

ADOPTED: 18 February 2021 doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2021.6478

Setting of an import tolerance for potassium phosphonates in blueberries

European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), Maria Anastassiadou, Giulia Bellisai, Giovanni Bernasconi, Alba Brancato, Luis Carrasco Cabrera, Lucien Ferreira, Luna Greco, Samira Jarrah, Aija Kazocina, Renata Leuschner, Jose Oriol Magrans, Ileana Miron, Stefanie Nave, Ragnor Pedersen, Hermine Reich, Alejandro Rojas, Miguel Santos, Alessia Pia Scarlato, Anne Theobald, Benedicte Vagenende and Alessia Verani

Abstract

In accordance with Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, the applicant Exponent International Ltd. (on behalf of the U.S. Highbush Blueberry Council (USHBC)) submitted a request to the competent national authority in France to set an import tolerance for the active substance potassium phosphonates in blueberries. The data submitted in support of the request were found to be sufficient to derive a maximum residue level (MRL) proposal for blueberries. Adequate analytical methods for enforcement are available to control the residues of phosphonic acid on the commodity under consideration at the validated limit of quantification (LOQ) of 0.1 mg/kg. Based on the risk assessment results, EFSA concluded that the short-term and long-term intake of residues resulting from the use of potassium phosphonates according to the reported agricultural practice is unlikely to present a risk to consumer health. The consumer risk assessment shall be regarded as indicative and a refined intake assessment will be performed in the framework of the joint review of MRLs for fosetyl and phosphonates.

© 2021 European Food Safety Authority. *EFSA Journal* published by John Wiley and Sons Ltd on behalf of European Food Safety Authority.

Keywords: potassium phosphonates, fosetyl, phosphonic acid, blueberries, fungicide, import tolerance, consumer risk assessment

Requestor: European Commission

Question number: EFSA-Q-2020-00613

Correspondence: pesticides.mrl@efsa.europa.eu



Declarations of interest: The declarations of interest of all scientific experts active in EFSA's work are available at https://ess.efsa.europa.eu/doi/doiweb/doisearch.

Acknowledgements: EFSA wishes to thank: Stathis Anagnos, Laszlo Bura and Silvia Ruocco for the support provided to this scientific output.

Suggested citation: EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Anastassiadou M, Bellisai G, Bernasconi G, Brancato A, Carrasco Cabrera L, Ferreira L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Kazocina A, Leuschner R, Magrans JO, Miron I, Nave S, Pedersen R, Reich H, Rojas A, Santos M, Scarlato AP, Theobald A, Vagenende B and Verani A, 2021. Reasoned Opinion on the setting of an import tolerance for potassium phosphonates in blueberries. EFSA Journal 2021;19(3):6478, 28 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa. 2021.6478

ISSN: 1831-4732

© 2021 European Food Safety Authority. *EFSA Journal* published by John Wiley and Sons Ltd on behalf of European Food Safety Authority.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and no modifications or adaptations are made.



The EFSA Journal is a publication of the European Food Safety Authority, a European agency funded by the European Union.





Summary

In accordance with Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, Exponent International Ltd. (on behalf of the U.S. Highbush Blueberry Council (USHBC)) submitted an application to the competent national authority in France (rapporteur Member State, RMS) to set an import tolerance for the active substance potassium phosphonates in blueberries. The RMS drafted an evaluation report in accordance with Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, which was submitted to the European Commission and forwarded to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) on 11 September 2020. The RMS proposed to establish a maximum residue level (MRL) for blueberries imported from the USA at the level of 150 mg/kg, in accordance with both the existing enforcement residue definition (fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl)) and the proposed enforcement residue definition for potassium phosphonates (phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid). EFSA assessed the application and the evaluation report as required by Article 10 of the MRL regulation.

Based on the conclusions derived by EFSA in the framework of Directive 91/414/EEC, the data evaluated under previous MRL assessments and the additional data provided by the RMS in the framework of this application, the following conclusions are derived.

The European Union (EU) pesticides peer review concluded that, given the elementary nature of potassium phosphonates and according to available data from public literature, the main metabolite of potassium phosphonates in plants is phosphonic acid. Studies investigating the effect of processing on the nature of potassium phosphonates (hydrolysis studies) demonstrated that the active substance is stable. As the authorised use of potassium phosphonates is on imported crop, investigations of residues in rotational crops are not required.

Based on the metabolic pattern identified in metabolism studies, hydrolysis studies, the toxicological significance of the metabolite, the EU pesticides peer review proposed a general residue definition for potassium phosphonates in plant products as 'phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid' for both enforcement and risk assessment. The current residue definition for enforcement set in Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 is 'fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl)'. This residue definition for enforcement is in common with other two active substances approved for use in plant protection products in the EU, disodium phosphonate and fosetyl. The residue definitions are applicable to primary crops, rotational crops and processed products.

EFSA concluded that for the crop assessed in this application, metabolism of potassium phosphonates in primary and the possible degradation in processed products has been sufficiently addressed and that the previously derived residue definitions are applicable.

Sufficiently validated analytical methods based on high-performance liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry (HPLC–MS/MS) are available to quantify residues in the crop assessed (high acid content commodity) in this application according to the current enforcement residue definition in Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 and the one proposed during the EU pesticides peer review (as phosphonic acid). The methods enable quantification of residues at or above an limit of quantification (LOQ) of 0.1 mg phosphonic acid/kg.

The available residue trials are sufficient to derive an MRL proposal of 150 mg/kg for blueberries in accordance with both the existing residue enforcement definition (fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl)) and the proposed enforcement residue definition for potassium phosphonates (phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid).

Specific studies investigating the magnitude of residues in processed commodities are not required, since the contribution of blueberries in the total theoretical maximum daily intake (TMDI) is below the trigger value of 10% of the acceptable daily intake (ADI).

Residues of potassium phosphonates in commodities of animal origin were not assessed since the crop under consideration in this MRL application is normally not fed to livestock.

The toxicological profile of potassium phosphonates was assessed in the framework of the EU pesticides peer review under Directive 91/414/EEC and the data were sufficient to derive an ADI of 2.25 mg/kg body weight (bw) per day for phosphonic acid, which is the toxicologically relevant metabolite of potassium phosphonates in products of plants and animal origin. An acute reference dose (ARfD) was deemed unnecessary.

The consumer risk assessment was performed with revision 3.1 of the EFSA Pesticide Residues Intake Model (PRIMo). For the calculation of the chronic exposure, EFSA used the median residue values (STMR) as derived from the residue trials on blueberries, the STMR available from previously issued EFSA opinions and from recently implemented Codex MRLs. For the remaining commodities of plant and animal

origin, the existing MRLs as established in the EU legislation, recalculated to express them as phosphonic acid, were included in the risk assessment. Using the toxicological reference value set for potassium phosphonates, no long-term consumer intake concerns were identified; the calculated long-term exposure accounted for a maximum of 48% of the ADI (DE child diet). The contribution of phosphonic acid residues expected in blueberries is minor, accounting for 0.05% of the ADI (NL toddler diet).

EFSA also performed an indicative risk assessment using the proposed revised ADI of 1 mg/kg bw per day applicable to phosphonic acid according to the recent EFSA conclusion on fosetyl, noting that the value is not yet formally taken note. The long-term dietary exposure accounted for a maximum of 97% of the ADI (DE child, and NL toddler diets). When excluding from this exposure calculation the commodities for which the existing EU MRLs are set at the LOQ, assuming that no uses are authorised on these crops, and taking into account the peeling factor for citrus fruits, the overall chronic exposure to phosphonic acid residues is lower (91% of the ADI; DE child). In both scenarios, the contribution of phosphonic acid residues in blueberries to the overall long-term exposure is minor (0.11% of the ADI; NL toddler diet).

All these exposure calculations shall be regarded as indicative since information on the contribution for all authorised uses and all sources leading to residues of phosphonic acid is not available at this stage. For a number of products, the exposure calculations were performed with the MRLs instead of the STMRs which is likely to overestimate the exposure to residues arising from the use of potassium phosphonates in plants.

EFSA concluded that the existing USA authorised use of potassium phosphonates on blueberries will not result in a consumer exposure exceeding the toxicological reference value and therefore is unlikely to pose a risk to consumers' health.

As the joint review of MRLs for fosetyl and phosphonates under Article 12 and 43 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 is not yet finalised, the conclusions reported in this reasoned opinion are indicative and may need to be reconsidered in the light of the outcome of the MRL review.

EFSA proposes to amend the existing MRL as reported in the summary table below. However, it should be noted that in a previous reasoned opinion an MRL on blueberries has been also proposed, based on EU trials on currants and blueberries. An MRL of 200 mg/kg was calculated for blueberries according to the existing enforcement residue definition (fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl)), or 150 mg/kg according to the proposed enforcement residue definition for potassium phosphonates (phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid).

Full details of all endpoints and the consumer risk assessment can be found in Appendices B-D.

| Code ^(a) | Commodity | Existing EU MRL (mg/kg) | Proposed EU MRL (mg/kg) | Comment/justification | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Enforcement residue definition: 1) Existing enforcement residue definition: fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl) 2) Proposed enforcement residue definition: phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid | | | | | | | |
| 0154010 | Blueberries | 80 | 1) 150 2) 150 | The submitted data are sufficient to derive an import tolerance (US GAP). Risk for consumers unlikely. In a previous reasoned opinion an MRL of 200 mg/kg (expressed in accordance with the existing enforcement definition) or 150 mg/kg (expressed in accordance with the proposed enforcement residue definition) has been proposed by EFSA on the basis of an indoor use EU GAP, which has not yet been implemented in the MRL legislation. | | | |

MRL: maximum residue level; GAP: Good Agricultural Practice.

(a): Commodity code number according to Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005.



