

Pesticide Residue Control Results

“National summary report”

Country: *Finland*

Year: 2013

National competent authority/organisation:

Finnish Food Safety Authority Evira and Finnish Customs

Web address where the national annual report is published:

<http://www.evira.fi/portal/fi/evira/asiakokonaisuudet/vierasaineet/kasvinsuojeluainejaamat/valvonta/>

The purpose of this document is to provide additional, complimentary information in support to the national data and information already provided in the XML file in line with the SSD data model. In particular, this document is useful to report information that may not be held by laboratories; for example, the possible reasons and the actions taken in case of samples non compliant with the EU MRLs.

This document should report information concerning sample of both plant and animal origin. If different national bodies are responsible for pesticide residue control in the two sample matrices it is the responsibility of the national competent authorities to co-ordinate the collection and compilation of the information to be reported in this document at national level .

1. Objective and design of the national control programme

In the design of the monitoring plan in Finland, the following factors have been considered:

- EU-commissions Regulation concerning a coordinated multiannual control programme of the Union
- Importance of a commodity in national food consumption
- Food commodities with high residues/non-compliance rate in previous years
- Number of organic/conventional production samples reflects the market shares
- Origin of food: domestic, EU or third country
- RASFF notifications
- Co-operation possibilities in sampling with different contaminant projects
- Needs of the national risk assessment projects

The selection criteria for pesticide residues and metabolites included into the control program are the following:

- Those pesticides which are commonly used and which are known to leave residues in foods are included. Frequency of pesticide findings in the EU-monitoring reports is used as selection criteria.
- Pesticides listed in the Regulation concerning a coordinated multiannual control programme are included as far as possible.
- Toxicity of the active substances is considered. E.g. many toxic OP-compounds which are not commonly used anymore are still included (they may occur in samples originating from the developing countries)
- Pesticides that are authorized for use in Finland are included into the program when relevant
- Multiresidue analyses are preferred, as the cost of analysis in case of single residue methods is higher. If many single residue analyses are performed the total number of samples to be analysed is decreased.
- Single residue methods are run as required by the EU coordinated programme and a limited number of other samples. Instrument and personnel capacity in the laboratories is limiting the number of single residue analyses.

2. Key findings, interpretation of the results and comparability with the previous year results

The total number of samples analysed under the national and EU coordinated programs was 2408, which is 7 % more than previous year. This total number includes 195 follow-up enforcement samples or samples based on the Regulation (EC) No. 669/2009. The number of

samples taken under the EU coordinated program was 466.

The distribution of the samples by origin was: domestic 13 %, EEA 40 %, other countries not EEA 45 % and unknown 2 %.

51 % of all samples had residues of one or more pesticide active ingredients. Exceedances of MRLs were found in 122 samples and 66 of them were non-compliant (measurement uncertainty taken in to consideration; including surveillance and enforcement samples). The percentage of non-compliances (2.7 %) increased slightly compared to previous year (2.2 %). The non-complying lots originated from 17 different countries. Highest number of non-compliances was in Indian products as 19 lots were rejected. Several non-complying samples were found also in products of Egypt (6), Thailand (6) and Spain (5). Twelve non-complying samples originated from EEA countries including three domestic samples. In addition two domestic leek samples had residues of pesticides which are not authorized in Finland to be used on leek. Information of these misuses was forwarded to the authorities responsible for the control of pesticide usage.

Most non-compliant samples were fresh or frozen vegetables and fruit and other plant products. Only 5 processed products and 2 cereal samples were non-compliant. The commodities with most non-compliances were tea (9 samples), basil and other fresh herbs (9), leaf vegetables and spinach (7), oranges (6) and currants (5). The baby food samples and samples of foods of animal origin did not contain any residues.

This year 195 enforcement samples were taken from fruits and nuts (105), vegetables (57) and tea (33). Only 12 enforcement samples were from EEA countries. The number of non-compliances was 19 (9.7 %). Among the enforcement samples there were 130 samples taken in the framework of regulation 669/2009. Ten samples (7.7 %) of these were non-complying.

466 samples were taken under the EU coordinated program. All samples were compliant.

A total of 227 samples from organic production were analysed. 26 samples had residues above reporting limit. In 6 samples the residues exceeded the MRLs and 5 samples were non-compliant.

The number of multiresidue compounds analysed from samples of plant origin was 327 active ingredients and metabolites. From animal products (other than honey) 74 compounds were analysed.

3. Non-compliant samples: possible reasons and actions taken

In 2013, 2.7 % of the samples (66 samples in total) were found to be non-compliant with the EU MRLs.

For 5 samples RASSF notifications were issued.

