The Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues in Food provides independent advice to the Health and Safety Executive, Food Standards Agency and UK Ministers on matters relating to the surveillance programme; this is the 32nd meeting of the committee.

Those present:

Chairman:
Dr P Brantom

Members:
Ms A Davison, Dr J Blackman, Mr I Finlayson, Dr S Freeman, Mr J Points

Representatives:
Mr A Dixon (Health and Safety Executive), Mr D Faulkner (Northern Irish Government), Ms E Ingram (Health and Safety Executive), Dr D Mortimer (Food Standards Agency), Dr S Nawaz (National Reference Laboratory), Ms K Reid (Scottish Government)

Observers:
Stakeholder observers were present throughout the meeting, other than the pre-meeting session.

Pre-meeting session

1.1 HSE updated the Committee on the approach being taken on a recent technical analytical incident. The Committee agreed the approach taken to date was sensible and thorough.

Agenda item 1: Chairman’s Introduction

1.1 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Open Business Meeting. He asked the observers to note any questions or comments, and ask them at the end of the meeting, so they could see how the meeting proceeded.
Agenda item 2: Introductions and declarations of interest

2.1 The Chairman explained that there were no changes to the interests that Committee members had previously declared.

Agenda item 3: Apologies

3.1 Apologies were received from Dr G Wedzicha and Defra.

Agenda item 4: Action points from PRiF meeting of 23 January 2019

4.1 Minutes of the last meeting

4.1.1 The Chairman confirmed that the minutes of the last meeting were agreed and had been published. HSE confirmed that the report for Q3 2018 was published on 8 March, and all actions relating to the format of the report had been completed.

4.2 Fungicide Resistance Action Group (FRAG) guidance document

4.2.1 The Secretariat was aware that FRAG had produced a draft document which was being circulated amongst its members. A Committee member said that the document included all soft fruits. It is useful, comprehensive and will be published by the end of May.

Action: Complete

4.3 Lower analytical reporting levels for monitoring of infant food

4.3.1 The Secretariat reminded members that there had been discussion at a European level as to whether it was necessary to lower the analytical reporting levels in infant food. The original issue related to whether a more precautionary level should be applied to infants under 16 weeks old. HSE had produced a summary paper on this topic for the October 2018 meeting. It was subsequently agreed that a few pesticides would be identified for additional validation work by the EU Reference Laboratory (EURL). HSE will circulate the original October 2018 paper and provide an update on the EURL position.

Action: Secretariat

4.3.2 HSE informed the meeting that testing for glyphosate (parent only) was a mandatory requirement for certain EU surveys in 2019. The UK National Reference Laboratory had conducted research during 2018 into methods for glyphosate metabolites that may form part of the future residue definition. The Secretariat had prepared a paper summarising the results and had circulated this to members. The UK National Reference Laboratory had bought new specialised
equipment for these tests. It had now been validated and the laboratory was confident that it would meet the required specifications. The Scottish Government representative confirmed that they also would be testing for glyphosate in specific surveys during 2019.

**Action: Complete**

4.4 **Acetamiprid**

4.4.1 The Secretariat reported that there had been several residues in Chinese cabbage of acetamiprid (0.02mg/kg (MRL=1.5 mg/kg in Chinese leaf and 3 mg/kg in baby leaf), which in the UK is only permitted for use on baby leaf crops. Some pesticides have been specifically authorised by HSE for use on baby leaf crops, but this does not automatically mean that they are also permitted for use on a crop grown to maturity. This is clarified on the product label or on the [Extension of Authorisation for Minor Use (EAMU)](https://www.hse.gov.uk/pesticides/). The Grower Liaison Group (GLG), made up of grower representatives who work with HSE to deliver the [UK Action Plan for the Sustainable Use of Pesticides Directive](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/acton-plan-for-the-sustainable-use-of-pesticides-directive) discussed this misinterpretation of the baby leaf uses. HSE, with the assistance of GLG members would explore routes for disseminating information in future when findings arose.