Table of contents

| Abstract | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Summary | | | | | | |
| Assessment | | | | | | |
| 1. Residues in plants | . 7 | | | | | |
| 1.1. Nature of residues and methods of analysis in plants | . 7 | | | | | |
| 1.1.1. Nature of residues in primary crops | . 7 | | | | | |
| 1.1.2. Nature of residues in rotational crops | . 7 | | | | | |
| 1.1.3. Nature of residues in processed commodities | | | | | | |
| 1.1.4. Methods of analysis in plants | . 7 | | | | | |
| 1.1.5. Storage stability of residues in plants | . 8 | | | | | |
| 1.1.6. Proposed residue definitions | . 8 | | | | | |
| 1.2. Magnitude of residues in plants | . 8 | | | | | |
| 1.2.1. Magnitude of residues in primary crops | . 8 | | | | | |
| 1.2.2. Magnitude of residues in rotational crops | . 9 | | | | | |
| 1.2.3. Magnitude of residues in processed commodities | . 9 | | | | | |
| 1.2.4. Proposed MRLs | . 9 | | | | | |
| 2. Residues in livestock | . 9 | | | | | |
| 3. Consumer risk assessment | . 9 | | | | | |
| 4. Conclusion and Recommendations | . 10 | | | | | |
| References | | | | | | |
| Abbreviations | | | | | | |
| Appendix A – Summary of intended GAP triggering the amendment of existing EU MRLs 13 | | | | | | |
| Appendix B – List of end points | | | | | | |
| Appendix C – Pesticide Residue Intake Model (PRIMo) | | | | | | |
| Appendix D – Input values for the exposure calculations 2 | | | | | | |
| Appendix E – Used compound codes 28 | | | | | | |



Assessment

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) received an application to set an import tolerance for potassium phosphonates in blueberries. The detailed description of the existing use of potassium phosphonates in blueberries authorised in the USA, which is the basis for the current MRL application, is reported in Appendix A.

Potassium phosphonates is the ISO common name for potassium hydrogen phosphonate and dipotassium phosphonate (IUPAC). The chemical structures of the active substance and its main metabolites are reported in Appendix E.

Potassium phosphonates was evaluated in the framework of Directive 91/414/EEC¹ with France designated as rapporteur Member State (RMS) for the representative use as a foliar spraying on grapes. The draft assessment report (DAR) prepared by the RMS has been peer reviewed by EFSA (EFSA, 2012b). Potassium phosphonates was approved² for the use as fungicide on 1 October 2013.

The process of renewal of the first approval has not yet been initiated.

The European Union (EU) MRLs for potassium phosphonates are established in Annexes III of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005³. The current residue definition for enforcement is set as 'fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl)', reflecting the residues of the active substances fosetyl, disodium phosphonate and potassium phosphonates. The review of existing MRLs for potassium phosphonates according to Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 (MRL review) is not yet finalised. For fosetyl, the MRL review is completed (EFSA, 2012a). EFSA has received from the European Commission a mandate to provide a reasoned opinion on the joint review of MRLs for fosetyl and phosphonates in or on food and feed according to Articles 12 and 43 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 and this assessment is currently ongoing. EFSA has issued several reasoned opinions on the modification of MRLs for fosetyl and potassium phosphonates (EFSA, 2009, 2012c, 2015, 2018b,d, 2019b, 2020a,b,c). The proposals from previous reasoned opinions (EFSA, 2009, 2012c, 2015, 2018b,d) have been considered in recent MRL regulations.⁴ However, recent proposed modifications of the existing MRLs (EFSA, 2019b, 2020a,b,c) have not yet been implemented in the MRL legislation. Certain Codex maximum residue limits (CXLs) have been taken over in the EU MRL legislation.⁵

In accordance with Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, Exponent International Ltd. (on behalf of the U.S. Highbush Blueberry Council (USHBC)) submitted an application to the competent national authority in France (RMS) to set an import tolerance for the active substance potassium phosphonates in blueberries. The RMS drafted an evaluation report in accordance with Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, which was submitted to the European Commission and forwarded to EFSA on 11 September 2020. The RMS proposed to establish MRLs for blueberries imported from the US at the level of 150 mg/kg, in accordance with both the existing residue definition for potassium phosphonates as 'fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl)' and the proposed enforcement residue definition as 'phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid'.

EFSA assessed the application and the evaluation report, as required by Article 10 of the MRL regulation.

EFSA based its assessment on the evaluation report submitted by the RMS (France, 2020), the DAR and its addendum (France, 2005, 2012) prepared under Council Directive 91/414/EEC and the renewal assessment report (RAR) on fosetyl (France, 2017, 2019) prepared under Regulation (EU) No 1107/2009⁶, the Commission review report on potassium phosphonates (European Commission, 2013), the conclusion

¹ Council Directive 91/414/EEC of 15 July 1991 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market. OJ L 230, 19.8.1991, p. 1–32.

² Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 369/2013 of 22 April 2013 approving the active substance potassium phosphonates, in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market, and amending the Annex to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 540/2011. OJ L 111, 23.4.2013, p. 39–42.

³ Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 of the Parliament and of the Council of 23 February 2005 on maximum residue levels of pesticides in or on food and feed of plant and animal origin and amending Council Directive 91/414/EEC. OJ L 70, 16.3.2005, p. 1–16.

⁴ For an overview of all MRL Regulations on this active substance, please consult: http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/pesticides/eupesticides-database/public/?event=pesticide.residue.selection&language=EN.

⁵ Commission Regulation (EU) 2019/552 of 4 April 2019 amending Annexes II and III to Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards maximum residue levels for azoxystrobin, bicyclopyrone, chlormequat, cyprodinil, difenoconazole, fenpropimorph, fenpyroximate, fluopyram, fosetyl, isoprothiolane, isopyrazam, oxamyl, prothioconazole, spinetoram, trifloxystrobin and triflumezopyrim in or on certain products C/2019/2496. OJ L 96, 5.4.2019, p. 6–49.

 ⁶ Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 October 2009 concerning the placing of plant protection products on the market and repealing Council Directives 79/117/EEC and 91/414/EEC. OJ L 309, 24.11.2009, p. 1–50.

on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substances potassium phosphonates (EFSA, 2012b) and fosetyl (EFSA, 2018c), as well as the conclusions from previous EFSA opinions on potassium phosphonates and fosetyl (EFSA, 2009, 2012c, 2015, 2018b,d, 2019b, 2020a,b,c) including the reasoned opinion on the MRL review on fosetyl according to Article 12 of Regulation No 396/2005 (EFSA, 2012a).

For this application, the data requirements established in Regulation (EU) No 544/2011⁷ and the guidance documents applicable at the date of submission of the application to the RMS are applicable (European Commission, 1997a–g, 2000, 2010a,b, 2017; OECD, 2011). The assessment is performed in accordance with the legal provisions of the Uniform Principles for the Evaluation and the Authorisation of Plant Protection Products adopted by Commission Regulation (EU) No 546/2011⁸.

As the joint review of MRLs for fosetyl and phosphonates under Article 12 and Article 43 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 is not yet finalised, the conclusions reported in this reasoned opinion may need to be reconsidered in the light of the outcome of the MRL review.

A selected list of end points of the studies assessed by EFSA in the framework of this MRL application including the end points of relevant studies assessed previously, is presented in Appendix B.

The evaluation report submitted by the RMS (France, 2020) and the exposure calculations using the EFSA Pesticide Residues Intake Model (PRIMo) are considered as supporting documents to this reasoned opinion and, thus, are made publicly available as background documents to this reasoned opinion.

1. Residues in plants

1.1. Nature of residues and methods of analysis in plants

1.1.1. Nature of residues in primary crops

The metabolism of potassium phosphonates in primary crops was assessed during the EU pesticides peer review (EFSA, 2012b). It was concluded that data from the public literature are sufficient to address the metabolism in plants which mainly involves the transformation of potassium phosphonate salts into phosphonic acid. No further studies on the metabolism of potassium phosphonates in primary crops were submitted in the present MRL application and are not required.

For the intended use, the metabolic behaviour in primary crops is sufficiently addressed.

1.1.2. Nature of residues in rotational crops

Investigations of residues in rotational crops are not required for imported crops.

1.1.3. Nature of residues in processed commodities

The effect of processing on the nature of phosphonic acid, which is the main product produced from the metabolism of potassium phosphonates, was investigated in the framework of the EU pesticides peer reviews for potassium phosphonates and fosetyl (EFSA, 2012b, 2018c). These studies showed that phosphonic acid is hydrolytically stable under standard processing conditions representative of pasteurisation, baking/brewing/boiling and sterilisation.

1.1.4. Methods of analysis in plants

Analytical methods for the determination of phosphonic acid residues, using high-performance liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass spectrometry (HPLC–MS/MS), were assessed during the peer review of fosetyl (EFSA, 2018c). The methods are sufficiently validated for residues of phosphonic acid in matrices with high water, high oil content, and dry commodities at the limit of quantification (LOQ) of 0.01 mg/kg and in high acid content matrices at the LOQ of 0.1 mg/kg (EFSA, 2018c). In the framework of the current assessment, the applicant submitted a modified European Reference Laboratories for Pesticide Residues (EURL) method (QuPPe method; LC–MS/MS; LOQ: 0.5 mg/kg) for the determination of phosphonic acid residues in blueberries' samples. However, according

⁷ Commission Regulation (EU) No 544/2011 of 10 June 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the data requirements for active substances. OJ L 155, 11.6.2011, p. 1–66.

⁸ Commission Regulation (EU) No 546/2011 of 10 June 2011 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards uniform principles for evaluation and authorisation of plant protection products. OJ L 155, 11.6.2011, p. 127–175.

to the RMS the method is not highly specific (only one mass transition monitored) and an ILV is missing (France, 2020). Since this modified method is not fully validated, it is not recommended for enforcement monitoring.

1.1.5. Storage stability of residues in plants

The storage stability of phosphonic acid in commodities with high acid content under frozen conditions was investigated in the framework of the MRL review of fosetyl (EFSA, 2012a), and the peer review of potassium phosphonates (EFSA, 2012b). In addition, a study on the stability of phosphonic acid residues in blueberries was submitted with the current application, which demonstrated that residues were stable for at least 14 months when stored at -20° C (France, 2020). Overall, the available information demonstrates that residues of phosphonic acid in commodities with high acid content, to which blueberries belong, are stable for up to 25 months when stored at -18° C (EFSA, 2012a).

1.1.6. Proposed residue definitions

Based on the metabolic pattern identified in metabolism studies, the results of hydrolysis studies, the toxicological significance of the metabolite, the capability of the analytical method, the following residue definitions were proposed during the EU pesticides peer review of potassium phosphonates (EFSA, 2012b):

- residue definition for risk assessment: Phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid.
- residue definition for enforcement: Phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid.

