Belgium
 codex.be@health.belgium.be

BRAZIL

Mr. Carlos Ramos Venancio
Head of Pesticide Registration Division Ministry of
Agriculture Livestock and Food Supply
carlos.venancio@agricultura.gov.br

Mr. Marcus Venicius Pires
 Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency - ANVISA
 marcus.pires@anvisa.gov.br

BULGARIA

Ivelin Rizov
 State expert in "Policies on agri-food chain"
 Directorate
 Ministry of agriculture, food and forestry
IVRizov@mzh.government.bg

CANADA

Ms. Jennifer Selwyn
 Section Head
 Minor Use Assessment Section
 Health Canada; Health Evaluation Directorate, Pest
 Management Regulatory Agency
 Jennifer.Selwyn@Canada.ca

Ms. Isabelle Pilote
 Section Head
 Exposure to Fungicides/Herbicides
 Health Canada; Health Evaluation Directorate, Pest
 Management Regulatory Agency
 Isabelle.Pilote@Canada.ca

Dr. Peter Chan
Director General
Health Evaluation Directorate
Health Canada; Pest Management Regulatory
Agency
Peter.Chan@canada.ca

CHILE

Roxana Inés Vera Muñoz
Coordinator for the International Affairs Division Unit
Livestock and Agriculture Service (SAG)
Coordinator for the National CCPR
ccpr.chile@sag.gob.cl

Codex Contact Point Chili
codex@achipia.gob.cl

COSTA RICA

Verónica PICADO POMAR
Jefe de Laboratorio
Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado, MAG; Laboratorio
de Análisis de Residuos de Plaguicidas
vpicado@sfe.go.cr

Amanda LASSO CRUZ
Licensed Food Technologist
Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry;
Department of Codex
alasso@meic.go.cr

CROPLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Dr. Cheryl Cleveland
Global Consumer Safety
BASF Corporation
cheryl.cleveland@basf.com

DENMARK

Bodil Hamborg Jensen
Senior adviser DTU, National Food Institute,
Division for Risk Assessment and
Nutritionbhje@food.dtu.dk

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Almut Bitterhof
Head of Unit
European Commission
Almut.bitterhof@ec.europa.eu

Volker Wachtler
Administrator
European Commission
volker.wachtler@ec.europa.eu

Christophe Didion
Administrator
European Commission
Christophe.DIDION@ec.europa.eu

EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY

Hermine Reich
European Food Safety Authority
Hermine.REICH@efsa.europa.eu

ECUADOR

Ms. Jakeline Fernanda Arias Mendez
Agrocalidad
jakeline.arias@agrocalidad.gob.ec

FINLAND

Ms. Tiia Mäkinen-Töykkä
Senior Inspector
Finnish Food Safety Authority
Eviratia.makinen@evira.fi

FRANCE

Ms. Florence GERAULT
National expert on pesticide residues and other
contaminants
Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Agro-alimentaire et de
la Forêt Florence.
gerault@agriculture.gouv.fr

Ms. Gaelle VIAL
Scientific assessor
Unité Résidus et Sécurité des Aliments, ANSES
gaelle.vial@anses.fr

Mr. Nicolas BREYSSE
Scientific assessor
Unité Résidus et Sécurité des Aliments, ANSES
nicolas.breysse@anses.fr

Dr. Xavier SARDA
Head of unit
Unité Résidus et Sécurité des Aliments, ANSES
xavier.sarda@anses.fr

GERMANY

Mr. Christian Sieke
Federal Institute for Risk Assessment - Residues
and Analytical Methods christian.sieke@bfr.bund.de

Codex Contact Point Germany
313@bmel.bund.de

GHANA

Dr. Paul Osei-Fosu
posei_fosu@yahoo.co.uk

ICBA

Ms. Simone Soo Hoo
Program Director
International Council of Beverages Association
simone@icba-net.org

INC

Dr. Gabriele Ludwig
International Nut and Dried Fruit Council
gludwig@almondboard.com

Ms. Irene Gironès
Scientific and Technical Projects Manager
International Nut and Dried Fruit Council
irene.girones@nutfruit.org

INDIA

Dr. K. S. Murthy
Principal Scientist (Expert in Pesticide residues & Spices)
ITC Limited
k.satyamurthy@itc.in

Dr. Debabrata Kanungo
FSSAI Scientific Panel on Pesticides -Chair
Additional Director General (Retired)
Ministry of Health & family Welfare, Govt. of India
Kanungo294@gmail.com

Dr. Anoop A. Krishnan
Assistant Director (T)
Export Inspection Agency
Kochi Laboratory
Ministry of Commerce & Industry, Govt. of India
eia-ochilab@eicindia.gov.in

Dr. K.K. Sharma
Network Coordinator
Indian Council of Agricultural Research
kksaicrp@yahoo.co.in

Codex Contact Point India
codex-india@nic.in

INDONESIA

Ms. Feni Amriani
Researcher
Indonesian Institute of Science
feni.amriani@lipi.go.id; feni.chem1@gmail.com;
bidang_kps@yahoo.co.id

IUPAC

Dr. Caroline Harris
IUPAC
charris@exponent.com

JAPAN

Dr. Yukiko Yamada
Advisor to Vice-Minister
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries of Japan
yukiko_yamada530@maff.go.jp

Yuta Ogawa
Food Standards and Evaluation Division
Pharmaceutical Safety and Environmental Health Bureau
Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan
codexj@mhlw.go.jp

KENYA

Ms. Lucy M. Namu
Head Quality Assurance and Laboratory Accreditation
Kenya plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
Inamu@kephis.org