The following follow-up actions were taken in case of sample non-compliant with the EU MRL (measurement uncertainty taken into consideration):

Table 1: Actions taken on the non-compliant samples

| Number of non-compliant samples | Action taken | Note |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 19 | Warnings Administrative sanctions | Enforcement samples, The lots were detained and destroyed under Customs control or sent back to the seller by permission of authorities in the country of origin. |
| 47 | Administrative sanctions | The lot partly or totally consumed. The remaining part detained and destroyed or sent back to the seller by permission of authorities in the country of origin. Enforcement sampling on next coming import lots. |
| 5 | RASFF notification – border rejection - lot detained- no distribution | Sample code: 13-00885-02 RASFF ref: 2013.ASK, Sample code: 13-02266-02 RASFF ref: 2013.AYA Sample code: 1-02964-02 RASFF ref: 2013.BCK Sample code: 13-04045-03 RASFF ref: 2013.BKP, Sample code: 13-04532-01 RASFF ref: 2013.BKO |
| 1 | RASFF notification - product distributed, recall from consumers | Sample code: 13-02730-04, 13-02885-01 and 13-02885-02 RASFF ref: 2013.0652 |
| 1 | RASFF notification – product already consumed | Sample code: 13-08384-01 RASFF ref: 2014.009 |
| 1 | Recall from consumers | Turnips Sample code: MLAB 2013-11851-01 The lot partly consumed. The remaining part detained and destroyed under the control of competent authority of Uusikaupunki. |

Table 2: Possible reasons for MRL non compliance

| Product | Residue | Reasons for MRL non-compliance | Note |
|---------------------------|--|---|----------------------|
| Basil | carbendazim clofentezine thiophanate-methyl tetraconazole | Use of an approved pesticide on a crop for which the use was not (or no longer) permitted. | Kenya, India, Israel |
| Basil | anthraquinone | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Uganda |
| Basil | triazophos | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | India |
| Beans (dry) | methamidophos acephate | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Thailand |
| Beans (with bods) | profenofos | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Uganda |
| Brussels sprouts | tau-fluvalinate | Use of an approved pesticide on a crop for which the use was authorised, but not respecting the GAP (dose rate, PHI, etc) | Finland |
| Carrots | iprodione | Use of an approved pesticide on a crop for which the use was authorised, but not respecting the GAP (dose rate, PHI, etc) | Israel |
| Cucurbits (inedible peel) | acephate | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | India |
| Currants | propargite | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Poland, Morocco |
| Currants | fenazaquin | Use of an approved pesticide on a crop for which the use was authorised, but not respecting the GAP (dose rate, PHI, etc) | Poland |
| Fresh herbs | ethion profenofos triazophos acephate | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | India |
| Herbal infusions | anthraquinone propargite | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Russia, USA |
| Kale | pirimicarb | Use of an approved pesticide on a crop for which the use was authorised, but not respecting the GAP (dose rate, PHI, etc) | Spain |
| Onions | methamidophos | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Peru |
| Oranges | profenofos diazinon | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Egypt |
| Oranges | dimethoate | Use of a pesticide on a crop for which no import tolerance is set. | Egypt |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|----------------------|
| Peppers | profenofos triazophos ethion | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | India, Thailand |
| Peppers | methiocarb | Use of an approved pesticide on a crop for which the use was authorised, but not respecting the GAP (dose rate, PHI, etc) | Spain |
| Peppers | methomyl | Use of a pesticide on a crop for which no import tolerance is set. | Spain |
| Scarole (broad- leaf endive) | phorate triadimefon | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Spain |
| Spring Onions | chlorfenapyr | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | Thailand |
| Spring Onions | carbendazim diflubenzuron fipronil | Use of a pesticide on a crop for which no import tolerance is set. | Thailand |
| Tea | quintozene | Use of a pesticide which is not approved in the EU | India |
| Tea | acetamiprid buprofezin dimethoate fipronil imidacloprid methomyl 2-phenylphenol | Use of a pesticide on a crop for which no import tolerance is set. | China, India, Taiwan |
| Turnip | dimethoate | Use of an approved pesticide on a crop for which the use was not (or no longer) permitted. | Finland |

4. Quality assurance

Table 3: Laboratories participating in the control programme

| Country code | Laboratory Name | Laboratory Code | Accreditation Date | Accreditation Body | Participation in proficiency tests or interlaboratory tests |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|--|
| FI | Finnish Customs Laboratory | FI01 | 24/03/2014 | FINAS-Espoo, Finland | EUPT-FV15, EUPT-C7, EUPT-SRM8, EUPT-FV-SM5, EUPT-FV-T01, FAPAS 0592, IMEP-37, BIPEA 05-03019, BIPEA 04-3219, BIPEA 0619-066, BIPEA-08-0619, BIPEA 04-2619, BIPEA 3119-0026, BIPEA 04-3119, BIPEA 03-0519 |
| FI | MetropoliLab Oy | FI02 | 30/06/2014 | FINAS-Espoo, Finland | EUPT-FV15 |
| FI | Finnish Food Safety Authority | FI03 | 29/11/2013 | FINAS-Espoo, Finland | FAPAS 0984, FAPAS 0587, EUPT AO-08, EUPT SRM8, EUPT-CF7 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

5. Additional Information