DRAFT

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SUBSTANCES ADDED TO THE NATIONAL LIST

Category 1. Adverse impacts on humans or the environment? Substance _ Moxidectin

| Category 1. Adverse impacts on humans or the environment? Substance Moxidectin | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Question | Yes | No | N/A ¹ | Documentation (TAP; petition; regulatory agency; other) | |
| 1. Are there adverse effects on environment from manufacture, use, or disposal? [§205.600 b.2] | | | X | | |
| 2. Is there environmental contamination during manufacture, use, misuse, or disposal? [§6518 m.3] | | X | | | |
| 3. Is the substance harmful to the environment? [§6517c(1)(A)(i);6517(c)(2)(A)i] | X | | | Binds tightly to soil, long half life – up to six months, lipophilic - 26% excreted as active parent compound, adverse effects on non-target soil organisms, TAP pgs 5 & 6 | |
| 4. Does the substance contain List 1, 2, or 3 inerts?[§6517 c (1)(B)(ii); 205.601(m)2] | | | X | Contains excipients | |
| 5. Is there potential for detrimental chemical interaction with other materials used [§6518 m.1] | | X | | | |
| 6. Are there adverse biological and chemical interactions in agro-ecosystem? [§6518 m.5] | | X | | No adverse biological or chemical interaction in agroecosystem have been found using the route of administration approved for this material TAP pg 4; reviewer 1 comments: "there is limited possible interactions with other materials used in organic farming systems", TAP pg 9 reviewer 3 comments "I agree with the criterion evaluation" on the lack of potential for detrimental interactions with other materials used in the organic farming system TAP pg14 | |
| 7. Are there detrimental physiological effects on soil organisms, crops, or livestock? [§6518 m.5] | X | | | Reported adverse effects on several non-target soil organisms, TAP pg 6 | |
| 8. Is there a toxic or other adverse action of the material or its breakdown products? [§6518 m.2] | X | | | Binds tightly to soil, long half life – up to six months, lipophilic - 26% excreted as active parent compound, adverse effects on non-target soil organisms, TAP pgs 5 & 6 Reported adverse effects on several non-target soil organisms, TAP pg 6 | |
| 9. Is there undesirable persistence or concentration of the material or breakdown products in environment?[§6518 m.2] | X | | | Long half life – up to six months, TAP pg 5 | |
| 10. Is there any harmful effect on human health? [§6517 c (1)(A)(i); 6517 c(2)(A)i; §6518 m.4] | | X | | | |
| 11. Is there an adverse effect on human health as defined by applicable Federal regulations? [205.600 b.3] | | | X | | |
| 12. Is the substance GRAS when used according to FDA's good manufacturing practices? [§205.600 b.5] | | | X | | |
| 13. Does the substance contain residues of heavy metals or other contaminants in excess of FDA tolerances? [§205.600b.5] | | | X | | |

¹If the substance under review is for crops or livestock production, all of the questions from 205.600 (b) are N/A—not applicable.

DRAFT

Category 2. Is the Substance Essential for Organic Production? Substance Moxidectin

| Question | Yes | No | N/A ¹ | Documentation (TAP; petition; regulatory agency; other) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Is there a natural source of the substance? [§205.600 b.1] | | | X | |
| 2. Is there an organic substitute? [\$205.600 b.1] | | | X | |
| 3. Is the substance essential for handling of organically produced agricultural products? [§205.600 b.6] | | | X | |
| 4. Is there a wholly natural substitute product? [§6517 c (1)(A)(ii)] | | X | | There are potential alternatives but their safety and efficacy are unknown. TAP pg 8 |
| 5. Is the substance used in handling, not synthetic, but not organically produced? [§6517 c (1)(B)(iii)] | | | X | |
| 6. Is there any alternative substances? [§6518 m.6] | X | | | Ivermectin is on the National List; Ivermectin has more adverse impacts on the environment; restricted to prior to breeding age |
| 7. Is there another practice that would make the substance unnecessary? [§6518 m.6] | X | | | Grazing management techniques, Mixing younger and older animals or mixing species, biological control (nematodes to decrease number of larvae in feces), stock selection, stocking rate, adequate nutrition |

 $^{^{1}}$ If the substance under review is for crops or livestock production, all of the questions from 205.600 (b)are N/A—not applicable.