**Action: Ongoing**

4.5 **Communication: email addresses**

4.5.1 The Secretariat had started its review of the protocol for holding stakeholder’s email addresses, as part of a general review for compliance with General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) requirements. This is ongoing, as further work is required.

**Action: Secretariat**

4.6 **Communications: corrections**

4.6.1 The Secretariat had corrected the spelling of Jonathan Blackman’s name on the PRiF website, corrected links to the 2017 annual report and published the Q3 report.

**Action: Complete**

4.7 **Chlorate: progress on setting new MRLs, effect on Quarter 3 2018 report**

4.7.1 Members had identified potential microbiological food safety concerns over the EU proposals to amend chlorate MRLs, which might lead to reductions in disinfectant uses in food processing. HSE and FSA emphasised that they continued to work closely to represent UK’s position and that Government would
not compromise on microbiological safety or allow unsafe food into the market. It was felt that further discussion and clarification were needed. The Secretariat had updated the note on chlorate in the PRiF report and had included chlorate on the agenda for the PRiF meeting today.

**Action: Complete**

4.8.2 **Impact of MRLs on biocides use**

4.9.1 The aims for a meeting with the ACMSF, a scientific advisory committee that provides the FSA with independent expert advice on matters relating to the microbiological safety of food, were discussed. It was expected to assess the concerns originally raised by sections of the food industry on the implications of changes to the MRLs for QACs, chlorate and other biocidal active substances. It was felt that, in general, larger industry businesses were prepared for the proposed changes, whilst smaller wholesalers might stop using disinfectants and would need targeted guidance and clear instruction to help maintain safe practices, and share information with suppliers. The Secretariat had monitored progress and this item would be covered at today’s meeting.

**Action: Complete**

4.10 **Apples**

4.10.1 Dithiocarbamates residues were found in 2 samples of apples in Q3 2018, thought to be from the UK but confirmed as being from outside the EU. Traceability of samples from the suppliers was discussed. The Secretariat said that small businesses generally dealt with a few suppliers, and it was likely that traceability to the grower would be possible, if required. The Secretariat had checked details relating to these 2 samples, as requested. Only one was from the UK.

**Action: Complete**

4.11 **Berries and small fruits**
4.11.1 The Secretariat had cross-referenced the results for fresh and frozen blueberries in the Q3 report, and would cross-reference them in future reports.

**Action: Complete**

4.12 Cheese (soft)

4.12.1 The Secretariat had inserted a separate section to cover chlorate issues and this was signposted from appropriate sampling categories, to cover chlorate residues in Q3 2018. An error in sentence construction on page 35 of the report was also corrected.

**Action: Complete**

4.13 Fish (white)

4.13.1 The first line of the ‘BAC (sum) and DDAC’ section on page 42 of the Q3 2018 report had been edited for clarity.

**Action: Complete**

4.14 Ginger

4.14.1 It had been noted that non-compliance was found in the Chinese samples. The high level of non-compliance in Chinese samples tested across Europe has led to this survey being conducted. HSE confirmed that the “ranking tool” used to prioritise the foods for testing programme will be discussed at agenda item 11. An assessor agreed that it was important to carefully look at how the number of RASFF’s influences the ranking points.

4.15 Pineapple

4.15.1 The Secretariat explained that samples included both canned and fresh pineapple. They emphasised that, because some pineapples from other countries were prepared in UK, the stated source was not necessarily the country of origin. As requested, the Secretariat had added a separate section for prepared pineapple in the Brand Name Annex (BNA).

**Action: Complete**

4.16 Vine leaves

4.16.1 The Secretariat had added a sentence to the Q3 2018 report to clarify that vine leaves, as a food commodity are subject to their own separate set of MRLs, distinct from those for vine and table grapes.

**Action: Complete**

4.17 Lettuce
4.17.1 HSE’s investigation into a sample of lettuce from the UK containing inorganic bromide had found no evidence of illegal use of methyl bromide and had not identified a source for the residue. The investigation had now been closed and classed as an isolated incident. The Committee supported this conclusion.

