



IAPPS NEWSLETTER

Number VI September, 2002

HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE 34th SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON PESTICIDE RESIDUES

The 34th session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR) was convened in the Hague, Netherlands, May 13 - 18 2002, with a pre-meeting session of the Priorities Working Group on May 11. It was attended by 52 countries and 14 international agencies. A full detailed accounting may be found on the CAC website: (<http://www.codexalimentarius.net/Reports.htm#Full>).

Sixty-four pesticides were considered for Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs). The US opposed the advancement of proposed MRLs to Step 8 for organophosphorus pesticides until the US cumulative risk assessments are completed in mid-2002. For lack of support, the following pesticides will be recommended for removal from the Codex system: parathion, phosphamidon, mecarbam, monocrotophos, bendiocarb, paclobutazol, and anilazine. Numerous proposed MRLs were not advanced in the process because of concerns for acute dietary risk exposure. This concern often was associated with the lack of an acute reference dose. The following new pesticides have been scheduled for toxicological review from 2002 - 22005: esfenvalerate, flutolanil, imidacloprid, cyprodinil, famoxadone, methoxyfenozide, pyraclostrobin, fludioxinil, trifloxystrobin, dimethenamid-P, fenhexamid, indoxacarb, and novaluron. Consideration of acute toxicity has been requested for the following compounds: carbofuran, ethephon, fenamiphos, folpet, oxydemeton-methyl, dimethoate, malathion, and fenpyroximate. The Committee discussed the situation on the phasing out of methyl bromide and on the critical need to facilitate the establishment of MRLs for replacements. Setting residue limits for DDT in meat (fat) remained a divisive issue. As an outcome of a general debate, the Committee is requesting member governments to supply information on the availability of new toxicology data and new monitoring data for persistent pesticides.

At the request of the 33rd CCPR, the USA led a drafting group to develop possible solutions to the window of trade vulnerability problem. Under current procedures, it can take up to 7 years from the time of nomination to generate final standards for a pesticide. Meanwhile, growers and exporters can not legally use new, safer pesticides on crops to be shipped to countries that rely upon the Codex standards. Eight options were presented, and after considerable discussion the US suggested that an interim standard based on national MRLs be further explored via a working group that would consider application of the procedure to safer pesticides. Nine nations, the EC, Consumers International, and CropLife International will assist the US in developing a working paper on a pilot project for the examination of national MRLs as Interim Codex MRLs.. One objective of the paper is the development of details of the safeguards to be instituted to prevent interim standards based on faulty or incomplete databases or spurious dietary risk analyses.

The US delegation presented a paper prepared by the Netherlands and the US on current practices in the use of probabilistic techniques for acute dietary risk assessment and the possible implementation of those techniques at the international level. It was recognized that the consumption data bases and residue survey data needed to fully implement probabilistic modeling at the international level are not currently available and that the technique is resource intensive, but that a tiered approach might be used to introduce some probabilistic aspects. An IUPAC project on acute dietary assessment is nearly complete and will include proposals for improving the deterministic approach. Also an FAO/WHO consultation on intake assessment, including considerations of acute methodology, is planned in the near future. The US also presented a paper on the current status of cumulative risk assessment in the US. The Committee was pleased to receive the information, but agreed that nothing could be accomplished at the international level until the probabilistic approach was developed.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON KARNAL BUNT

"Risk Associated with the Movement of Wheat from Karnal Bunt Infected Areas to Disease Free Destinations," which is a pest risk analysis on karnal bunt, is now out. This 120-page publication gives the view of India on the sanitary and phytosanitary issues associated with the movement of wheat grain. This publication, which is free of cost, can be obtained from: Dr. S. Nagarajan, Director
Indian Agricultural Research Institute
New Delhi 110012, India
E-mail: snagarajan@flashmail.com

Computer software that simulates the karnal bunt risk is available for US \$50 per CD, including mailing cost, from:
Directorate of Wheat Research
Kunjpura Road

