

MUF Priority-setting Process 2025

Industry Solution Nomination Guidance & Frequently-Asked Questions

This document contains explanation and guidance on responding to nominations that the Minor Use Foundation (MUF) has received. Your responses are required by **14 April 2025**. Completed worksheets and any queries during your review should be forwarded to Veronica Picado at veronica.picado@minorusefoundation.org.

There are four worksheets where your review is being sought. These are nominations seeking:

1. [New innovative solutions](#)
2. [Trade-enabling MRLs](#)
3. **Expanding registered solutions***
4. [JMPR Periodic Reviews](#)

*** Note:** The MUF is still reviewing nominations and seeking further information from submitters for Worksheet #3 *Expanding registered solutions*. The MUF will advise you as soon as this worksheet is available for review.

General Guidance

The worksheets (provided in Excel) are ordered alphabetically by crop/commodity. You may re-sort the order if necessary to assist in your review (ie. by chemical, crop, Codex code, target). You are encouraged to review all entries but are not required to complete all row entries.

You only need to complete row entries for those where you have a suggested solution, information on potential support and provide any general comments. In the general comments field you can:

- 1) Nominate alternative solutions for a need;
- 2) Note if data for a related commodity (ie. same crop group/representative crop) is available;
- 3) Note relevant details about a label or ability/inability to obtain a label;
- 4) Make any other relevant comments.

Where the options provided to indicate your support include 'YES', 'NO' or 'MAYBE'; 'MAYBE' may indicate that while it may be difficult to definitively provide support in the form of a 'YES', you would be interested in further discussions for a particular nomination.

The following sections provide more background to the four different worksheets and how to complete them.


New innovative solutions

This worksheet contains 457 nominations from 32 countries where stakeholders have expressed a need to identify new solutions for specific target pests and diseases in a crop or crop group.

We are seeking your input to identify potential new solutions, be they conventional, biological or both. We encourage you to identify solutions that may be innovative including new compounds that may still be in the development phase right through to existing solutions you are aware are registered elsewhere globally in that crop, crop group or in other commodities.

New Solutions Diagram

Commodity	Codex code	Cultivation Type	Target	Nominating Country	Solution Preference	Industry Nomination (enter compound or biological name here)	Solution Type	General Comments



Trade-Enabling Solutions

This worksheet contains 237 nominations from 17 countries where stakeholders have expressed a desire to obtain either a Codex MRL or Import MRL in a crop or crop group. For those seeking Import MRLs, destination countries of interest are listed.

We are seeking your input to identify those crop/compound combinations where you would be willing to support pursuing a Codex MRL and/or Import MRL. The options provided to indicate your support include 'YES', 'NO' or 'MAYBE'. Recognizing that in the short timeframe provided for your review it may be difficult to definitively provide support in the form of a 'YES', we have provided the 'MAYBE' option.

If you have other and/or related commodities that you would also like to discuss with the MUF in pursuing either a Codex MRL and/or Import MRL you may suggest these in the General Comments field.

Trade- Enabling Solutions Diagram

Compound	Commodity	Codex Code	Nominating Country	Codex MRL and/or Import MRL Country	Support	Codex MRL and/or Import MRL Country (list one or multiple that you are interested to support)	Label Available	Data Available	General comments



Expanding registered Solutions (*Reducing the Technology Gap*)

This worksheet contains 47 nominations from 14 countries where stakeholders have expressed a desire to obtain a domestic registration for a product, they are aware is registered in another country for a

given crop/target need. The purpose of these nominations is to reduce the Technology Gap for producers through pursuing opportunities to expand existing registered solutions into other countries. The worksheet contains details of the crop, target, nominating country and source country where they understand the solution is currently registered. We are seeking your input to determine if you would be supportive of pursuing the nominated expansion.

Expanding Registered Solutions Diagram

Compound	Commodity	Codex Code	Target	Nominating Country	Nominated Source Country	Industry Support	General Comments

This information will be pre-populated with details for each nomination

These fields are for indicating your support

JMPR Periodic Reviews

This worksheet contains 34 nominations from 5 countries where stakeholders have expressed a desire to pursue maintenance of an existing Codex MRL during a future JMPR Periodic Review. Please note that the MUF only sought stakeholder nominations for those compounds that are currently scheduled for review by JMPR from now through until 2028.

JMPR Periodic Reviews Diagram

Compound	Year of JMPR review	Commodity of Interest	Codex Code	Nominating Country	Industry Support	General Comments

This information will be pre-populated with details for each nomination

These fields are for indicating your support

Frequently-Asked Questions

The following Q&A's are common questions that we have received from potential collaborators when looking to engage with the MUF in pursuing new solutions, particularly as it relates to expectations where field studies are required.

Field Phase

Q: Is industry expected to ship products directly to the test sites or to a central location?

A: Yes. Shipping terms are typically DDP (Delivered Duty Paid) or DAP (Delivered at Place), depending on the country.

Q: Will all field samples be shipped to one central analytical facility with sample processing capabilities, or to separate local facilities?

A: In most cases, samples are shipped to separate local facilities.

Q: Will the trials be monitored (and reported) for phytotoxicity?

A: Yes, if required.

Q: Which GAP (Good Agricultural Practice) will be used in the studies?

A: The critical GAP is generally preferred.

Analytical Phase

Q: Where will the analytical labs be located?

A: We typically partner with government laboratories, specifically official Pesticide Residue Analysis Laboratories in each country.

Q: Will industry be required to send analytical standards to these facilities?

A: Yes. We will provide assistance with the necessary documentation.

Q: Will draft analytical results be shared with industry?

A: Yes.

Registration and Submission

Q: Does MUF plan to prepare all submission documents, including JMPR dossiers and local registration documents?

A: This depends on industry needs. We can provide a final study director report or a JMPR report if required.

Q: If an active ingredient (AI) is not currently registered in one of the listed countries, what additional AI-related information would industry need to supply (toxicology, product chemistry, environmental fate, etc.)?

A: All relevant documentation according to local regulations is required. We can help arrange meetings with registration departments and review requirements, including the acceptance of data from other countries.

Q: Will MUF submit local registration applications on behalf of the industry?

A: No. These applications must be submitted by the industry or its local representative.

Archiving Data

MUF retains an electronic copy of the data, while raw data remains at the test sites. Please let us know if you would like the raw data forwarded to any specific email or physical address.