Codex Contact Point Kenya
info@kebs.org

KOREA (REPUBLIC OF)

Codex Contact Point Korea
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety
codexkorea@korea.kr

Codex Contact Point Korea
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA)
codex1@korea.kr

Jin-sook KIM
Deputy Director
Residues and Contaminants Standard Division
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety (MFDS)
jin1015@korea.kr

Chan-Hyeok KWON
Scientific Officer
Residues and Contaminants Standard Division
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety (MFDS)
chkwon@korea.kr

Ji-Yoon EOM
Scientific Officer
Residues and Contaminants Standard Division
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety (MFDS)
eomy1979@korea.kr

Jung-ah DO
Scientific Officer
Pesticide & Veterinary Drug Residue Division
Ministry of Food and Drug Safety (MFDS)
jado@korea.kr

Kyeong-ae SON
Affiliation: National Institute of Agricultural Sciences
sky199@korea.kr

MALAYSIA

Mohammad Nazrul Fahmi Abdul Rahim
Pesticide Control Division
Department of Agriculture Malaysia
nazrulfahmi@doa.gov.my nazsmie@yahoo.com

Nurul Hazila Abdul Ghani
Pesticide Control Division
Department of Agriculture Malaysia
hazilaghani@gmail.com

MOROCCO

Mr. Ahmed JAAFARI
Chef Service des Intrants Chimiques
ahmedjaafari@yahoo.fr

Mr. Ahmed ZOUAQUI
Chef Service Pesticides LOARC
zouaouiloarc@yahoo.fr

Codex Contact Point Morocco
cnc.ma@ONSSA.GOV.MA

NETHERLANDS

Dr. Martijn Martena
Policy Officer Department of Nutrition, Health Protection and Prevention
Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport
mj.martena@minvws.nl

Dr. Hidde Rang
Policy Officer Department of Nutrition, Health
Protection and Prevention
Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport
h.rang@minvws.nl

Dr. Anton Rietveld
Senior adviser
Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the
Environment (RIVM) anton.rietveld@rivm.nl

Mr. Arie Ton
Scientific Assessor Consumer Safety
Board for the Authorisation of Plant Protection
Products and Biocides (Ctgb)
Arie.Ton@ctgb.nl

Mr. Henk van der Schee
Wetenschappelijk medewerker
Nederlandse Voedsel- en Warenautoriteit
h.a.vanderschee@nvwa.nl

Dr. Marie-Ange Delen
National Codex coordinator
Ministry of Economic Affairs
info@codexalimentarius.nl

NEW-ZEALAND

Warren Hughes
Principal Adviser
Ministry for Primary Industries
warren.hughes@mpi.govt.nz

NIGERIA

Philomina Nwobosi
pnwobosi@yahoo.com

Codex Contact Point Nigeria
codexsecretariat@son.gov.ng;

NORWAY

Ingunn Haarstad Gudmundsdottir
Senior Adviser
Norwegian Food Safety Authority
inhgu@mattilsynet.no

Codex Contact Point Norway
codex@mattilsynet.no

POLAND

Dr. Paweł Strucinski
Senior Researcher, Head of Environmental
Contaminants and Risk Assessment Unit National
Institute of Public Health
National Institute of Hygiene; Department of
Toxicology and Risk Assessment
pstrucinski@pzh.gov.pl

Codex Contact Point Poland
kodeks@ijhars.gov.pl

SPAIN

Mr. César Casado de Santiago
Head of pesticide residues Service
Spanish Agency for Consumer Affairs, Food Safety
and Nutrition (AECOSAN); Ministry of Health, Social
Services and Equality
fitosani@msssi.es

Mrs. Alicia Yagüe
Spanish Agency for Consumer Affairs, Food Safety
and Nutrition (AECOSAN); Ministry of Health, Social
Services and Equality
ayaque@msssi.es

SINGAPORE

Dr. Wu Yuansheng
Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority of Singapore
Wu_Yuan_Sheng@ava.gov.sg

SWITZERLAND

Mr. Emanuel Hänggi
Scientific Officer
Federal Food Safety and Veterinary Office FSVO
Emanuel.Haenggi@blv.admin.ch

THAILAND

Mr. Pisan Pongsapitch
Deputy Secretary General
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and
Food Standards
pisan@acfs.go.th

Ms. Panpilad Saikaew
Standards Officer
Office of Standard Development, National Bureau of
Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards
panpilad@acfs.go.th;
pls_pilad@gmail.com

Codex Contact Point Thailand
codex@acfs.go.th

TURKEY

Sinan Arslan
Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
General Directorate of Food and Control
Food Establishment and Codex Department
sinan.arslan@tarim.gov.tr
arslansinan58@hotmail.com

İlhami Şahin
Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock
General Directorate of Food and Control
Food Establishment and Codex Department
ilhami.sahin@tarim.gov.tr

UGANDA

Mr. Geoffrey ONEN (Co-chair)
Principal Government Analyst; head delegate at
CCPR
Government Chemist and Analytical Laboratory
onengff@hotmail.com

UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Julian Cudmore
Chemistry and Residues Specialist
Health & Safety Executive
julian.cudmore@hse.gsi.gov.uk

UNITED STATES

Dr. David Miller
Branch Chief
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of
Pesticide Programs
miller.davidj@epa.gov

Ms. Maria Maratos
International Issues Analyst
US Department of Agriculture, Food Safety and
Inspection Service, US Codex Office
Marie.Maratos@fsis.usda.gov