DRAFT

Category 3. Is the substance compatible with organic production practices?

| Substance | Moxidectin |
|-----------|-------------|
| Substance | MOXIGECTIII |

| Question | Yes | No | N/A ¹ | Documentation (TAP; petition; regulatory agency; other) |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|----|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Is the substance compatible with organic handling? [§205.600 b.2] | | | X | |
| 2. Is the substance consistent with organic farming and handling? [§6517 c (1)(A)(iii); 6517 c (2)(A)(ii)] | X | | | If other methods to control parasites are used first; this is a last resort, TAP pg 8, reviewers TAP pgs 10 & 15 "Organic livestock producers in the US rely on non-chemical methods such as herd management, grazing management and proper nutrition to control parasite infections within their herds, but these methods are not always effective." Pg 8 TAP |
| 3. Is the substance compatible with a system of sustainable agriculture? [§6518 m.7] | X | | | Substance has a positive influence on the health and welfare of animals, promotes the economic viability of organic farm operations, is consistent with substances on National List. |
| 4. Is the nutritional quality of the food maintained with the substance? [§205.600 b.3] | | | X | |
| 5. Is the primary use as a preservative? [§205.600 b.4] | | | X | |
| 6. Is the primary use to recreate or improve flavors, colors, textures, or nutritive values lost in processing (except when required by law, e.g., vitamin D in milk)? [205.600 b.4] | | | X | |
| 7. Is the substance used in production, and does it contain an active synthetic ingredient in the following categories: a. copper and sulfur compounds; | | X | | |
| b. toxins derived from bacteria; | X | | | TAP pg 2 |
| c. pheromones, soaps, horticultural oils, fish emulsions, treated seed, vitamins and minerals? | | X | | |
| d. livestock parasiticides and medicines? | X | | | TAP pg 1 & 2; petition pg 1 |
| e. production aids including netting, tree wraps and seals, insect traps, sticky barriers, row covers, and equipment cleaners? | | X | | |

 $^{^{1}}$ If the substance under review is for crops or livestock production, all of the questions from 205.600 (b) are N/A—not applicable.

NOSB RECOMMENDED DECISION

Form NOPLIST2. Full Board Transmittal to NOP

| For NOSB Meeting: Ma | Substance: Moxidectiin | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| A. Evaluation Criteria (Documentation attached; committee recommendation attached) | | | | | | | | |
| | Criteria Satisfied? | | | | | | | |
| Impact on huma | | Yes \ddot{y} No \ddot{y} | | ow) | | | | |
| Availability criter | | | | Yes \ddot{y} No \ddot{y} | | | | |
| 3. Compatibility & o | | | | Yes \ddot{y} No \ddot{y} | | | | |
| , | 3. Compatibility & consistency | | | | | | | |
| | notation: | | | | | | | |
| | C. Proposed Ani | | | | | | | |
| B. Substance fails criteria | ? | | | | | | | |
| Criteria category: | | Basis for annota | tion: | | | | | |
| Comments: | | To meet criteria | above: | _ Criteria: | | | | |
| | | Other regulatory | criteria: | _ Citation: | | | | |
| D. Final Board Action & V | oto: Motion by: | | 900 | and: | | | | |
| | | 11 | | | - | | | |
| <u>Vote</u> : | Agricultural | Nonagricul | | Crops | | | | |
| Yes: | Synthetic | Not synthe | | Livestock | X | | | |
| No: | Allowed ¹ | Prohibited | | Handling | | | | |
| Abstain: | No restriction | Deferred4 | | Rejected ³ | | | | |
| Abstairi. | | | | | | | | |
| Annotation: | 1—substance vote | ed to be added a | s "allowed" or | n National List | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 2—substance to b | e added to "proh | ibited" paragi | raph of National | List | | | |
| Describe why a prohibited | | | · · · | · | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 3—substance was rejected by vote for amending National List Describe why material was rejected: | | | | | | | | |
| Describe wity material was rejected | | | | | | | | |
| 4-substance was recommended to be deferred | | | | | | | | |
| Describe why deferred; if a | any follow-up is ne | eded. If follow-u | p needed, wh | o conducts follo | W- | | | |
| up | up | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| E. Approved by NOSB Chair to transmit to NOP: | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Dave Carter, NOSB Chair Date | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| F. NOP Action: Include in FR to amend National List: \ddot{y} | | | | | | | | |
| Return to NOSB \ddot{y} | Reason: | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Richard H. Mathews, Program Manager Da | | | | | | | | |

NOSB COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Form NOPLIST1. Committee Transmittal to NOSB

| For NOSB Meeting: Apr | il 2004 | | Substance: Moxidectin | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Committee: Crops \ddot{y} Livestock $f X$ Handling \ddot{y} | | | | | | |
| A. Evaluation Criteria (Documentation attached; committee recommendation attached) Criteria Satisfied? 1. Impact on humans and environment Yes ÿ No X (see B below) 2. Availability criteria Yes X No ÿ (see B below) Yes X No ÿ (see B below) B. Substance fails criteria? Criteria category:1 Comments: concern about half life and impact on soil organisms; less problematic than ivermectin Criteria Catieria (Documentation attached) Criteria Satisfied? Yes X No ÿ (see B below) C. Proposed Annotation:control of internal parasites only: Basis for annotation: natural, effective controls for external parasites; reduce impact on humans and the environment To meet criteria above: _X Criteria:1 | | | | | | |
| D. Recommended Committee Action & Vote: Motion by: Mike Lacy Seconded: Rebecca Goldberg | | | | | | |
| Seconded:_Rebecca Goldberg | | | | | | |
| E. Approved by Committee Chair to transmit to NOSB: Committee Chair Date | | | | | | |