THE CRITICAL USE EXEMPTION PROCESS FOR THE METHYL BROMIDE PHASEOUT

Production of methyl bromide, an ozone depleting chemical, is scheduled to be eliminated under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, an international treaty under the auspices of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP). Methyl bromide was identified as a potential ozone-depleting substance in 1991, and at the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol held in 1992, methyl bromide was added to the list of controlled substances. By the Ninth Meeting of the Parties, a phaseout date for developed countries had been set for January 1, 2005; developing countries have a phaseout date of 2015. Exemptions for quarantine and pre-shipment applications were established in 1992, and two additional exemptions were approved by the Ninth Meeting of the Parties. These exemptions, which are for critical and emergency uses, will go into effect following the methyl bromide phaseout for developed countries in 2005. In 2001, the Parties to the Protocol agreed to a specific time line, as well as data requirements, for the Critical Use Exemptions (CUE), which will provide additional time for certain end users to transition to alternatives. The CUE will permit users to obtain methyl bromide if they credibly demonstrate that there will be no technically or economically feasible alternatives available to them by the phaseout date. Applicants will be required to submit information on their current use of methyl bromide and data on the status of alternatives for their crops or end use.

In the United States, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will evaluate these applications based on technical and economic criteria and, with other agencies, develop a nomination package for submission to the Secretariat of the Montreal Protocol in January 2003. By working in partnership with affected stakeholders and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, EPA expects to implement an appropriate, effective and informed CUE Program that will meet the obligations under the Montreal Protocol, while ensuring that methyl bromide can be used for those critical agricultural needs until such time as economically and technologically feasible alternatives are available. Currently the details of the exemption program are under development, including the submission process, (who will be responsible for applying, when applications will be accepted, etc.) and the specific criteria and procedures to be used by the U.S. government in making determinations for this exemption. EPA also plans to propose and finalize rules in the future to permit production of methyl bromide after 2005 for those critical uses, as well as emergency uses, authorized under the Protocol.

A technical evaluation of the nominated critical use will be made by the UNEP's Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP). In essence, TEAP will evaluate a proposed exemption according to:

- Availability of, as well as efforts to find, receive approval of, and market, alternatives for that particular use;
- Efforts to minimize use and emissions; and,
- The potential for meeting that need through banked or recycled methyl bromide. TEAP's evaluations will serve as a basis for the Parties to use the following criteria to determine whether to grant a CUE:

"(a) That a use of methyl bromide should qualify as 'critical' only if . . .

(ii) There are no technically and economically feasible alternatives or substitutes available to the user that are acceptable from the standpoint of environment and health and are suitable to the crops and circumstances of the nomination;

(b) That production and consumption, if any, of methyl bromide for a critical use should be permitted only if:

(i) All technically and economically feasible steps have been taken to minimize the critical use and any associated emission of methyl bromide;

(ii) Methyl bromide is not available in sufficient quantity and quality from existing stocks of banked or recycled methyl bromide, also bearing in mind the developing countries' need for methyl bromide;

(iii) It is demonstrated that an appropriate effort is being made to evaluate, commercialize and secure national regulatory approval of alternatives and substitutes . . . Parties must demonstrate that research programmes are in place to develop and deploy alternatives and substitutes . . . "

As the phaseout nears many alternatives are appearing. Anyone interested in the exemption should focus on pursuing these alternatives and demonstrating whether they are economically and technically feasible. In pursuing a CUE, one must be able to show that appropriate efforts are being made to evaluate, commercialize and secure national regulatory approval of alternatives and substitutes.

The IAPPS Newsletter is published by the International Association for the Plant Protection Sciences and distributed in Crop Protection to members and other subscribers. Crop Protection, published by Elsevier, is the Official Journal of IAPPS.

IAAPS Mission: to provide a global forum for the purpose of identifying, evaluating, integrating, and promoting plant protection concepts, technologies, and policies that are economically, environmentally, and socially acceptable.

It seeks to provide a global umbrella for the plant protection sciences to facilitate and promote the application of the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach to a the world's crop and forest ecosystems.

The *IAPPS Newsletter* welcomes news, letters, and other items of interest from individuals and organizations. Address correspondence and information to:

[Dr. Nancy N. Ragsdale](#), Editor
IAPPS Newsletter
ARS/USDA
5601 Sunnyside Ave.
Beltsville, MD 20705-5140 USA
E-mail: nnr@ars.usda.gov