Action: Complete

4.18 Rolling Reporting update

4.18.1 The Rolling Reporting update was not available at the last meeting but had subsequently been uploaded on Huddle, and would be discussed today.

Action: Complete

4.19 2019 Open Event

4.19.1 The Communications Sub-Group and Secretariat would update the meeting on progress with 2019 Open Event, and suggestions for items for inclusion would be discussed during the Communications Update today.

Action: Ongoing

4.20 Travel claims for PRiF members

4.20.1 Attendees were asked to submit any outstanding travel claims by lunchtime today.

Action: Ongoing

Agenda item 5: Matters Arising

5.1 The Secretariat explained that a summary of the current position in developing and implementing cumulative risk assessment methodology had been uploaded onto Huddle. Work on this was ongoing in the EU, and no final position had yet been reached.

Agenda item 6

6.1 There was no Agenda item 6, as there had been a numbering error on the agenda. The minutes relate to the agenda as provided on the day.

Agenda item 7: Update from the PRiF Analytical Sub Group (ASG)

7.1 The Secretariat reminded the meeting that the National Reference Laboratory (NRL) conducted a Defra funded research project to develop and validate a method glyphosate and its metabolites that may form part of the future residue definition for glyphosate. It was not possible to achieve the full aims of this project
due to technical reason. However, the work enabled the NRL to identify possible solutions to these issues and implement improved and complete the validation work during the course of 2019 monitoring programme. More updates will be available for the next PRiF meeting in July.

7.2 The National Reference Laboratory also provide a summary of progress made so far for another Defra funded research project for dithiocarbamates analysis. Dithiocarbamate residues are currently tested using a common marker common moiety (CS2). All dithiocarbamates contain this common moiety and therefore it is not possible to identify which dithiocarbamate(s) is present. Development work is underway to develop methods for some of the more toxic individual dithiocarbamates. Any samples found to contain CS2 above an agreed threshold would be re-analysed to determine if the ziram, thiram or propineb were present. This extra information will allow PRiF to make more informed risk assessments. The Secretariat agreed to update future PRiF meeting with progress on this.

Agenda item 8: Current topics update

8.1 EU Exit

8.1.1 HSE explained that they have produced guidance to help stakeholders prepare in the event that the UK leaves the EU without a deal (and therefore without an implementation period). As a contingency the government has made changes to legislation to ensure regulation of chemicals continues if the UK leaves the EU without a deal. With or without a deal, after we leave the EU the UK Government and devolved administrations have assured stakeholders that we will maintain current standards of environmental and health protection.

8.2 Chlorate

8.2.1 Progress on development of proposed MRLs: HSE attended a meeting in Brussels on 13 May to discuss chlorate. The main points were:

- The suggestion to deal with chlorate under contaminants or other legislation rather than 396/2005 was rejected. The European Commission is clear that the issue must be handled under 396/2005.

- The meeting identified a few potential changes to the proposal, based on a fresh reading of submitted data (from both MS and Industry), the levels arising in new data (mostly 2018 monitoring results), and consultation responses where industry has suggested (and provided reasonable argument for) higher levels to be set. However, these changes apply only to certain foods, where data or argument enable the position to change.
• The Commission will look to produce a further proposal (amended in accordance with the above) for discussion at the June Standing Committee. The Secretariat will update the Committee on developments after the June Standing Committee meeting.

**Action:** Secretariat

• The Commission is committed to putting a proposal for vote this year (probably for vote no later than this Autumn, although no specific date was mentioned). They have agreed at senior level that this cannot be allowed to drag on.

8.2.2 Members asked if the EU **REFIT** (the European Commission’s regulatory fitness and performance programme) review of plant protection product legislation might produce changes to legislation which would address the chlorate issue. HSE advised that it awaits the Commission’s report of its REFIT review. However, although offering obvious scope for improvement, it is unclear whether the Commission will propose revising the legislation. In any event, the Commission were working to a shorter timescale on proposing chlorate MRLs than on the REFIT review, and any consequential actions.

