

Improving pesticide-use data for the EU

Robin Mesnage^{1}, Edward A. Straw^{2*}, Michael N. Antoniou¹, Charles Benbrook³, Mark J. F. Brown², Marie-Pierre Chauzat⁴, Robert Finger⁵, Dave Goulson⁶, Ellouise Leadbeater², Ana López-Ballesteros⁷, Niklas Möhring⁸, Peter Neumann⁹, Dara Stanley¹⁰, Jane C. Stout¹¹, Linzi J. Thompson¹⁰, Christopher J. Topping¹², Blánaid White¹³, Johann G. Zaller¹⁴, Elena Zioga¹¹*

1 Gene Expression and Therapy Group, King's College London, Faculty of Life Sciences & Medicine, Department of Medical and Molecular Genetics, Guy's Hospital, London, SE1 9RT, UK

2 Centre for Ecology, Evolution & Behaviour, Department of Biological Sciences, School of Life Sciences and the Environment, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, UK

3 Heartland Health Research Alliance, Port Orchard, WA 98367, USA

4 ANSES, Sophia Antipolis laboratory, Unit of Honey bee Pathology, 06902 Sophia Antipolis, France

5 Agricultural Economics and Policy Group, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

6 School of Life Sciences, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK

7 BC3 - Basque Centre for Climate Change, Scientific Campus of the University of Basque Country, Leioa, Spain

8 Centre D'Études Biologiques de Chizé, UMR 7372, CNRS & La Rochelle Université, 79360, Villiers-en-bois, France

9 Institute of Bee Health, Vetsuisse Faculty, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland

10 School of Agriculture and Food Science, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

11 Department of Botany, School of Natural Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

12 Department of Bioscience, Kalø, Aarhus University, Denmark

13 Dublin City University, Glasnevin Campus, School of Chemical Sciences, Dublin, Ireland

14 Institute of Zoology, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna, Vienna, Austria

* Corresponding and co-first authors: robin.mesnage@kcl.ac.uk; edwardastraw@gmail.com

Access to pesticide-use data is essential for the accurate evaluation of adverse effects of pesticides on human and ecosystem health. In Europe, applicators are usually required to record the location and date of pesticide applications¹. A subset of these data are instead periodically sampled to produce heavily aggregated estimates of pesticide use, with spatial data reported to a national level. In contrast, in California all the data from applicators is

reported in an openly accessible and highly temporally and spatially granular database². The Californian approach has enabled the location of endangered species exposed to spray drift³, the monitoring of surface water pollution⁴, the determination of honeybee pesticide exposure⁵, and the identification of health effects from residential exposures to pesticides⁶. Such analyses are not possible within the European Union (EU).

The European Commission has proposed to reform the EU legal framework on statistics on agricultural input and output in February 2021⁷. This reform was examined by rapporteurs from the European Parliament and awaits a decision from the EU Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development. A main objective of this reform is to improve the high-quality European agricultural statistics “*for policymakers, businesses and the general public to be able to take appropriate evidence-based decisions*”. As such, we recommend changes so that pesticide-use data can be incorporated into EU environmental and health risk assessments. The spatial scale at which data are reported must enable fine-scale granular analyses, ideally at the level of individual fields. Reporting should include products applied, adjuvants, active ingredients (including their concentration), rate and timing of application, target crop variety, and should be reported per application. Digital record submission could be used to minimise the workload on farmers, with additional options (e.g. postal return) made available to maximise compliance. Since most farmers are already required to record these data, this should impose little additional burden. Data should be reported yearly with a short delay and should be standardised across the bloc. These data should be published as downloadable whole datasets, and have a user-friendly online interface. However, with an increase in transparency comes an associated cost to privacy. Explicit reporting of where controversial substances are used could open up pesticide users to targeted harassment.

Currently scientists and authorities have to rely on farmers voluntarily reporting pesticide use data to assess ecological impacts. In contrast to an open access standardised database, this is time-consuming and can produce low quality and potentially biased data. If the proposed database were paired with long term biodiversity monitoring, the relationship between pesticide use and ecosystem health could be determined⁸. This would allow for the identification of harm from specific pesticides using real world populations, as has been done in California for amphibians⁹.

The regulatory regime in the EU has demonstrated a willingness to allow academic findings to play decisive roles in the approval process of pesticides, as evidenced by the ban on three neonicotinoids after academics raised concerns about their effects on pollinators^{10,11}. Access to high-quality pesticide-use data will help inform pesticide regulation and provide greater transparency¹². Improving the tracking of pesticide use would facilitate the European Green Deal objective of reducing pesticide use 50% by 2030 and promote a move towards a more sustainable agri-food system.

References

1. Eurostat. *Office for Official Publications of the European Communities*. ISSN 1977-0375 (2008)
2. American Chemical Society. *ACS Symp. Series*. **1283** (2018).
3. Clemow, Y. H., et al. *Integr. Environ. Assess. Manag.* **14**, 224-239 (2018).

4. Wang, D., Singhasemanon, N., Goh, K. S. *Sci. Total Environ.* **571**, 332-341 (2016).
5. Mullin, C. A., Fine, J. D., Reynolds, R. D., Frazier, M. T. *Front. Public Health*, **4**, 92 (2016).
6. Costello, S., Cockburn, M., Bronstein, J., Zhang, X., Ritz, B. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **129**, 919-926 (2009).
7. European Commission (EC). COM/2021/37 Final (2021).
8. Mancini, F., Woodcock, B. A., Isaac, N. J. B. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sci. Health*, **11**, 53-58.
9. Davidson, C. *Ecol. Appl.*, **14**, 1892-1902 (2004).
10. EFSA (European Food Safety Authority). *EFSA Supp. Publ.*, **2018:EN-1378**, 1-31 (2018).
11. Goulson, D. *Science*, **360**, 973 (2018).
12. Möhring, N., Ingold, K., Kudsk, P., Martin-Laurent, F., Niggli, U., Siegrist, M., Studer, B., Walter, A., Finger, R. *Nature Food* **1**, 535–540 (2020).

Competing interests

Charles Benbrook has participated in pesticide litigation in the U.S. that entailed analysis of pesticide use data. The other authors declare no competing interests.