The same residue definitions are applicable to rotational crops and processed products.

The residue definition for enforcement set in Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 is different and residues of potassium phosphonates are currently covered by the enforcement residue definition for fosetyl:

• Fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl).⁹

Taking into account the proposed uses assessed in these applications, EFSA concluded that these residue definitions are appropriate, and further information is not required.

1.2. Magnitude of residues in plants

1.2.1. Magnitude of residues in primary crops

In support of the import tolerance application, the applicant submitted 8 residue trials conducted on outdoor blueberries in the USA in 2016 (France, 2020). Trials were performed according to the registered use, with six foliar applications 1.81–2.07 kg a.s./ha, with an interval of 7–10 days and a preharvest interval (PHI) of 2–3 days, and one trial was performed as a residue decline trial (PHI 1, 3, 7 and 14 days). Two trials, performed on different varieties at the same location and application dates, were considered different experimental conditions within a same trial and the highest residue value was selected. Overall, EFSA considered seven trials are sufficiently independent.

The samples were stored under conditions for which integrity of the residue has been demonstrated. According to the assessment of the RMS, the analytical method used was sufficiently validated and fit for purpose. In all trials, duplicate samples were collected and analysed for phosphonic acid residues (experimental replicates). The mean values were used to derive risk assessment value and for the MRL calculation. The results were also expressed as fosetyl equivalents, by applying the molecular weight conversion factor of 1.34, in order to derive the MRL proposals according to the existing enforcement residue definition and are presented in Table B.1.2.1.

An MRL proposal for blueberries is calculated at 150 mg/kg for both phosphonic acid and fosetyl equivalents.

It should be noted that an MRL on blueberries was proposed in a recent reasoned opinion (EFSA, 2020a), but not yet implemented. Based on an EU indoor Good Agricultural Practice (GAP) (greenhouse application, 3×3.02 kg a.s./ha, 7-10 days interval, PHI: 14 days), an MRL for blueberries was calculated at 150 mg/kg as phosphonic acid and at 200 mg/kg as fosetyl equivalents (EFSA, 2020a).

⁹ For crops with uses of potassium phosphonates, the contribution of fosetyl is not relevant.



1.2.2. Magnitude of residues in rotational crops

Investigations on the magnitude of residues in rotational crops are not required for imported crops.

1.2.3. Magnitude of residues in processed commodities

In the framework of the current assessment, no new processing studies were submitted by the applicant. Specific processing studies for blueberries are not required, since their contribution to the theoretical maximum daily intake (TMDI) is not expected to exceed the trigger value of 10% of the ADI (European Commission, 1997d).

1.2.4. Proposed MRLs

The available data are considered sufficient to derive MRL proposals as well as risk assessment values for the commodities under evaluation. EFSA derived MRL proposals according to both the existing and the proposed residue definition for enforcement (Appendix B.4). In Section 3 EFSA assessed whether residues on blueberries resulting from the use authorised in USA are likely to pose a consumer health risk.

2. Residues in livestock

Not relevant as blueberries are not used for feed purposes.

3. Consumer risk assessment

EFSA performed a dietary risk assessment using revision 3.1 of the EFSA PRIMo (EFSA, 2018a, 2019a). This exposure assessment model contains food consumption data for different sub-groups of the EU population and allows the acute and chronic exposure assessment to be performed in accordance with the internationally agreed methodology for pesticide residues.

The assessment was performed according to the residue definition 'phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid'.

The toxicological profile for potassium phosphonates was assessed in the framework of the EU pesticide peer review of this active substance (EFSA, 2012b). Considering that phosphonic acid is the relevant component of residues in plant and animal products, the acceptable daily intake (ADI) derived was related to phosphonic acid and was set at 2.25 mg/kg body weight (bw) per day (European Commission, 2013). Later, as phosphonic acid is a metabolite in common with fosetyl, during the process of the renewal of the approval for fosetyl, a revised ADI of 1 mg/kg bw per day has been derived and considered applicable also to phosphonic acid (EFSA, 2018c). Although this ADI is not yet formally taken note, an indicative risk assessment has been calculated according to this reference value as well. The short-term exposure assessment is not required since no ARfD is established or proposed.

For the calculation of the chronic exposure, EFSA used the median residue values (STMR) as derived from the residue trials on blueberries, the STMR values reported in previously issued EFSA reasoned opinions (EFSA, 2012c, 2015, 2018b,d, 2019b, 2020a,b,c) and the STMR values of the recently implemented Codex MRLs (FAO, 2017). For the remaining commodities of plant and animal origin, in the absence of risk assessment values for refinement, the existing MRLs set in the EU legislation for fosetyl, recalculated to phosphonic acid,¹⁰ were used.

Considering the conclusions of the consumer risk assessment derived in the previous reasoned opinion (EFSA, 2020a) a lower consumer exposure is now calculated, since a lower STMR value for blueberries is derived from trials submitted within the current application (35 vs 42.25 mg phosphonic acid/kg). The input values used in the exposure calculations are summarised in Appendix D.1.

Considering the current ADI of 2.25 mg/kg bw per day for phosphonic acid (scenario 1), the estimated long-term dietary exposure accounted for a maximum of 48% of the ADI (DE child). The contribution of phosphonic acid residues expected in blueberries to the overall long-term exposure is minor (0.05% of the ADI; NL toddler diet).

EFSA also performed an indicative risk assessment using the revised ADI of 1 mg/kg bw per day for phosphonic acid as proposed in the framework of the EU pesticides peer review of fosetyl (scenario 2, option a). The long-term dietary exposure accounted for a maximum of 97% of the ADI (DE child, and

¹⁰ Using the molecular weight conversion factor of 0.75.



NL toddler). The contribution of phosphonic acid residues in blueberries to the overall long-term exposure is minor (0.11% of the ADI; NL toddler diet).

When excluding from the exposure calculation the commodities for which the existing EU MRL is set at the LOQ, assuming that no uses are authorised for these crops, and applying to the MRL on citrus fruits the peeling factor of 0.81 as derived in the MRL review of fosetyl (EFSA, 2012a) (Scenario 2, option b), the overall chronic exposure to phosphonic acid residues is lower (91% of the ADI, DE child). The contribution of residues expected in blueberries to the overall long-term exposure is again minor (0.11% of the ADI; NL toddler diet).

EFSA concluded that the long-term intake of residues of potassium phosphonates resulting from the existing and the intended use in blueberries is unlikely to present a risk to consumers' health.

It is noted that all these exposure calculations shall be regarded as indicative since information on the contribution for all authorised uses and all sources leading to residues of phosphonic acid is not available at this stage. For a number of products, the exposure calculations were performed with the MRL instead of the STMR which is likely to overestimate the exposure to residues arising from the use of potassium phosphonates in plants. A refined consumer risk assessment will be conducted in the framework of the joint review of MRLs for fosetyl and phosphonates, according to Article 12 and 43 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005.

For further details on the exposure calculations, screenshots of the Report sheet of the PRIMo for the scenarios 1, 2a and 2b are presented in Appendix C.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The data submitted in support of this MRL application were found to be sufficient to derive an MRL proposal for blueberries.

EFSA concluded that the proposed use of potassium phosphonates on blueberries will not result in a consumer exposure exceeding the toxicological reference value and therefore is unlikely to pose a risk to consumers' health.

The MRL recommendations are summarised in Appendix B.4.

References

- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2009. Reasoned opinion on the modification of the existing MRL for fosetyl-Al in radishes. EFSA Journal 2009;7(9):1313, 22 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2009.1313
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2012a. Reasoned opinion on the review of the existing maximum residue levels (MRLs) for fosetyl according to Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005. EFSA Journal 2012;10 (11):2961, 65 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2012.2961
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2012b. Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance potassium phosphonates. EFSA Journal 2012;10(12):2963, 43 pp. https://doi.org/10. 2903/j.efsa.2012.2963
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2012c. Reasoned opinion on the modification of the existing MRLs for fosetyl in potato, kiwi and certain spices. EFSA Journal 2012;10(12):3019, 43 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2012. 3019
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2015. Reasoned opinion on the modification of the existing MRL for fosetyl in various crops. EFSA Journal 2015;13(12):4327, 20 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2015.4327
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Brancato A, Brocca D, Ferreira L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Leuschner R, Medina P, Miron I, Nougadere A, Pedersen R, Reich H, Santos M, Stanek A, Tarazona J, Theobald A and Villamar-Bouza L, 2018a. Guidance on use of EFSA Pesticide Residue Intake Model (EFSA PRIMo revision 3). EFSA Journal 2018;16(1):5147, 43 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5147
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Brancato A, Brocca D, De Lentdecker C, Erdos Z, Ferreira L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Kardassi D, Leuschner R, Lythgo C, Medina P, Miron I, Molnar T, Nougadere A, Pedersen R, Reich H, Sacchi A, Santos M, Stanek A, Sturma J, Tarazona J, Theobald A, Vagenende B, Verani A and Villamar-Bouza L, 2018b. Reasoned Opinion on the modification of the existing maximum residue levels for fosetyl-Al in tree nuts, pome fruit, peach and potato. EFSA Journal 2018;16(2):5161, 36 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5161
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Arena M, Auteri D, Barmaz S, Brancato A, Brocca D, Bura L, Carrasco Cabrera L, Chiusolo A, Civitella C, Court Marques D, Crivellente F, Ctverackova L, De Lentdecker C, Egsmose M, Erdos Z, Fait G, Ferreira L, Goumenou M, Greco L, Ippolito A, Istace F, Jarrah S, Kardassi D, Leuschner R, Lythgo C, Magrans JO, Medina P, Mineo D, Miron I, Molnar T, Padovani L, Parra Morte JM, Pedersen R, Reich H, Riemenschneider C, Sacchi A, Santos M, Serafimova R, Sharp R, Stanek A, Streissl F, Sturma J, Szentes C, Tarazona J, Terron A, Theobald A, Vagenende B, Van Dijk J and Villamar-Bouza L, 2018c. Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance fosetyl. EFSA Journal 2018;16(7):5307, 25 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5307

- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Brancato A, Brocca D, Carrasco Cabrera L, De Lentdecker C, Erdos Z, Ferreira L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Kardassi D, Leuschner R, Lythgo C, Medina P, Miron I, Molnar T, Pedersen R, Reich H, Riemenschneider C, Sacchi A, Santos M, Stanek A, Sturma J, Tarazona J, Theobald A, Vagenende B and Villamar-Bouza L, 2018d. Reasoned opinion on the modification of the existing maximum residue levels for potassium phosphonates in certain small berries and fruits. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5411
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Anastassiadou M, Brancato A, Carrasco Cabrera L, Ferreira L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Kazocina A, Leuschner R, Magrans JO, Miron I, Pedersen R, Raczyk M, Reich H, Ruocco S, Sacchi A, Santos M, Stanek A, Tarazona J, Theobald A and Verani A, 2019a. Pesticide Residue Intake Model- EFSA PRIMo revision 3.1. EFSA supporting publication 2019;16(3):EN-1605, 15 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/sp.efsa.2019.en-1605
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Anastassiadou M, Brancato A, Carrasco Cabrera L, Ferreira L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Kazocina A, Leuschner R, Magrans JO, Miron I, Pedersen R, Raczyk M, Reich H, Ruocco S, Sacchi A, Santos M, Stanek A, Tarazona J, Theobald A and Verani A, 2019b. Reasoned Opinion on the modification of the existing residue levels for fosetyl/phosphonic acid for potatoes and wheat. EFSA Journal 2019;17(5):5703, 31 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5703
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Anastassiadou M, Bernasconi G, Brancato A, Carrasco Cabrera L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Kazocina A, Leuschner R, Magrans JO, Miron I, Nave S, Pedersen R, Reich H, Rojas A, Sacchi A, Santos M, Stanek A, Theobald A, Vagenende B and Verani A, 2020a. Modification of the existing maximum residue levels for fosetyl/phosphonic acid in various crops. EFSA Journal 2020;18(1):5964, 33 pp. https://doi. org/10.2903/j.efsa.2020.5964
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Anastassiadou M, Bernasconi G, Brancato A, Carrasco Cabrera L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Kazocina A, Leuschner R, Magrans JO, Miron I, Nave S, Pedersen R, Reich H, Rojas A, Sacchi A, Santos M, Stanek A, Theobald A, Vagenende B and Verani A, 2020b. Modification of the existing maximum residue levels for potassium phosphonates in flowering brassica, Chinese cabbages, kales and spinaches. EFSA Journal 2020;18(5):6122, 31 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2020.6122
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), Anastassiadou M, Bernasconi G, Brancato A, Carrasco Cabrera L, Ferreira L, Greco L, Jarrah S, Kazocina A, Leuschner R, Magrans JO, Miron I, Nave S, Pedersen R, Reich H, Rojas A, Sacchi A, Santos M, Theobald A, Vagenende B and Verani A, 2020c. Reasoned Opinion on the modification of the existing maximum residue levels for potassium phosphonates in various crops. EFSA Journal 2020;18 (9):6240, 37 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2020.6240
- European Commission, 1997a. Appendix A. Metabolism and distribution in plants. 7028/IV/95-rev., 22 July 1996.
- European Commission, 1997b. Appendix B. General recommendations for the design, preparation and realization of residue trials. Annex 2. Classification of (minor) crops not listed in the Appendix of Council Directive 90/642/ EEC. 7029/VI/95-rev. 6, 22 July 1997.
- European Commission, 1997c. Appendix C. Testing of plant protection products in rotational crops. 7524/VI/95rev. 2, 22 July 1997.
- European Commission, 1997d. Appendix E. Processing studies. 7035/VI/95-rev. 5, 22 July 1997.
- European Commission, 1997e. Appendix F. Metabolism and distribution in domestic animals. 7030/VI/95-rev. 3, 22 July 1997.
- European Commission, 1997f. Appendix H. Storage stability of residue samples. 7032/VI/95-rev. 5, 22 July 1997.
- European Commission, 1997g. Appendix I. Calculation of maximum residue level and safety intervals.7039/VI/95 22 July 1997. As amended by the document: classes to be used for the setting of EU pesticide maximum residue levels (MRLs). SANCO 10634/2010, finalised in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health at its meeting of 23–24 March 2010.
- European Commission, 2000. Residue analytical methods. For pre-registration data requirement for Annex II (part A, section 4) and Annex III (part A, section 5 of Directive 91/414. SANCO/3029/99-rev. 4.
- European Commission, 2010a. Classes to be used for the setting of EU pesticide Maximum Residue Levels (MRLs). SANCO 10634/2010-rev. 0, Finalised in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health at its meeting of 23–24 March 2010.
- European Commission, 2010b. Residue analytical methods. For post-registration control. SANCO/825/00-rev. 8.1, 16 November 2010.
- European Commission, 2013. Review report for the active substance potassium phosphonates. Finalised in the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health at its meeting on 15 March 2013 in view of the approval of potassium phosphonates as active substance in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009. SANCO/10416/2013 rev 2, 15 March 2013.
- European Commission, 2017. Appendix D. Guidelines on comparability, extrapolation, group tolerances and data requirements for setting MRLs. 7525/VI/95-rev. 10.3, 13 June 2017.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), 2017. Phosphonic acid In: Pesticide residues in food 2017. 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. FAO Plant Production and Protection Paper 232, 327–328.

www.efsa.europa.eu/efsajournal



- France, 2005. Draft Assessment Report (DAR) on the active substance potassium phosphite prepared by the rapporteur Member State France in the framework of Directive 91/414/EEC, January 2005. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu
- France, 2012. Final addendum to the draft assessment report on potassium phosphonates, compiled by EFSA, November 2012. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu
- France, 2017. Renewal Assessment Report (RAR) on the active substance fosetyl prepared by the rapporteur Member State France, in the framework of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 844/2012, April 2017. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu
- France, 2019. Revised Renewal Assessment Report (RAR) on fosetyl prepared by the rapporteur Member State France in the framework of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009, March 2019. Available online: www.efsa.europa.eu
- France, 2020. Evaluation report on the setting of an import tolerance for potassium phosphonates in blueberries. July 2020, 34 pp.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2011. OECD MRL calculator: spreadsheet for single data set and spreadsheet for multiple data set, 2 March 2011. In: Pesticide Publications/Publications on Pesticide Residues. Available online: http://www.oecd.org

Abbreviations

| ADIacceptable daily intakeARfDacute reference doseBBCHgrowth stages of mono- and dicotyledonous plantsbwbody weightCFconversion factor for enforcement to risk assessment residue definitionCXLCodex maximum residue limit | ı |
|--|------|
| DAR draft assessment report DAT days after treatment | |
| EURLEU Reference Laboratory (former Community Reference Laboratory (CFAOFood and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations | RL)) |
| GAP Good Agricultural Practice HPLC-MS/MS high-performance liquid chromatography with tandem mass spectrome | otra |
| HR highest residue | suy |
| IEDI international estimated daily intake | |
| IESTI international estimated short-term intake | |
| ILV independent laboratory validation | |
| ISO International Organisation for Standardisation | |
| IUPAC International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry | |
| LOQ limit of quantification | |
| MRL maximum residue level | |
| MS Member States | |
| NEU northern Europe | |
| OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development PBI plant-back interval | |
| PBI plant-back interval PF processing factor | |
| PHI preharvest interval | |
| PRIMo (EFSA) Pesticide Residues Intake Model | |
| RA risk assessment | |
| RAC raw agricultural commodity | |
| RD residue definition | |
| RMS rapporteur Member State | |
| SANCO Directorate-General for Health and Consumers | |
| SC suspension concentrate | |
| SEU southern Europe | |
| STMR supervised trials median residue | |
| TMDI theoretical maximum daily intake | |
| WHO World Health Organization | |



Appendix A – Summary of intended GAP triggering the amendment of existing EU MRLs

| | | | | Prepa | ration | | Applic | ation | | Applica | ation rate | e per treatm | ent | | |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|--|--|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------|------------------------------|---|
| Crop and/or situation | r SEU, G | F G or I ^(a) | group of pests | Type ^(b) | Conc. a.s. | Method kind | Range of growth stages and season ^(c) | Number min– max | Interval between application (min) | g a.s./ hL min– max | Water L/ha min– max | Rate | Unit | PHI (days) ^(d) | Remarks |
| Blueberries | USA | F | Downy mildew | Liquid | 648 g/L | Foliar treatment – broadcast spraying | BBCH 71–89 | 6 | 7–10 | 200– 1,000 | 190–950 | 1,890 (equivalent to 1181 phosphonic acid) | g a.s./ ha | 3 | Application should be made in conjunction with an appropriate spray adjuvant (non-ionic surfactant) |

MRL: maximum residue level; GAP: Good Agricultural Practice; NEU: northern European Union; SEU: southern European Union; MS: Member State; a.s.: active substance.

(a): Outdoor or field use (F), greenhouse application (G) or indoor application (I).

(b): CropLife International Technical Monograph no 2, 7th Edition. Revised March 2017. Catalogue of pesticide formulation types and international coding system.

(c): Growth stage range from first to last treatment (BBCH Monograph, Growth Stages of Plants, 1997, Blackwell, ISBN 3-8263-3152-4), including, where relevant, information on season at time of application.

(d): PHI: minimum preharvest interval.