8.2.3 **Impact of MRLs on biocide use:** It was felt that the impact of MRLs on biocides could not be assessed until the proposals for MRLs had been finalised. A Committee member pointed out that a residue arising from the appropriate use of an approved biocide may not be compliant with the plant protection product MRL. It was acknowledged that for the moment biocide uses do not lead to MRL’s being established. The Secretariat said that this was a complex issue. They would keep the meeting updated on chlorate and the timetable for implementation to any changes to the MRLs.

**Action:** Secretariat

8.2.4 **Work with ACMSF:** The Secretariat explained that work on how residues and microbiological safety of food was affected, was being undertaken by ACMSF. This was ongoing, and the Secretariat would keep the Committee updated on progress, this is already a standing item on the agenda.

**Agenda item 9: Draft Quarter 4 2018 Report**
9.1 The Secretariat explained that brand name information had been redacted from the documents supplied for the observers, and commodities were listed in alphabetical order.

9.2 Animal fats

9.2.1 One sample contained a residue of DDAC above the MRL. The supplier had been written to, but no response had been received. This residue would be expected not to have an effect on health.

9.3 Apples

9.3.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.4 Aubergines

9.4.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected, and no safety issues were identified. A Committee member asked how non-UK unapproved uses were handled. The Secretariat explained that only UK unapproved uses were taken further. The authorisation and use of a plant protection product is regulated and enforced at a national level. It is not UK responsibility, nor do the regulators have the information to identify non authorised use in non-domestic produce. Exceedances of common European MRL’s were notified to regulators outside the UK. Any residues of pesticides in UK organic produce are notified to the appropriate branch of Defra, who then consider appropriate action.

9.5 Bananas

9.5.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected, and no safety issues were identified.

9.5.2 Two organic samples, from the Dominican Republic contained residues. The Chairman explained that Defra monitor the safety of organic produce, and the Secretariat said that the EU had an obligation to test organics. A Committee member pointed out that a retailer’s name was misspelt in the BNA, and the Secretariat would check this.

Action: Secretariat

9.5.4 The Secretariat clarified that samples of organic products with residues were not treated differently in the brand name tables. Residues over the MRLs were highlighted in the brand name tables, but the samples were not highlighted if there were residues at or under the MRL.
9.6 Beans with pods

9.6.1 Three samples contained residues above the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. A Committee member pointed out that a residue recorded for fipronil was incorrect, and the Secretariat would correct this.

Action: Secretariat

9.6.2 One of the samples contained a residue of monocrotophos. There is uncertainty about the potential for monocrotophos to cause genetic damage, on a precautionary basis any findings of this residue in food are considered to be undesirable. It was felt that the risk was low, unless a large quantity of food containing the residue were eaten on a regular basis. The Secretariat said that the Indian Embassy would be advised of any samples from India containing monocrotophos.

Action: Secretariat

9.7 Beef

9.7.1 Various samples of beef were tested. No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.8 Beer

9.8.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.8.2 Residues of chlorate were found in 22 of the samples. Residues of chlorate in beer were expected as disinfection is a routine process in brewing, essential to successful beer production as well as hygiene. Another potential source is chlorinated potable (drinking) water used by the brewer from the local public supply.

9.8.3 The Secretariat explained that only beer from retail outlets, not pubs, had been sampled. There had been no contact with suppliers, but they would be advised when the results were published.

Action: Secretariat

9.9 Bread

9.9.1 The Secretariat said that different types of bread were sampled each year. For this report brown, white, wholemeal and other were sampled. None of the samples contained a residue above the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.
9.9.2 A Committee member asked that the statements concerning the use of "processing factors" (PF's) should be added to this report in the same way as had been done previously.

Action: Secretariat

9.9.3 It was pointed out that processing factors were not available for every pesticide/bread combination. The Secretariat would use PF's where they were applicable.

