

Post-Harvest Pesticides: Regulation in Europe and Beyond

Sandro Frati, PhD

SANDRO FRATI

Education:

Master in Food Technology (University of Torino, Italy) PhD in Agricultural Entomology (University of Bologna, Italy)

Working in crop protection

2006 – 2013 <u>academia</u> Evaluation of biocontrol and integrated strategies in pre- and post-harvest Morphological and molecular identification of pest and diseases Evaluation of new crop varieties

Since 2013 <u>private sector</u> Efficacy trials Product development Business development

Based in Antwerp, Belgium





ÉLÉPHANT VERT IN A NUTSHELL





A FAST AND TARGETED DEVELOPMENT

2012 **CREATION OF ÉLÉPHANT**VERTSA



Launch of production sites in Morocco and Mali





2015

Creation of Éléphant

Vert France



the microorganisms

Creation of the

Éléphant Vert

Senegal

Launch of

2016



2017

Acquisition of the assets

Environnement: bacteria

production tool, products

Creation of the Elephant

of Xurian

and approvals

Vert Ivory Coast

Acquisition of Kenya

Biologics Ltd. in Kenya





Acquisition of

Coast

Biofertil composting

platform in lvory

Acquisition of the

majority stake in

providing the group

salesforce in France,

BIO3G group

with **its own**

2018



2019

Registration of the

biocontrol product

1st proprietary

Novacrid®,





New general

management

specialist in

worldwide

2021

New strategy « To

become a product

biosolutions for







Installation of 2 fermenters of 4m³ at Lipofabrik

Launch of new foliar biostimulant Novastim

100% takeover of BIO3G





2024



2014

2022

Acquisition of the

French start-up

Lipofabrik

2023

Diversified range of biosolutions on sale and a rich pipeline



Organic fertilizers

A wide range of

- Organic fertilizers •
- Enriched with amino acids, . trace elements etc.

Enriching & improving soil Increasing yields



eléphont vert



Biostimulants

Non-microbial

Seaweed extracts, algae complex

- Econitrate[®]
- Vitality[®]

Microbial and microbial-based

Pseudomonas putida

- Ovalis rhizofertil[®] Xurian[®] *Bacillus subtilis* metabolites
- Novastim[®]





Microbials

- Virus-based: Helitec[®]
- Fungal-based: Novacrid® + various microbial-based development candidates across indications

Natural substances

Development candidates



600 A=

Post-Harvest losses and control

- Increased attention from consumer for healthy food and sustainable environment
- Globalization, every fruit has to be available year-round / no seasonality
- Longer storage and transport
- \bullet About 1/3 of food production is wasted, mostly in post-harvest
- Estimation of losses (Sawicka, 2019):
- \$ 680 billion per year in industrialized countries
- \$ 310 billion per year in developing countries
- Current mainstream strategy: post-harvest application of synthetic pesticides





Key traits of Post-Harvest Pesticides

Pesticides applied after harvest

Examples: fungicides, insecticides, sprout inhibitors, ethylene inhibitors

Used on grains, fruits, vegetables

Ensure food safety

Extend shelf-life

Support trade and reduce wastes



Application methods #1

Drenching

Produce is immersed or sprayed with a high-volume solution, allowing even distribution of the pesticide over the surface.

Drip Application

Controlled application through a drip system, usually during storage or packing, allowing slow and steady pesticide delivery.

Fogging (Aerosol or Thermal)

The pesticide is dispersed into fine droplets or vapor, covering stored produce in enclosed spaces (e.g., warehouses).

Fumigation

Use of volatile chemicals in gas form to penetrate deep into storage areas and produce; commonly used against insects or molds.

Spraying

Direct application of the pesticide solution using handheld or automated sprayers, often on sorting/packing lines.



Application methods #2

Wax Coating with Incorporated Pesticide

Pesticide is mixed with wax or coating solution and applied to fruits (e.g., citrus) to protect and extend shelf life. **Dip Treatment (Immersion)**

Produce is submerged in a tank of pesticide solution for a specified time to ensure full surface contact. Brush Application

Product is brushed onto produce surfaces, often in combination with wax application for fruits.

Electrostatic Spraying

Uses electrically charged droplets to achieve uniform pesticide coverage with lower volume, often in packhouses.

Gas-Phase Treatments

Used for substances like ethylene inhibitors or sprout suppressants (e.g., chlorpropham in potatoes) via gas release in storage.



Purposes of registration of PPP (including post-harvest)

Different procedures / strategies. E.g. Europe, US, Brazil, Asia. Goals are the same!