Appendix B – List of end points

B.1. Residues in plants

- **B.1.1.** Nature of residues and methods of analysis in plants
- **B.1.1.1.** Metabolism studies, methods of analysis and residue definitions in plants

| Primary crops (available studies) | Crop groups | Crop(s) | Application(| s) | Sampling (DAT) | Comment/Source | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|--|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| | Fruit crops Root crops Leafy crops Cereals/grass Pulses/oilseeds Miscellaneous | No experimental studies available. The EU peer review concluded that, given the elementary nature of potassium phosphonates and according to available data from public literature, the main metabolite of potassium phosphonates in plants is phosphonic acid (EFSA, 2012b). | | | | | | |
| Rotational crops (available studies) | Crop groups | Crop(s) PBI (DAT) Comment/Source | | | | | | |
| | Root/tuber crops | | | | | | | |
| | Leafy crops | Lettuce | 32 | | rom fosetyl. Study not conducted with | | | |
| | Cereal (small grain) | Barley | 32 | radiolabelled material (EFSA, 2018c). Residues of phosphonic acid are observed in plants grown only one month after application the soil. Radish root: 0.8 mg/kg,; lettuce: 0.76 mg/kg In all other crop parts phosphonic acid residu LOQ (0.5 mg/kg). | | | | |
| Processed commodities (hydrolysis study) | Conditions | | Stable? | Cor | nment/Source | | | |
| | Pasteurisation (20 pH 4) | min, 90°C, | Yes | According to experimental studies pro peer review of potassium phosphonat | | phosphonates and | | |
| | Baking, brewing and boiling (60 min, 100°C, pH 5) Sterilisation (20 min, 120°C, pH 6) | | Yes | | etyl (EFSA, 2012b, 201 rolytically stable. | 8c), phosphonic acid is | | |
| | | | Yes | | | | | |
| | Other processing of | conditions | _ | _ | | | | |

| Can a general residue definition be proposed for primary crops? | Yes | EFSA (2012b) |
|---|-----|--------------|
| Rotational crop and primary crop metabolism similar? | Yes | EFSA (2012b) |
| Residue pattern in processed commodities similar to residue pattern in raw commodities? | Yes | EFSA (2012b) |



| Plant residue definition for monitoring (RD-Mo) | Phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid (EFSA, 2012b) Fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed as fosetyl) (Regulation (EC) No 396/2005) |
|--|--|
| Plant residue definition for risk assessment (RD-RA) | Phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid (EFSA, 2012b) |
| Methods of analysis for monitoring of residues (analytical technique, crop groups, LOQs) | HPLC–MS/MS: matrices with high water content, high oil content and dry matrices at LOQ of 0.01 mg/kg and in matrices with high acid content at LOQ 0.1 mg/kg (fosetyl, and phosphonic acid) (EFSA, 2018c). |

DAT: days after treatment; PBI: plant-back interval; LOQ: limit of quantification; HPLC-MS/MS: high - performance liquid chromatography with tandem mass spectrometry.

| B.1.1.2 . | Stability | of residues | in plants |
|------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|

| Plant | | | | Stabilit | y period | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------|----------|----------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| products (available studies) | Category | Commodity | T (°C) | Value | Unit | Compounds covered | Comment/ Source |
| | High water | Potato | -20 | 12 | Months | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2019b) |
| | content | | -18 | 12 | Months | Sum of phosphonic acid and fosetyl | EFSA (2012b) |
| | | | -18 | 25 | Months | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2012b) |
| | | Wheat, whole plant | -20 | 12 | Months | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2019b) |
| | | Cucumber, lettuce | -18 | 12 | Months | Sum of phosphonic acid and fosetyl | EFSA (2012b) |
| | | Cucumber, cabbage | -18 | 25 | Months | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2012b) |
| | | Apples | -18 | 12 | Months | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2018b) |
| | | Peaches | -18 | 307 | Days | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2018b) |
| | High oil content | Almond | -20 | 218 | Days | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2018b) |
| | | Pistachio | -20 | 221 | Days | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2018b) |
| | | Walnut | -20 | 146 | Days | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2018b) |
| | High protein content | - | _ | _ | - | - | _ |
| | Dry/High starch | Wheat, grain | -20 | 12 | Months | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2019b) |
| | High acid content | Grapes | -18 | 25 | Months | Sum of phosphonic acid and fosetyl | EFSA (2012a) |
| | | | | | | Phosphonic acid | |
| - | | | -18 | 12 | Months | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2012b) |
| | | Blueberries | -20 | 14 | Months | Phosphonic acid | France (2020) |
| | Processed products | Peach jam, puree, nectar and canned peaches | -18 | 112–114 | Days | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2018b) |
| | Others | Wheat, straw | -20 | 12 | Months | Phosphonic acid | EFSA (2019b) |



B.1.2. Magnitude of residues in plants

B.1.2.1. Summary of residues data from the supervised residue trials

| Commodity | Region/ Indoor ^(a) | Residue levels observed in the supervised residue trials (mg/kg) | Comments/Source | Calculated MRL (mg/kg) | HR ^(b) (mg/kg) | STMR ^(c) (mg/kg) | CF ^(d) |
|-------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Blueberries | USA | Mo: 35, 36 ^(e) , 40, 47, 62, 63, 64 RA: 26, 27 ^(e) , 30, 35, 46, 47, 48 | Residue trials on blueberries compliant with US GAP. | 150 (as phosphonic acid) 150 (as fosetyl) | 48 (as phosphonic acid) | 35 (as phosphonic acid) | n/a |

MRL: maximum residue level; GAP: Good Agricultural Practice; Mo: monitoring; RA: risk assessment; n/a: not applicable.

(a): NEU: Outdoor trials conducted in northern Europe, SEU: Outdoor trials conducted in southern Europe, Indoor: indoor EU trials or Country code: if non-EU trials.

(b): Highest residue.

(c): Supervised trials median residue.

(d): Conversion factor to recalculate residues according to the residue definition for monitoring to the residue definition for risk assessment.

(e): Higher residue value at later PHI selected (7 days PHI).



B.1.2.2. Residues in rotational crops

| Residues in rotational and succeeding crops expected based on confined rotational crop study? | Yes | Rotational crop field studies are summarised in the peer review of fosetyl (EFSA, 2018c). Residues in rotational crops cannot be excluded. Member States should |
|---|-----|--|
| Residues in rotational and succeeding crops expected based on field rotational crop study? | Yes | consider setting specific pre-planting intervals. |

B.1.2.3. Processing factors

No processing studies were submitted in the framework of the present import tolerance application.

B.2. Residues in livestock

Not relevant.

B.3. Consumer risk assessment

An acute consumer risk assessment is not relevant since no ARfD has been considered necessary.

Scenario 1 – with implemented TRVs (ADI = 2.25 mg/kg bw per day for phosphonic acid)

| ADI | 2.25 mg/kg bw per day (European Commission, 2013) |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Highest IEDI, according to EFSA PRIMo | 48% ADI (DE child) Contribution of crops assessed: Blueberries: 0.05% of ADI (NL toddler) |
| Assumptions made for the calculations | The calculation is based on the STMRs (expressed as phosphonic acid) derived for raw agricultural commodities assessed in the current application, in previous assessments (EFSA, 2012c, 2015, 2018b,d, 2019b, 2020a,b,c) and the STMRs of the implemented CXLs (FAO, 2017). For the remaining commodities, the MRLs established for fosetyl in the EU legislation, recalculated to phosphonic acid were used. The molecular weight conversion factor of 0.75 was used to express residue levels as phosphonic acid. The consumer risk assessment is indicative since information on the contribution for all authorised uses and all sources leading to residues of phosphonic acid is not available at this stage. A refined chronic intake assessment will be performed in the framework of the MRL review for potassium phosphonates. Calculations performed with PRIMo revision 3.1. |



| Scenario 2 – | indicative consumer RA with revised TRVs (ADI = 1.0 mg/kg bw per day for |
|--------------|--|
| phosphonic a | cid) |

| | 1 mg///g huy new day/ (net implemented yet FECA 2010a) |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| ADI | 1 mg/kg bw per day (not implemented yet, EFSA, 2018c) |
| Highest IEDI, according to EFSA PRIMo | Option a (including all MRLs): 97% ADI (DE child, NL toddler) |
| | Option b (excluding MRLs <loq; applying="" citrus):<br="" factor="" for="" peeling="">91% ADI (DE child)</loq;> |
| | Contribution of crops assessed: Blueberries: 0.11% of ADI (NL toddler) for both options. |
| Assumptions made for the calculations | Option a: The calculation is based on the STMRs (expressed as phosphonic acid) derived for raw agricultural commodities assessed in the current application, in previous assessments (EFSA, 2012c, 2015, 2018b,d, 2019b, 2020a,b,c) and the STMRs of the implemented CXLs (FAO, 2017). For the remaining commodities, the MRLs established for fosetyl in the EU legislation, recalculated to phosphonic acid were used. The molecular weight conversion factor of 0.75 was used to express residue levels as phosphonic acid. |
| | Option b: The calculation is based on the STMRs (expressed as phosphonic acid) derived for raw agricultural commodities assessed in the current application, in previous assessments (EFSA, 2012c, 2015, 2018b,d, 2019b, 2020a,b,c), the STMRs of the implemented CXLs (FAO, 2017) and the MRLs above the LOQ established for fosetyl in the EU legislation, recalculated to phosphonic acid by a CF of 0.75, were used. |
| | The commodities, for which the existing EU MRL is set at the LOQ, were excluded from the calculation, under the assumption that there are no authorised uses supporting the MRL. The existing MRL for citrus fruits was multiplied by a peeling factor of 0.81 for phosphonic acid derived by the MRL review of fosetyl (EFSA, 2012a). |
| | The consumer risk assessment is indicative, since information on the contribution for all authorised uses and all sources leading to residues of phosphonic acid is not available at this stage. A refined chronic intake assessment will be performed in the framework of the joint review of the existing MRLs for fosetyl and phosphonates. |
| | Calculations performed with PRIMo revision 3.1. |

ARfD: acute reference dose; TRV: toxicity reference values; ADI: acceptable daily intake; bw: body weight; IEDI: international estimated daily intake; STMR: supervised trials median residue; MRL: maximum residue level; CXL: codex maximum residue limit; PRIMo: (EFSA) Pesticide Residues Intake Model; LOQ: limit of quantification.



B.4. Recommended MRLs

| Code ^(a) | Commodity | Existing EU MRL (mg/kg) | Proposed EU MRL (mg/kg) | Comment/justification | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Enforcement residue definition: 1) Existing enforcement residue definition: fosetyl-Al (sum of fosetyl, phosphonic acid and their salts, expressed | | | | | | | | | | |
| as fosetyl) 2) Proposed enforcement residue definition: phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as phosphonic acid | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0154010 | Blueberries | 80 | 1) 150 2) 150 | The submitted data are sufficient to derive an import tolerance (US GAP). Risk for consumers unlikely. In a previous reasoned opinion an MRL of 200 mg/kg (expressed according to the existing enforcement definition) or 150 mg/kg (expressed according to the proposed RD-Mo) has been proposed by EFSA, not yet implemented by MRL Regulation. | | | | | | |

MRL: maximum residue level; GAP: Good Agricultural Practice.

(a): Commodity code number according to Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005.



