#### Background and context of the EFSA guidance for soil exposure and stakeholder involvement

EFSA info session 4/5 June 2019

Mark Egsmose





Trusted science for safe food



#### **BACKGROUND FOR THE GUIDANCE**

- The European Commission tasked EFSA to:
  - Prepare an EFSA guidance on PECs in soil

## Take into account

- Science and methodology proposed by the PPR Panel
- Different application techniques
- Metabolites and transformation products
- Involve stakeholders
  - Public consultation and info sessions





## • Two types of **crops**

- Annual crops including row crops (band, strip & spot applications) and crops grown on ridges
  - Ploughing each year to 20 cm, homogenous top soil

#### Permanent crops including grassland

No or some mechanical cultivation, organic matter gradient in top soil

## Different types of application techniques

- Boom spraying to soil or crop canopy
- Soil incorporation, granules and small seeds
- Air assisted broadcast spraying in permanent crops
- Different types of in-field exposure
  - E.g. In-row areas vs. between-row areas





#### THE COMPLETE EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT





#### MAIN FEATURES OF THE EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT

## Concentrations

- Total soil to be used in line with current procedure
- Ecotoxicological averaging depths
  - 5 cm to be used in line with current procedure
- Wide range of time weighted average PEC values (TWA)
  - 2 56 days
- Exposure mapping (Tier-2 and 3B only)
  - High resolution crop maps with calculated PEC/TWA values
  - First step towards risk mapping and landscape based approaches for compounds



#### MAIN FEATURES OF THE EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT

## Tiered approach

- 4 levels with increasing realism from lower to higher tier
- Tier-1 to Tier-3 supported by user friendly software (PERSAM, PEARL & PELMO)

## Wash-off from crop canopy

- Predefined default wash-off at lower tiers
- Scenario specific wash-off at higher tiers calculated by model

## Substance properties

- Consistent with ground water and surface water exposure assessment including metabolite parameters
- Soil depending substance properties (e.g. *p*H dependent sorption)



#### THE EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT GOAL

- The exposure concentration should not exceed the regulatory acceptable concentration in 90 % of the area of intended use of a pesticide in the three regulatory zones
- The area of intended use is approximated by the area of the crop in which the pesticide is intended to be used







- All tiers aim at the same exposure assessment goal
- Higher tiers are less conservative but require more effort
- Two major routes of refinement
  - Refinement of **processes**
  - Refinement of spatial detail
- All tiers are modelling tiers, except Tier-4, which consists of post-registration monitoring
- Strong focus on consistency

   not necessary to include different tiers in regulatory submissions





- Currently three models have been updated to support the guidance
  - PERSAM: EFSA soil exposure software developed under procurement with contractor for PECs at Tier 1 and Tier 2 and for scenario selection at Tier 3A
  - **PEARL and PELMO:** Groundwater models updated also to be able to be used for soil PECs at higher tier (Tier 3A)
  - All models are in final testing phase
    - PERSAM is being tested through EFSA WG and EFSA
    - PEARL and PELMO were submitted into FOCUS version control

























#### **FEATURES OF EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT**

- Until new effect guidance is available,
  - the ecotoxicological averaging depth remains 5 cm and should be continued to be used in soil organism risk assessment
  - pore water exposure concentrations not to be used in soil organism risk assessment

(pore water concentrations may be used as a surrogate for puddles  $\rightarrow$  Birds & Mammals / bee risk assessment)



#### **NEW VS. CURRENT EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT**

- Factors leading to higher PEC values
  - Shift in bulk soil density to significantly lower values
  - Wash-off from crop canopy included
  - Adjustment factors needed at lower tiers (consistent tiered approach)
- Factors leading to lower PEC values
  - Leaching included at all tiers
  - Shift from worst-case *DissT50* to average *DegT50*
- On average new assessment (Tier-3A) more conservative for short living substances but less or similarly conservative for persistent substances
- Lower tiers (Tier-1 and 2) always more conservative





## **Interaction with stakeholders**

- IRIS (EFSA/JRC) workshop at the start of the project
- The PPR Panel took considerations from this workshop into account when developing scientific opinions
- Based on two fate and one in soil effect PPR opinions EFSA developed a draft GD PECs in soil for annual crops (excluding permanent crops and crops grown on ridges)
  - 1<sup>st</sup> public consultation launched by July 2014
  - ~ 300 comments
- Draft GD published in April 2015





# **Interaction with stakeholders – cont.**

- Update on draft GD amended with guidance on permanent crops and crops grown on ridges
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> public consultation on new approaches launched by July 2016
  - ~ 180 comments
- The WG gave responses to all comments (EFSA technical reports) and considered the comments for preparing the GD
- Final GD published in October 2017





#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

# The Guidance document was prepared by the EFSA working group "PECs in soil"

- Aaldrik Tiktak (Netherlands)
- Michael Stemmer (Austria)
- Jos Boesten (Netherlands)
- Michael Klein (Germany)
- Giovanna Azimonti (Italy)
- Chris Lythgo (EFSA)
- Mark Egsmose (EFSA)
- Sylvia Karlsson (Sweden, until April 2015)



#### Stay connected





#### **Subscribe to**

www.efsa.europa.eu/en/news/newsletters www.efsa.europa.eu/en/rss



#### **Engage with careers**

www.efsa.europa.eu/en/engage/careers



#### **Follow us on Twitter**

@efsa\_eu
@plants\_efsa
@methods\_efsa