- ✓ Ensure Consumer Safety Protect public health by setting safe residue limits and requiring toxicological evaluation.
- Guarantee Food Quality and Integrity Maintain produce freshness, prevent spoilage, and reduce contamination during storage and transport.
- ✓ Protect the Environment Limit environmental impact from pesticide use, including air, water, and non-target species.
- ✓ Facilitate Fair Trade Harmonize standards (e.g., MRLs) to reduce trade barriers and align with international guidelines (e.g., Codex).
- Promote Efficacy and Proper Use Ensure products work as intended and are applied correctly to avoid resistance and overuse.
- ✓ Support Agricultural Productivity Allow tools that reduce post-harvest losses and help farmers meet market standards.
- Encourage Innovation and Safer Alternatives Foster development of newer, lower-risk technologies and active substances.



The EU approach, core principles



Precautionary Principle

Regulatory decisions favor caution when scientific evidence is uncertain, prioritizing human and environmental safety.

Dual Authorization System

Active substances: Assessed and approved at the EU level by EFSA. Plant protection products (formulations): Authorized at the Member State level, based on zonal and mutual recognition principles.

Main Legal Framework

Governed by **Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009**, which sets rules for the placing of plant protection products on the market.

Complemented by related regulations on MRLs (Reg. EC No 396/2005) and data requirements.

Today there is no separate procedure for PH PPP





Step 1: Active Substance Approval

Submission of a comprehensive dossier to a Rapporteur Member State (RMS) and EFSA. EFSA conducts a scientific risk assessment (toxicology, residues, environmental impact). European Commission and Member States vote on EU-wide approval.

Step 2: Product Authorization

Based on an already approved active substance.

Application submitted to one zonal authority (interzonal for PH products, as treatment usually happens indoors).

- \rightarrow Zonal Evaluation: Focused on local agronomic, climatic, and usage conditions.
- \rightarrow Mutual Recognition: Other countries in the zone may accept the authorization with limited review.

Step 3: Data Requirements

Must include data on:

- Residues (including post-harvest trials)
- Toxicology (short-term and long-term exposure)
- Efficacy (demonstrating the product works on target pests/diseases)
- Physico-chemical properties, storage stability, operator exposure, etc.



Comparison with other systems

......





Responsible Authority: -

Unified Process: -

Risk-Benefit Standard:

Residue Tolerances (MRLs):

Data Requirements:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

EPA reviews both active ingredients and formulated products—no separate national vs. state-level system for core approvals.

Products may be approved if the **benefits outweigh the risks** to human health and the environment.

Set under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) by the EPA in collaboration with the FDA.
Required for each crop and use pattern; tolerances must be met for the product to be sold.

Include studies on toxicology, residue chemistry, environmental fate, ecotoxicology
Efficacy part is very limited
Post-harvest uses may have reduced data needs if exposure is limited.



Brazil



Responsible Authorities (Three-Agency System):

Simultaneous Review:

Applicable Legislation:

Post-Harvest Uses Included:

Data Requirements:

MRLs and Food Safety:

MAPA (Ministry of Agriculture): evaluates agronomic efficacy. ANVISA (Health Surveillance Agency): evaluates toxicology and human health risks.

IBAMA (Environment Agency): evaluates environmental impact.

All three agencies review the same dossier in parallel, streamlining the process.

Governed by Federal Law No. 7.802/1989 and Decree No. 4.074/2002. New pesticide law reforms are under discussion to further modernize the system.

Evaluated similarly to field uses, but with specific focus on **residue behavior during storage** and **food safety**.

Include **residue trials**, **toxicological studies**, **efficacy data**, and **environmental fate** studies. Data from other countries may be accepted if scientifically justified.

ANVISA sets MRLs; often aligned with **Codex** or adapted to national consumption data.





Country	Regulatory Authority	Post-Harvest Focus	Key Notes
China	ICAMA (MOA)	Similar to field use, with storage residue focus	GLP data increasingly required; Codex MRL misalignments
India	CIBRC	Requires local trials, residue data	Simpler process; potential backlog; limited Codex alignment
Japan	MAFF	Strict residue control, storage stability required	Data-heavy; zero-tolerance policy; aligned with OECD



Expected timelines for registration

Access Bores

European Union: 5–7 years (active substance + product authorization) United States (EPA): 2–4 years for new active substances; shorter for amendments Brazil: 2–4 years (MAPA, ANVISA, IBAMA joint review) China: 3–5 years (can vary depending on data availability and product type) India: 2–3 years (Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee) Japan: 3–5 years (MAFF reviews with detailed data requirements)



Acortis Henny

Importance of MRL (Maximum Residue Limit) #1

Consumer Safety	Ensure that pesticide residues in food are within scientifically acceptable levels for human health.	
Regulatory Compliance	Products must comply with MRLs to be legally sold in domestic and export markets.	
Trade Facilitation	Harmonized or aligned MRLs reduce trade barriers and rejections at borders , especially for exporters.	
Risk Communication	MRLs act as a clear, measurable standard for regulators, producers, and consumers.	
Basis for Monitoring and Enforcement	Authorities use MRLs to check if food samples comply during inspections and market surveillance.	
Encourages Good Agricultural Practices (GAP)	MRLs are derived based on GAP, encouraging growers and packers to apply pesticides correctly and responsibly.	
Post-Harvest Specific Impact	Post-harvest treatments directly affect residue levels at the point of consumption; strict control is essential.	
Varies by Jurisdiction	MRLs differ between countries (e.g. EU, USA, Codex, Japan), requiring careful alignment in international trade.	