Appendix C – Pesticide Residue Intake Model (PRIMo)

• Scenario 1

| | *. O | fsa | | LOQs (mg/kg) range | | 0.375 cal reference v | to: | 3.8 | Details-cl | | Supplementary | | |
|----|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| | C | | | ADI (mg/kg bw per d | | 2.25 | ARfD (mg/kg bw): | Not necessary | assess | ment | chronic risk ass | essment | |
| E | uropean Foo | d Safety Authority | | Source of ADI: | | EC | Source of ARfD: | EC | Details – a | | Details-acu | | |
| | | vision 3.0; 2017/12/11 | | Year of evaluation: | | 2012 | Year of evaluation: | 2012 | assessmen | t/children | assessment/ | adults | |
| en | nts: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | Norma | <u>al mode</u> | | | | | | |
| | | | | - | Chronic ris | k assessment | : JMPR methodo | ology (IEDI/TMDI) | | | | | |
| _ | | | | No of diets exceeding | the ADI : | - | - | | | 1 | 1 | Exposure MRLs set at | |
| | Calculated exposur (% of ADI) | e MS Diet | Expsoure (µg/kg bw per | Highest contributor to MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ group of commodities | | 2nd contributor to MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ group of commodities | | 3rd contributor to MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ group of commodities | the LOQ (in % of ADI) | under as: (in % c |
| 1 | (% of ADI) 48% | DE child | day) 1070.95 | (IN % OF ADI) 13% | Apples | | (IN % OF ADT) 10% | Oranges | | (IN % OF ADI) 4% | Wheat | 0.4% | |
| | 47% | NL toddler | 1062.53 | 11% 12% | Apples | | 6% | Oranges | | 5% 3% | Potatoes | 2% | |
| | 41% 31% | GEMS/Food G06 NL child | 924.97 700.47 | 12% | Tomatoes Apples | | 7% 4% | Wheat Wheat | | 3% 4% | Watermelons Potatoes | 0.7% | |
| | 28% | RO general | 619.90 | 6% | Tomatoes | | 5% | Wheat | | 4% | Potatoes | 0.3% | |
| | 27% | GEMS/Food G11 | 617.85 | 5% | Potatoes | | 4% | Wheat | | 3% | Tomatoes | 0.8% | |
| | 27% 27% | GEMS/Food G08 | 606.04 605.81 | 5% 9% | Potatoes Oranges | | 4% 5% | Wheat Wheat | | 4% 3% | Tomatoes Tomatoes | 0.6% | |
| | 26% | FR child 3 15 yr GEMS/Food G15 | 595.65 | 9% 5% | Wheat | | 5% | Potatoes | | 3% 4% | Tomatoes | 0.6% | |
| | 26% | GEMS/Food G10 | 592.85 | 5% | Tomatoes | | 4% | Wheat | | 4% | Potatoes | 0.7% | |
| I | 26% | GEMS/Food G07 | 591.82 | 4% | Potatoes | | 4% | Wheat | | 4% | Tomatoes | 0.6% | |
| | 24% | IE adult | 542.82 | 3% | Potatoes | | 3% | Oranges | | 2% | Wheat | 0.7% | |
| I | 22% | ES child | 500.15 | 5% | Oranges | | 5% | Wheat | | 3% | Tomatoes | 0.3% | |
| | 22% 21% | PT general SE general | 499.87 479.80 | 6% 5% | Potatoes Potatoes | | 4% 3% | Wheat Wheat | | 3% 3% | Tomatoes Tomatoes | 0.3% | |
| | 21% | UK toddler | 467.22 | 5% | Oranges | | 4% | Potatoes | | 4% | Wheat | 0.5% | |
| I | 21% | FR toddler 2 3 yr | 465.98 | 4% | Oranges | | 3% | Apples | | 3% | Wheat | 0.5% | |
| | 20% | DE women 14-50 yr | 459.03 | 5% | Oranges | | 3% | Apples | | 2% | Tomatoes | 0.6% | |
| I | 19% | IT toddler | 434.20 | 7% | Wheat | | 5% | Tomatoes | | 1% | Oranges | 0.2% | |
| | 18% | DE general | 413.80 | 4% | Oranges | | 3% | Apples | | 2% | Tomatoes | 0.6% | |
| | 18% | DK child | 397.11 | 5% | Wheat | | 3% | Potatoes | | 2% | Apples | 0.6% | |
| | 16% 16% | NL general ES adult | 370.55 358.84 | 3% 3% | Potatoes Oranges | | 3% 3% | Oranges Tomatoes | | 2% 2% | Wheat Wheat | 0.5% | |
| I | 16% | FI 3 yr | 352.71 | 6% | Potatoes | | 2% | Tomatoes | | 1% | Wheat | 0.2% | |
| | 15% | IT adult | 345.52 | 4% | Wheat | | 4% | Tomatoes | | 0.9% | Oranges | 0.1% | |
| I | 15% | UK infant | 342.18 | 4% | Potatoes | | 3% | Oranges | | 3% | Wheat | 0.5% | 1 |
| | 13% | FR adult | 294.51 | 2% | Wine grapes | | 2% | Wheat | | 2% | Tomatoes | 0.3% | 1 |
| 1 | 13% | FI 6 yr | 290.47 282.51 | 5% 2% | Potatoes | | 1% 2% | Tomatoes Wheat | | 1% 2% | Wheat Tomatoes | 0.3% | 1 |
| 1 | 13% 12% | UK vegetarian PL general | 282.51 271.98 | 2% | Oranges Potatoes | | 2% | vvneat Tomatoes | | 2% | Apples | 0.2% | 1 |
| 1 | 10% | LT adult | 234.17 | 4% | Potatoes | | 2% | Tomatoes | | 2% | Apples | 0.1% | 1 |
| I | 10% | UK adult | 223.12 | 2% | Wheat | | 2% | Potatoes | | 1% | Tomatoes | 0.2% | 1 |
| I | 10% | FR infant | 217.08 | 2% | Potatoes | | 2% | Apples | | 0.8% | Wheat | 0.3% | 1 |
| 1 | 9% | DK adult | 211.74 | 2% | Tomatoes | | 2% | Potatoes | | 1% | Wheat | 0.1% | 1 |
| | 9% 3% | FI adult IE child | 197.06 73.30 | 2% 1% | Tomatoes Wheat | | 1% 0.7% | Potatoes Potatoes | | 1% 0.3% | Oranges Apples | 1% 0.1% | 1 |
| | 070 | | 10.00 | | | | 0.770 | | | 0.070 | | 0.170 | 1 |



| Acute risk assessment/children | Acute risk assessment/adults/general population |
|--|---|
| Details – acute risk assessment/children | Details – acute risk assessment/adults |

As an ARfD is not necessary/not applicable, no acute risk assessment is performed.

Show results for all crops

| odities | Results for childrer | n for which ARfD/ADI is | | | Results for adults No. of commodities for which ARfD/ADI is | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| u u u | exceeded (IESTI): | | | | exceeded (IESTI): | | | | | |
| 000 | IESTI | | | | IESTI | | | | | |
| Unprocessed commodities | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | | |
| đun | Expand/collapse list Total number of co children and adult ((IESTI calculation) | mmodities exceeding the Af | RfD/ADI in | | | | | | | |
| w | Deculto for children | - | | | Desults for adults | | | | | |
| noditie | Results for children No of processed com is exceeded (IESTI): | modities for which ARfD/ADI | | | Results for adults No of processed con is exceeded (IESTI): | nmodities for which ARfD/ADI | | | | |
| omr | IESTI | | | | IESTI | | | | | |
| Processed commodities | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Processed commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Processed commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | | |
| Proc | Expand/collapse list | | | | | | | | | |

Conclusion:



• Scenario 2a

| efsa | | | assium phosphonates (p | c acid) | | Input | values | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | | LOQs (mg/kg) range | | to: | 3.8 | Details-c | hronic risk | Supplementary re | sults – | |
| TSam | | | Toxicological reference | values | | asses | | chronic risk asses | | |
| | | ADI (mg/kg bw per da | y): 1 | ARfD (mg/kg bw): | Not necessary | | | | | |
| d Safety Authority evision 3.0; 2017/12/11 | | Source of ADI: Year of evaluation: | EFSA 2018 | Source of ARfD: Year of evaluation: | EFSA 2018 | Details – a assessmer | | Details – acute assessment/ac | | |
| SVISION 3.0, 2017/12/11 | | I | 2010 | 1 | 2010 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Refined cal | culation mode | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | Chronic risk assessmen | t: JMPR methodo | ology (IEDI/TMDI) | | | | | |
| | | No of diets exceeding | the ADI : | | | | 1 | 1 | Exposure MRLs set at | e resulting f |
| re MS Diet | Expsoure (µg/kg bw per | Highest contributor to MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ | 2nd contributor to MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ | | 3rd contributor to MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ group of commodities | the LOQ (in % of ADI) | under asse (in % of |
| DE child | day) 973.81 | (IN % 01 ADI) 29% | group of commodities Apples | (IN % 0T ADI) 23% | group of commodities Oranges | | (IN % 01 AD1) 7% | Tomatoes | 1% | |
| NL toddler | 971.31 | 25% | Apples | 13% | Oranges | | 11% | Potatoes | 4% | 1 |
| GEMS/Food G06 NL child | 757.63 605.36 | 27% 13% | Tomatoes Apples | 6% 9% | Watermelons Potatoes | | 6% 8% | Oranges Oranges | 2% 2% | |
| GEMS/Food G11 | 534.44 | 13% | Appies Potatoes | 9% 7% | Tomatoes | | 8% 4% | Oranges | 2% | |
| GEMS/Food G08 | 511.63 | 11% | Potatoes | 9% | Tomatoes | | 3% | Apples | 1% | |
| RO general | 502.71 | 15% | Tomatoes | 10% | Potatoes | | 4% | Sweet peppers/bell peppers | 0.7% | |
| GEMS/Food G10 | 502.18 | 10% | Tomatoes | 8% | Potatoes | | 6% | Oranges | 2% | |
| FR child 3 15 yr | 499.54 | 19% | Oranges | 6% | Tomatoes | | 4% | Potatoes | 1% | |
| GEMS/Food G07 | 494.22 | 10% | Potatoes | 8% 9% | Tomatoes | | 8% | Oranges | 1% | |
| GEMS/Food G15 IE adult | 490.55 489.73 | 10% 6% | Potatoes Potatoes | 9% 6% | Tomatoes Oranges | | 5% 4% | Sweet peppers/bell peppers Grapefruits | 1% 2% | |
| DE women 14-50 yr | 409.39 | 11% | Oranges | 6% | Apples | | 4 % 6% | Tomatoes | 1% | |
| PT general | 409.24 | 14% | Potatoes | 7% | Tomatoes | | 6% | Wine grapes | 0.6% | |
| SE general | 405.75 | 11% | Potatoes | 6% | Tomatoes | | 4% | Oranges | 0.7% | |
| ES child | 397.56 | 12% | Oranges | 7% | Tomatoes | | 5% | Potatoes | 0.6% | |
| FR toddler 2 3 yr | 394.83 | 8% | Oranges | 7% | Apples | | 5% | Potatoes | 1% | |
| UK toddler | 376.60 | 11% | Oranges | 9% | Potatoes | | 4% | Tomatoes | 1% | |
| DE general NL general | 370.21 325.84 | 9% 7% | Oranges Potatoes | 6% 6% | Apples Oranges | | 5% 3% | Tomatoes Apples | 1% 1% | |
| FI 3 yr | 325.12 | 13% | Potatoes | 4% | Tomatoes | | 2% | Mandarins | 0.8% | |
| ES adult | 304.53 | 7% | Oranges | 6% | Tomatoes | | 3% | Potatoes | 0.4% | 1 |
| DK child | 294.91 | 7% | Potatoes | 5% | Apples | | 4% | Tomatoes | 1% | 1 |
| UK infant | 281.56 | 9% | Potatoes | 7% | Oranges | | 4% | Apples | 1% | 1 |
| IT toddler | 280.46 | 11% | Tomatoes | 3% | Oranges | | 2% | Potatoes | 0.5% | 1 |
| PL general FI 6 yr | 271.98 267.94 | 9% 10% | Potatoes Potatoes | 7% 3% | Tomatoes Tomatoes | | 5% 2% | Apples Mandarins | 0.2% | 1 |
| IT adult | 267.94 249.87 | 9% | Tomatoes | 2% | Oranges | | 2% | Apples | 0.8% | 1 |
| FR adult | 243.08 | 6% | Wine grapes | 3% | Tomatoes | | 3% | Oranges | 0.6% | 1 |
| UK vegetarian | 235.14 | 5% | Oranges | 5% | Tomatoes | | 4% | Potatoes | 0.4% | 1 |
| LT adult | 209.84 | | Potatoes | 5% | Tomatoes | | 4% | Apples | 0.3% | |
| FR infant | | | | | | | | | | |
| FI adult DK adult | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| UK adult | 184.35 | 4% | Potatoes | 3% | Tomatoes | | 3% | Oranges | 0.3% | 1 |
| IE child | 46.40 | 2% | Potatoes | 0.8% | Apples | | 0.5% | Oranges | 0.1% | 1 |
| F | T adult R infant I adult IK adult IK adult | T adult 209.84 R infant 198.91 I adult 189.65 K adult 185.75 K adult 184.35 | T adult 209.84 9% R Infant 198.91 5% I adult 189.65 4% K adult 185.75 4% K adult 184.35 4% | T adult 209.84 9% Potatoes R Infant 198.91 5% Potatoes I adult 189.65 4% Tomatoes K adult 185.75 4% Tomatoes K adult 184.53 4% Potatoes | T adult 209.84 9% Potabos 5% R Infant 198.91 5% Potatoes 4% I adult 198.95 4% Tomatoes 3% K adult 189.75 4% Tomatoes 3% K adult 184.75 4% Tomatoes 3% | T adult 298,4 9% Potaloes 5% Tomatoes R infant 198.91 5% Potaloes 4% Apples I adult 198.95 4% Tomatoes 3% Potaloes K adult 189.75 4% Tomatoes 3% Potaloes K adult 184.35 4% Potaloes 3% Potaloes | T adult 298.84 9% Potatoes 5% Tomatoes R infant 198.91 5% Potatoes 4% Apples Iadult 188.05 4% Tomatoes 3% Potatoes K adult 185.75 4% Tomatoes 3% Potatoes K adult 184.35 4% Potatoes 3% Potatoes | T adult 298.44 9% Potaloes 5% Tomatoes 4% R infant 198.91 5% Potatoes 4% Apples 1% I adult 189.65 4% Tomatoes 3% Potatoes 2% K adult 185.75 4% Tomatoes 3% Potatoes 2% K adult 184.35 4% Potatoes 3% Tomatoes 3% | T adult 29.84 9% Potaloes 5% Tomatoes 4% Apples R Infant 198.91 5% Potatoes 4% Apples 1% Oranges I adult 189.95 4% Tomatoes 3% Potatoes 2% Oranges K adult 185.75 4% Tomatoes 3% Potatoes 2% Wine grapes K adult 184.35 4% Potatoes 3% Tomatoes 3% Oranges | Tadult 298.44 9% Potaloes 5% Tomatoes 4% Apples 0.3% Rinfant 198.91 5% Potatoes 4% Apples 1% Oranges 0.3% Iadult 188.95 4% Tomatoes 3% Potatoes 2% Oranges 2% K adult 187.5 4% Tomatoes 3% Potatoes 2% Wine grapes 0.3% K adult 184.35 4% Potatoes 3% Tomatoes 2% 0.3% |



| Acute risk assessment/children | Acute risk assessment/adults/general population |
|--|---|
| Details – acute risk assessment/children | Details – acute risk assessment/adults |

As an ARfD is not necessary/not applicable, no acute risk assessment is performed.

Show results for all crops

| Unprocessed commodities | Results for children No. of commodities fe exceeded (IESTI): | n or which ARfD/ADI is | | | Results for adults No. of commodities exceeded (IESTI): | for which ARfD/ADI is | | |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| L Co | IESTI | | | | IESTI | | | |
| ocessed | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) |
| Сли С | Expand/collapse list Total number of cor children and adult c (IESTI calculation) | mmodities exceeding the A liets | RfD/ADI in | | | | | |
| (0 | Deside for shill be | | | | Describe for a data | | | |
| noditie | Results for children No of processed com is exceeded (IESTI): | nmodities for which ARfD/AD | l | | Results for adults No of processed con is exceeded (IESTI): | nmodities for which ARfD/ADI | | |
| umo | IESTI | | | | IESTI | | | |
| Processed commodities | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Processed commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Processed commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) |
| Proc | | | | | | | | |

Expand/collapse list

Conclusion:



• Scenario 2b

| * | * | fsa a | | | assium phosphonates (p | hosphoni | | | | t values | | |
|--------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| * | | tca_ | | LOQs (mg/kg) range f | | to: | 3.8 | | hronic risk | Supplementary re | | |
| | · · E | | | 101/ 0.1 | Toxicological reference | | | asses | sment | chronic risk asses | sment | |
| - | - | | | ADI (mg/kg bw per da | y): 1 | ARfD (mg/kg bw): | Not necessary | Details-a | acuto rick | Details-acute | rick | |
| Euro | pean Foo | d Safety Authority | | Source of ADI: | EFSA | Source of ARfD: | EFSA | assessmer | | assessment/ac | | |
| | SA PRIMo re | vision 3.0; 2017/12/11 | | Year of evaluation: | 2018 | Year of evaluation: | 2018 | assessmen | ity crinititien | assessment/ad | iuita |) |
| nents: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Defined cold | ulation mode | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Chronic risk assessmen | | | | | | | |
| | | | | No of diets exceeding | | . JWFK method | biogy (IEDI/ I MIDI) | | | | Evroquir | e resulting fr |
| Т | | | | NO OF GIELS EXCEEDING | | | | | | | MRLs set at | t commoditi |
| | | | Expsoure | Highest contributor to | | 2nd contributor to | | | 3rd contributor to | | the LOQ (in % of | under asse (in % of . |
| Cal | culated exposur (% of ADI) | MS Diet | (µg/kg bw per day) | MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ aroup of commodities | MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ | | MS diet (in % of ADI) | Commodity/ group of commodities | (in % or ADI) | (|
| _ | (% of ADI) 91% | MS Diet DE child | day) 911.25 | (in % of ADI) 29% | group of commodities Apples | (in % of ADI) 18% | group of commodities Oranges | | (in % of ADI) 7% | group of commodities Tomatoes | - ' | + |
| | 90% | NL toddler | 901.35 | 25% | Apples | 11% | Potatoes | | 10% | Oranges | | 1 |
| | 72% | GEMS/Food G06 | 723.38 | 27% | Tomatoes | 6% | Watermelons | | 5% | Potatoes | | |
| | 56% | NL child | 556.34 | 13% | Apples | 9% | Potatoes | | 6% | Oranges | | |
| | 50% | GEMS/Food G11 | 498.68 | 11% | Potatoes | 7% | Tomatoes | | 4% | Apples | | |
| | 49% | RO general | 490.09 | 15% | Tomatoes | 10% | Potatoes | | 4% | Sweet peppers/bell peppers | | |
| | 48% 47% | GEMS/Food G08 GEMS/Food G10 | 484.62 468.35 | 11% 10% | Potatoes Tomatoes | 9% 8% | Tomatoes Potatoes | | 3% 5% | Apples Oranges | | |
| | 47% | GEMS/Food G15 | 465.55 | 10% | Potatoes | 9% | Tomatoes | | 5% | Sweet peppers/bell peppers | | |
| | 46% | GEMS/Food G07 | 458.60 | 10% | Potatoes | 8% | Tomatoes | | 6% | Oranges | | |
| | 45% | IE adult | 447.86 | 6% | Potatoes | 5% | Oranges | | 3% | Grapefruits | | |
| | 45% | FR child 3 15 yr | 445.31 | 16% | Oranges | 6% | Tomatoes | | 4% | Potatoes | | |
| | 39% | PT general | 394.97 | 14% | Potatoes | 7% | Tomatoes | | 6% | Wine grapes | | |
| | 38% | SE general | 381.34 | 11% | Potatoes | 6% | Tomatoes | | 3% | Oranges | | |
| | 37% 36% | DE women 14-50 yr | 371.27 | 9% 10% | Oranges | 6% 7% | Apples | | 6% 5% | Tomatoes | | |
| | 36% | ES child FR toddler 2 3 yr | 364.96 357.65 | 10% | Oranges Apples | 7% | Tomatoes Oranges | | 5% 5% | Potatoes Potatoes | | |
| | 34% | UK toddler | 340.34 | 9% | Potatoes | 9% | Oranges | | 4% | Tomatoes | | |
| | 34% | DE general | 336.14 | 7% | Oranges | 6% | Apples | | 5% | Tomatoes | | |
| | 31% | FI 3 yr | 311.38 | 13% | Potatoes | 4% | Tomatoes | | 2% | Apples | | |
| | 30% | NL general | 300.96 | 7% | Potatoes | 5% | Oranges | | 3% | Apples | | |
| | 28% | ES adult | 284.18 | 6% | Oranges | 6% | Tomatoes | | 3% | Potatoes | | |
| 1 | 28% 27% | DK child | 276.01 268.67 | 7% 9% | Potatoes | 5% 7% | Apples | | 4% 5% | Tomatoes | | 1 |
| | 27% | PL general IT toddler | 267.42 | 9% 11% | Potatoes Tomatoes | 2% | Tomatoes Potatoes | | 2% | Apples Oranges | | |
| 1 | 26% | FI 6 yr | 256.88 | 10% | Potatoes | 2% | Tomatoes | | 1% | Mandarins | | 1 |
| 1 | 25% | UK infant | 254.13 | 9% | Potatoes | 6% | Oranges | | 4% | Apples | | 1 |
| 1 | 24% | IT adult | 240.31 | 9% | Tomatoes | 2% | Apples | | 2% | Oranges | | 1 |
| 1 | 23% | FR adult | 228.33 | 6% | Wine grapes | 3% | Tomatoes | | 3% | Oranges | | 1 |
| 1 | 22% | UK vegetarian | 219.68 | 5% | Tomatoes | 4% | Oranges | | 4% | Potatoes | | 1 |
| 1 | 20% 19% | LT adult FR infant | 204.70 188.14 | 9% 5% | Potatoes Potatoes | 5% 4% | Tomatoes Apples | | 4% 1% | Apples Spinaches | | 1 |
| 1 | 19% | DK adult | 179.07 | 5% 4% | Tomatoes | 4% | Potatoes | | 2% | Wine grapes | | 1 |
| | 17% | UK adult | 173.02 | 4% | Potatoes | 3% | Tomatoes | | 3% | Wine grapes | | 1 |
| | 16% | FI adult | 159.68 | 4% | Tomatoes | 3% | Potatoes | | 2% | Oranges | | 1 |
| | 4% | IE child | 43.85 | 2% | Potatoes | 0.8% | Apples | | 0.4% | Tomatoes | | 1 |
| - | clusion: | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | I | | |
| | | term dietary intake (TMDI/NEDI/IEDI) | | | | | | | | | | |



