

SUMMARY COMMENTS AND STATUS OF HORIZONTAL DS 5. HELMINTH OVA

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE STEERING COMMITTEE

This item was discussed at length, as there was no agreement among researchers whether *Helminth* or *Ascaris* should be used as the reference parameter for sanitisation. It was agreed to concentrate on the viability enumeration of ova rather than on their presence or absence. Mr Simonart said that there are at least three methods being developed for Helminths, two of which were under standardisation process in France.

It was agreed to ask the Work Package Leader to **organise an expert workshop drawing from a list of names to be provided by the Steering Committee members**. The **desk study should be reviewed** in light of the results of this expert consultation and submitted to the Steering Committee **by March 2004**.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

HORIZONTAL DESK STUDY 5. HELMINTH OVA

Authors: Véronique PIERZO
Tristan SIMONART (Institut Pasteur de Lille)

Five comments on this desk study were received before 15th October 2003 :

- Four on this specific desk study on helminth ova (1 from the Danish standardization Association (see Annex 1), 1 from DEFRA/UK (see Annex 2), 2 from the French standardization Association AFNOR (see Annex 3&4).
- One with general comments on the 6 WP3 desk studies, without specific comments on this desk study (French Environmental Agency, ADEME (see Annex 5)).

1.1– *Synthesis of the answers to the general questions*

The general questions asked on page 1 of the file of Horizontal comments on desk studies were not systematically filled by the initiator of comments.

Question 1 :How do you value the horizontal standardization approach as presented in project HORIZONTAL?

The only two values assigned were **2** and **4**.

The following comment was added by the initiator of comments who gave the value 4 :
“Horizontal standardization as proposed by the HORIZONTAL program is good. However, the work provided by the WP 3 is only partially horizontal. The work would

have been definitively horizontal if the teams “writer” had been plurinational. In its current configuration, work makes emerge national elements which are not in the Horizontal program’s objectives.”

Question 2 :How do you value this particular desk study?

The three values assigned were 3, 4 and 3.

Question 3 :Can you largely endorse the recommendations for the next phase of this part of the work?

Only three initiator of comments answered to this questions. Two answered “yes” and one answered “No”.

Question 4 :How were you informed on how to obtain the desk study reports?

Only one initiator of comments answered “by mail”.

Question 5 :Do you have suggestions to improve the consultation process?

Only one initiator of comments proposed a suggestion :

“Not change the document too often. I start to read a document dated from the 21st august to see it’s changed at the 11th September”.

1.2 – *Synthesis of the general thrust of the comments*

The five comments files received including our general answers are presented in Annexes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

Comments are mainly general and technical.

Two general comments concern the whole desk studies of WP3 (comments from ADEME).

One is editorial and suggests that a head document would have been useful to present the different desk studies of this WP3.

The other one is technical and is about the problems linked with sampling of hygienic parameters, which is shortly presented in the introduction of the desk studies on *E. coli* and *Salmonella*. The missing of the presentation of the specific sampling of hygienic parameters in the WP2 is then evoked.

Other comments deal with the specific desk study on helminth ova.

Several general comments suggest that more details are needed in the introduction :

- purpose and recommendation on the parameter (not included in the sludge or biowaste draft directive),
- relative importance in terms of dangers and risk of the different helminth species (*Ascariasis*, *Toxocariasis*, *Truchriasis*, *Taeniasis*), in order to help to choose the more convenient method in term of target parameter,
- influence of the different kind of matrices (treatment applied or not, etc...).

General answers noted in the annexed comments files mention that more details will be given and discussed on those specific points.

Two comments remind that there is still considerable work to develop (to reduce throughput time and cost) and validate the methods, and this on all the possible matrices.

One initiator of comments focused mainly on the comparison of the three available methods, with several specific remarks, questions, comments and additional information. An amended version of the Triple flotation method (annex 2 of the desk study) is annexed to these comments. As far as they are available additional information and data will be taken into account for this comparison of methods.

2.1 - Evaluation of drafting a HORIZONTAL standard on Helminth ova, critical point and recommendation

As already specified in §3 of the desk study on Helminth ova, the following questions need to be resolved before any standardization of techniques on this parameter :

- Target parameters : Nematodes (*Ascaris*, ...) and/or Cestodes (*Taenia*, ...)?
- Detection or enumeration?
- Which detection limit needed?
- Viability assessment or not?

To date, no final standard method is available. Three available draft methods have been proposed (US EPA modified method, triple flotation method, Norwegian method) as available, but need to be fully described and adapted to the answers to the above questions.

Some results issued from an interlaboratory study have been discussed but further studies are needed in order to compare the three methods (with a sufficient number of European representative laboratories, on the different kinds of matrices treated or untreated, etc..). No method is capable of combining quick detection and viability of helminth eggs.

For the viability, no fully and comprehensive characterisation of the techniques is available.