Critical for Market Access: MRLs determine whether treated produce can be legally sold in domestic and export markets.

Trade-Driven Sensitivity: Post-harvest treatments often leave detectable residues, making MRLs a key compliance factor in international trade.

- EU: Very strict and precautionary approach; default MRL = 0.01 mg/kg if not specifically set. Often limits availability of post-harvest products.
- US (EPA): MRLs (called tolerances) are more pragmatic, set based on risk assessments with greater flexibility.
- Brazil: Tends to follow Codex MRLs or set national ones; faster and often more tolerant than the EU.
- China: MRLs expanding rapidly; not always aligned with Codex or exporting countries, leading to trade risks.
- India: MRLs are often outdated and inconsistently enforced; harmonization with Codex is ongoing.
- Japan: Very comprehensive and specific MRL list; zero-tolerance policy applies where no MRL is set, similar to the EU.



Importance of MRL (Maximum Residue Limit) #3



Fruit travels a lot! MRL must comply with the regulation at destination

éléphont vert

Post-Harvest Registration Challenges #1

Challenge/Impact	Description
Residue Behavior during Storage	Lack of consistent data on residue decline over time; variations in storage and transport conditions.
Diverse Use Patterns	Multiple application methods create complex residue profiles; different practices affect residue stability.
Geographic Variability	Regional variations affect pesticide behavior, requiring localized studies.
Regulatory Variability	Different MRL standards across jurisdictions complicate international trade and harmonization.
Lack of Efficacy Data	Limited data on the efficacy of post-harvest products under real conditions.
Environmental Impact	Environmental safety concerns persist even for post-harvest products.
Duration & Cost of Approval	Lengthy approval processes (3-7 years) and high costs of studies are significant barriers.
Public Perception	Concerns over chemical residues lead to regulatory scrutiny and consumer backlash.
Market Access	Compliance with MRLs opens global markets; non-compliance limits exports.
Competitive Advantage	Navigating regulations fast-tracks market entry and leadership.
Cost Implications	High registration and compliance costs reduce profitability.
Innovation	Stringent processes can hinder new product development.



Post-Harvest Registration Challenges #2

Challenge/Impact	Description
Agricultural Practices	Industry demand for sustainable pesticides drives global practices.
Supply Chain	Regulatory delays can disrupt supply chains, especially exports.
Consumer Trust	Strong compliance builds trust and strengthens brand reputation.
Barriers to Entry	New entrants face challenges with complex regulatory systems.
Reduced Availability of Tools	Regulatory burdens limit access to effective post-harvest pesticide tools, hindering pest management.
Harder Market Entry for SMEs	Small and medium enterprises face higher costs and complexity, limiting their ability to compete.
MRL Discrepancies Cause Trade Issues	Inconsistent MRLs between countries lead to trade barriers and rejections at international borders.



To summarize-what could be improved?

eléphont vert

Streamlined Approvals	Simplify and harmonize the registration process across regions to reduce regulatory complexity.
Shorter Timeframes	Set realistic but faster evaluation timelines to speed up market access and innovation.
More Support for Minor Uses	Introduce incentives, subsidies, or simplified procedures for low-volume or niche crops and post-harvest treatments.
Codex Alignment	Increase alignment with Codex Alimentarius MRLs to reduce trade barriers and improve international consistency.
International Mutual Recognition	Promote cross-border recognition of risk assessments and data to avoid duplication.
Adapted Data Requirements for Post- Harvest Uses	Tailor data requirements (e.g., residue trials, efficacy) to the specific nature of post-harvest applications .
Digitalization and Transparency	Use digital platforms to improve transparency, tracking, and communication during the approval process.
Public-Private Collaboration	Foster collaboration between regulators, industry, and academia to streamline innovation and compliance.
Training and Regulatory Support	Provide better guidance, especially for SMEs and developing countries , to navigate registration processes.

Thank you for your attention! Any questions?



www.elephant-vert.com

Contact:

Sandro Frati Director Export et Business Development <u>sandro.frati@elephant-vert.com</u> +32 474 281457

Rejoignez-nous !