| Acute risk assessment/children | Acute risk assessment/adults/general population |
|--|---|
| Details – acute risk assessment/children | Details – acute risk assessment/adults |

As an ARfD is not necessary/not applicable, no acute risk assessment is performed.

Show results for all crops

| Unprocessed commodities | | n or which ARfD/ADI is | | | Results for adults No. of commodities for which ARfD/ADI is | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| umo. | exceeded (IESTI): | | | | exceeded (IESTI): | | | | | |
| ad ce | IESTI | | | | IESTI | | | | | |
| rocesse | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | | |
| с, ч | Expand/collapse list Total number of cor children and adult c (IESTI calculation) | mmodities exceeding the Af | RfD/ADI in | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Processed commodities | Results for children No of processed com is exceeded (IESTI): | n modities for which ARfD/ADI | | | Results for adults No of processed con is exceeded (IESTI): | nmodities for which ARfD/ADI | | | | |
| umo | IESTI | | | | IESTI | | | | | |
| essed c | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Processed commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | Highest % of ARfD/ADI | Processed commodities | MRL/input for RA (mg/kg) | Exposure (µg/kg bw) | | |
| Proc | Expand/collapse list | | | | | | | | | |

Conclusion:



Appendix D – Input values for the exposure calculations

D.1. Consumer risk assessment

| Commodity | Chronic risk assessment | | Acute risk assessment | |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|---------|
| | Input value (mg/kg) | Comment | Input value (mg/kg) | Comment |
| Risk assessment re | esidue defi | inition: Phosphonic acid and its salts, expressed as pho | osphonic ac | cid |
| Blueberries | 35 | STMR-RAC | Considering the toxicological profile of the active substance, an acute risk assessment was not needed as the setting of an ARfD for the active substance was considered not necessary. | |
| | 250.5 | An STMR of 42.25 mg/kg was previously derived by EFSA based on an EU indoor GAP (EFSA, 2020a) for which MRL proposals are not yet implemented in the EU Legislation. | | |
| Almonds, Chestnuts, Hazelnuts/cobnuts, Pistachios, Walnuts | 358.5 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020a) ^(a) | | |
| Brazil nuts, cashew nuts, macadamias, pecans, pine nut kernels | 64.5 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2018b) | | |
| Pome fruits | 23.2 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2018b) | | |
| Peaches | 12.51 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2018b) | | |
| Table grapes | 15.5 | STMR-RAC (FAO, 2017) ^(b) | | |
| Wine grapes | 24.1 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020c) ^(a) | | |
| Strawberries | 11 | STMR-RAC (FAO, 2017) | | |
| Blackberries, Raspberries | 36.9 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020a) ^(a) | | |
| Currants, Gooseberries | 42.25 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020a) ^(a) | | |
| Elderberries | 18.4 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2018d) | | |
| Table olives | 23 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020c) ^(a) | | |
| Kiwi fruits | 23.5 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2012c) ^(b) | | |
| Avocados | 14.88 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020c) ^(a) | | |
| Granate apples/ pomegranates | 25 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020a) ^(a) | | |
| Potatoes | 26.9 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2019b) | | |
| Celeriacs/turnip rooted celeries | 0.21 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2015) | | |
| Horseradishes | 41.18 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020c) ^(a) | | |
| Garlic, Shallots | 4.4 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020c) ^(a) | | |
| Cucumbers | 14 | STMR-RAC (FAO, 2017) ^(b) | | |
| Courgettes | 25.5 | STMR-RAC (FAO, 2017) ^(b) | | |
| Melons | 14 | STMR-RAC (FAO, 2017) ^(b) | | |
| Flowering brassica | 11.35 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020b) ^(a) | | |
| Leafy brassica | 4.9 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020b) ^(a) | | |
| Lettuces | 41 | STMR-RAC (FAO, 2017) ^(b) | | |
| Spinaches | 47 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020b) ^(a) | | |
| Herbs and edible flowers | 98.25 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020a) ^(a) | | |
| Olives for oil production | 23 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020c) ^(a) | | |
| Wheat | 23.13 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2019b) | | |

| Commodity | Chronic risk assessment | | Acute risk assessment | |
|---|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|---------|
| | Input value (mg/kg) | Comment | Input value (mg/kg) | Comment |
| Hops | 350 | STMR-RAC (FAO, 2017) ^(b) | | |
| Spices | 74 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2012c) ^(b) | | |
| Horseradish, root spices | 41.18 | STMR-RAC (EFSA, 2020c) ^(a) | | |
| Other commodities of plant and animal origin (with MRL above LOQ) | MRL ^(c) | Draft Commission Regulation SANTE/11822/2019 ^(e) | | |
| Other commodities of plant and animal origin (with MRL at the LOQ) | LOQ ^(d) | Draft Commission Regulation SANTE/11822/2019 ^(e) | | |

STMR-RAC: supervised trials median residue in raw agricultural commodity; MRL: maximum residue level; LOQ: limit of quantification.

(a): STMR derived by EFSA based on GAPs of potassium phosphonates which MRL proposals are not yet implemented in the EU legislation.

(b): STMR derived based on the GAPs of Fosetyl-Al.

(c): Expressed as phosphonic acid by applying the molecular weight conversion factor of 0.75.

(d): In Scenario 2, Option b of the risk assessment: the commodities with MRLs established at the LOQ were excluded from the exposure calculation, assuming that the use of fosetyl and potassium phosphonate is not approved on these crops. In addition, the MRL for citrus fruits was multiplied by the peeling factor of 0.81.

(e): Draft Commission Regulation SANTE/11822/2019 revising MRLs in potatoes, wheat and products of animal origin has been voted at the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed Section Phytopharmaceuticals – Residues held on 26-27 September 2019. The regulation is not yet published in the Official Journal of the European Union.



| Code/trivial name ^(a) | IUPAC name/SMILES notation/InChiKey ^(b) | Structural formula ^(c) |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| potassium hydrogen | potassium hydrogen phosphonate | ο κ⁺ |
| phosphonate | [K+].O[PH]([O-])=O | HP=0 |
| | GNSKLFRGEWLPPA-UHFFFAOYSA-M | он |
| dipotassium phosphonate | Dipotassium phosphonate | O⁻ K⁺ |
| | [K+].[K+].[O-][PH]([O-])=O | HP=0 |
| | OZYJVQJGKRFVHQ-UHFFFAOYSA-L | ο ⁻ κ ⁺ |
| fosetyl | ethyl hydrogen phosphonate | 0 |
| | 0=P(0)0CC | О-НР́́ Н ₃ С—_́ОН |
| | VUERQRKTYBIULR-UHFFFAOYSA-N | |
| fosetyl-Al | aluminium tris(ethyl phosphonate) | с <u>э</u> |
| fosetyl aluminium | [Al+3].[O-]P(=0)OCC.[O-]P(=0)OCC.[O-]P(=0) OCC | $H_3C - H_{I}$ |
| | ZKZMJOFIHHZSRW-UHFFFAOYSA-K | |
| phosphonic acid | phosphonic acid | ŎН |
| phosphorous acid | 0=P(0)0 | |
| | ABLZXFCXXLZCGV-UHFFFAOYSA-N | он |

Appendix E – Used compound codes

IUPAC: International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry; SMILES: simplified molecular-input line-entry system; InChiKey: International Chemical Identifier Key.

(a): The metabolite name in bold is the name used in the conclusion.

(b): ACD/Name 2019.1.3 ACD/Labs 2019 Release (File version N05E41, Build 111418, 3 September 2019).

(c): ACD/ChemSketch 2019.1.3 ACD/Labs 2019 Release (File version C05H41, Build 111302, 27 August 2019).