9.9.4 The Secretariat would correct a typographic error in the last paragraph of this section.

Action: Secretariat

9.10 Broccoli

9.10.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.10.2 Two UK samples contained a residue of tri-allate, which is not approved for use on broccoli in the UK. Details of both samples were passed to HSE Enforcement who will be investigating further. One sample was organic, so HSE will also liaise with Defra's Organic Farming Branch and the relevant organic certification organisations after these enquiries.

9.11 Cheese (soft)

9.11.1 Nine samples contained residues above the MRLs. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. Chlorate residues above the MRL were found in 9 of the samples. It was expected that chlorate would be found in dairy products, where disinfection could be used as part of routine processes, or where the food is packed in water.

9.11.2 The Q4 report would be published at the end of June, and the 2018 report in July.

Action: Secretariat

9.12 Eggs

9.12.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. The secretariat stated that tests for fipronil were included.
9.13 Fish (white)

9.13.1 A range of samples were tested. No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.13.2 A Committee member asked if any biocide residues were found in the samples. The Secretariat would check the results for this.

**Action:** Secretariat

9.14 Frozen fruits and smoothie mixes

9.14.1 Ten samples contained residues above the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.14.2 Residues of chlorate over the MRL were found in 9 of the 10 samples. It was expected that chlorate would be found in frozen foods products, where disinfection is used as part of routine processes. Only pesticides that were also disinfectants were sought in this survey. The Secretariat would clarify this in the summary of this commodity.

**Action:** Secretariat

9.15 Game

9.15.1 Two samples contained residues above the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.15.2 Both samples were of residues of BAC (sum) above the MRL. They came from the same butcher, who was concerned as BAC (sum) was used in accordance with the instructions.

9.15.3 The Secretariat would highlight these samples in the BNA tables, and check them.

**Action:** Secretariat

9.16 Ginger

9.16.1 Five samples contained residues above the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.16.2 All the samples were from China and contained residues of clothianidin and cyromazine. The Secretariat was unsure if they were all part of the same batch. The FSA suggested notifying the ports. The Secretariat will liaise with the FSA about how best to do this.
Action: Secretariat

9.17 Grapefruit

9.17.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in any of the samples surveyed. One sample contained a residue of chlorpyrifos and 20 samples contained residues of imazalil where the effect on health needed to be considered in more detail. Risk assessment of the detected residues concluded that an effect on health is unlikely when all the peel is consumed. If the peel is not consumed, an effect on health is not expected. None of the other residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.17.2 Some samples contained more than 1 residue, resulting in combined risk assessments. It was considered that the wording for these assessments could be confusing, so the Secretariat agreed to consider the wording for future assessments.

Action: Secretariat

9.17.3 There was discussion about the requirement for some citrus fruit (but not grapefruit) to be labelled with any post-harvest use of pesticides. The HMI inspectors noted such labelling on the sample forms submitted to HSE. The Secretariat would update HMI on any findings.

Action: Secretariat

9.18 Grapes

9.18.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.18.2 The Secretariat explained that the EU were considering the CAG (Common Assessment Group) definitions for certain chemicals, which may affect combined risk assessments, so would check on the wording of the last paragraph.

Action: Secretariat

9.19 Lettuce

9.19.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.19.2 HSE is investigating a case of unapproved use of spinetoram, which is not approved for use in the UK. The Secretariat will keep the Committee updated on progress with this investigation.

Action: Secretariat
9.19.3 One sample from outside the UK contained residues that required further investigation, and the Secretariat would pass details on to HSE Enforcement.

Action: Secretariat

9.20 Melon

9.20.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. All samples were tested for chlorate.

9.21 Milk

9.21.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.22 Mushrooms (cultivated)

9.22.1 One residue above the MRL was detected in the samples surveyed. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. A sample of button mushrooms from the UK contained a residue of 2-phenylphenol. The supplier had been contacted, and no response received. It was thought likely to have been caused by biocidal use, and no further action will be taken.

9.22.2 A residue of mepiquat was suspected to have come from straw.

9.23 Okra

9.23.1 Two samples contained a residue above the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.23.2 One sample from India contained residues above the MRL of flonacimid and tebuconazole. The Secretariat had written to the brand owner, and would check this sample further, as they needed to know more about the residues.

Action: Secretariat

9.24 Olive oil

9.24.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. One sample needed to have the country of origin added to the BNA table.

Action: Secretariat
9.25  **Pears**

9.25.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. One sample contained residues of dithiocarbamates to the level where a more detailed risk assessment was required. It has not yet been possible to determine which pesticide in the dithiocarbamate group was present. It was assumed that ziram was used, which may lead to a loss of appetite where large portions were consumed. Effects would be reversible and effect on health would be low. The supplier has been asked which dithiocarbamate was used.

9.26  **Peas without pods**

9.26.1 Seven samples contained residues above the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. Various peas were surveyed, including frozen and canned. The canned samples with residues above the MRL were all chlorate. The Secretariat would clarify the number of fresh peas included in the survey.

**Action:** Secretariat

9.26.2 The Secretariat would double-check the content of the second paragraph of the Risk assessments section.

**Action:** Secretariat

9.27  **Peppers**

9.27.1 Two samples contained residues above the MRLs. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. Two samples from Poland contained residues of ethephon above the MRL. A sample of red pepper contained a residue of ethephon of 4mg/kg where the MRL is 0.05mg/kg, where the effect on health needed to be considered in more detail. The risk assessment concluded that an effect on health was unlikely. A RASFF was issued for this sample. Some numbering issues were raised on pages 85 to 88 of the report, and the Secretariat would check these.

**Action:** Secretariat

9.28  **Pineapple**

9.28.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. Samples surveyed included fresh, canned, frozen and prepared pineapple. One sample included a residue of prochloraz (sum) and required further investigation, which concluded that an effect on health was unlikely.
9.28.2 The Secretariat would clarify that fresh samples tested included the peel and makes this clear in the summary of results.

**Action:** Secretariat

9.29 *Potatoes*

9.29.1 No samples contained residues over the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. Samples surveyed were of maincrop and new potatoes.

9.30 *Soft citrus*

9.30.1 No samples contained residues over the MRL. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health. One sample contained an MRL of thiabendazole that required further investigation. Risk assessment of the detected residues concluded that an effect on health is unlikely when all the peel is consumed, and an effect on health is not expected when no peel is consumed.

**Action:** Secretariat

9.31 *Speciality Vegetables*

9.31.1 One sample contained a residue above the MRL. A sample of eddoes contained a residue of thiabendazole above the MRL, which required a detailed risk assessment. The risk assessment found that some loss of appetite may be experienced after eating large portions of eddoes containing the highest levels found in the report. These effects were expected to be short-lived, minor and reversible. A RASFF was issued for this sample.

9.31.2 One sample of mooli contained a residue of dithiocarbamates at a level where a more detailed risk assessment was required. A risk assessment was undertaken, based on the assumption that ziram was present, and it was concluded that an effect on health would be unlikely.

9.31.3 One sample of taro from Bangladesh contained a level of DDT (sum). The use of DDT is banned or heavily restricted in many countries because residues take a long time to break down in the environment. By the nature of the residue it is concluded that this could be from recent use. The last residue of DDT reflecting recent use was found in fish also from Bangladesh in 2013. The Bangladesh embassy has been informed about this finding.

9.31.4 A sample of radish from the UK contained a residue of dithiocarbamates. It is suspected that this residue is not from illegal use but is an analytical artefact due to a naturally occurring residue.

9.32 *Wheat*
9.32.1 No residues above the MRLs were detected in the samples. None of the residues detected would be expected to have an effect on health.

9.33 Follow-up from previous reports

Quarter 3 2017

9.33.1 Some samples of raspberries contained chlorpyrifos which was not authorised for that use. As some considerable time has passed since the original findings, the Chairman asked that where no further information is expected then the topic should be closed with an appropriate comment, even if the investigation remains inconclusive.

Action: Secretariat

9.33.2 The chlorate section would be updated before the report is published.

Action: Secretariat

Agenda item 10: Rolling reporting update

10.1 The Chairman explained that the Rolling Reporting had been completed, and there were no concerns.

Agenda item 11: 2020 Monitoring Plan

11.1 The Secretariat explained that commodities to be sampled for each year had certain parameters. The frequency of being sampled earned points, then other issues such as Brexit, MRLs, and what other EU members were sampling is considered before deciding on commodities to sample.

11.2 A Committee member asked if infant formula was covered by separate legislation. The Secretariat explained that it was, but there was an understanding that this food would be covered in the general food survey organised by HSE.

11.3 The Secretariat gave an overview of the scoring system and explained that it was only a guide to the priority. Any food with over 100 points warrants consideration as a high priority, but there is still a need to sense check the scores for double counting the same issue. Some food with high scores is already being tested during 2019 and may not require testing again in 2020. The Secretariat would check the scores awarded to cauliflower and broccoli, as there was some inconsistency.

Action: Secretariat
The Secretariat will update the plan and send to the interested parties list. They would also organise a meeting with PRiF members who wish to be involved, and the FSA, to discuss any comments received and the way forward.

**Action:** Secretariat

**Agenda item 12: Communication update**

**12.1 2019 Open Event**

12.1.1 A Committee member said that the in the absence of any justification for an alternative venue, the Open Meeting would be held in York, on Wednesday 16 October. The topic will be the Future of Farming. The Communications sub-group had identified possible speakers and will be approaching them to confirm their acceptance to speak. There was some discussion about a speaker providing an update on technological advances (not just drones). The Secretariat can follow this up.

12.1.2 The programme would be completed by the next PRiF meeting, the Secretariat would create an Eventbrite page to enable booking before the programme is issued, and details of the event would be added to the 2018 Annual Report.

**12.2 2018 Annual Report**

12.2.1 The Secretariat explained that a skeleton version of the report was available on Huddle. It included figures, results and observations. The chlorate biocide results were as up to date as possible, and the format of the chlorate presentation was to be decided. It was agreed that there should be a new section on chlorate findings because there had been specific surveillance to obtain data to inform the MRL issue. The overall results will be presented without chlorate findings.

12.1.2 The Secretariat asked for members comments on the report, as published on Huddle, by 28 May.

**Action:** Members

**Agenda item 13: Any other business**

13.1 No items were raised for discussion under this agenda item.

13.1.2 The Chairman thanked everyone for their contributions to the discussions and closed this section of the meeting. He then asked the observers for any questions and comments.
Agenda item 1: Questions from observers

1.1 An observer from a fresh produce importer thanked the Committee for hosting them. They confirmed that the issues with chlorate levels were ongoing. The Committee should ask the food industry for more information, if required. The Drinking Water Directive was being kept under review, and the advice that vegetables should be washed before consumption is unchanged.

1.2 An observer thanked the PRiF for allowing them to attend the meeting. They were impressed with the way the PRiF operates. They asked if the exceedance information could be shared in a more timely way, as there were commercial implications arising from the exceedances. The Chairman explained that this was being addressed as far as possible, and that exceedance information from the Rolling Reporting system was already being shared more quickly.

1.3 Another observer said that they had found it useful to see how the PRiF works. The information they received was very useful, but sometimes difficult to extract, and asked if it could be issued in more accessible formats. The Secretariat explained that that the current format was the best that could be achieved. The published spreadsheets were tables cut and pasted from word-processing files. The entire residues monitoring programme, from sampling to publication, had been drawn to the attention of HSE’s digitisation programme as one where modernisation could improve the programme for all involved.

1.4 An observer said that it was useful for the organic food community to have the opportunity to understand the issues arising from the PRiF programme.

1.5 The Chairman thanked the observers for their contributions to the meeting.

The next meeting of the Expert Committee on Pesticide Residues in Food (PRiF) will be held in York on 10 July, 2019.