



### PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES NOVEMBER 2021

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 64	15 November 2021 h 10:00-17.00	Mammalian toxicology	Aspergillus Flavus, Strain MUCL54911- NAS 1107 (IT)
	16 November 2021 h 9:00-17.00		Isoflucypyram – NAS 1107/2009 (FR)
	17 November 2021 h 10.00-13.00		Rape seed oil – AIR IV (NL)
	18 November 2021 h 8.00-17.00		Heptamaloxyloglucan – AIR IV (FR), including non-dietary exposure <sup>(1)</sup> .
			Cymoxanil – AIR IV (LT), including non-dietary exposure <sup>(1)</sup> .
			(1) Non-dietary exposure will be discussed together with the discussion of individual substances.
	19 November 2021 h 9.00-17.00	Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology	Joint session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties (mam tox/ecotox) <sup>(2)</sup>
	(GMT+1, Rome)	(joint session) on ED properties	Isoflucypyram – NAS 1107/2009 (FR)
			Cymoxanil – AIR IV (LT)
			Rape seed oil – AIR IV (NL)
			Heptamaloxyloglucan – AIR IV (FR)
			(2) Joint session will be held on 19 November h 09:00-17:00 (GMT+1 Rome)

TC 65	16 November 2021 h 10:00-16:00 17 November 2021 h 10:00-16:00 18 November 2021 h 10:00-16:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Isoflucypyram – NAS 1107/2009 (FR)  Cymoxanil – AIR IV (LT)  Rape seed oil – AIR IV (NL)
TC 66	22 November 2021 h 14:00 - 18:00 23 November 2021 h 9:00 - 13:00 25 November 2021 h 14:00 - 18:00 26 November 2021 h 9:00 - 13:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Residues	Isoflucypyram – NAS 1107/2009 (FR)  Cymoxanil – AIR IV (LT)
TC 67	22 November 2021 h 9.00-17.00 23 November 2021 h 9.00-17.00 24 November 2021 h 9.00-17.00 25 November 2021 h 9.00-17.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Isoflucypyram – NAS 1107/2009 (FR)  Cymoxanil – AIR IV (LT)  Rape seed oil – AIR IV (NL)  Heptamaloxyloglucan – AIR IV (FR) – only ED discussion under the Mammalian toxicology –Ecotoxicology joint session on ED properties TC 64  The ED discussion of the substances Isoflucypyram, Cymoxanil and Rape seed oil is organised under the Mammalian toxicology –Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 64

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III, AIR IV - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New active substance under Reg (EU) No 1107/2009





### PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES SEPTEMBER 2021

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 60	13 September 2021 h 10:00-17:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Oxamyl - AIR III (IT) including non-dietary exposure (1)
	14 September 2021 h 10:00-17:00		Fenpyroximate – AIR IV (AT)
	1110.00 17.00		Novaluron - MRL Art. 12 review DE)
	15 September 2021 h 10:00-17:00	Mammalian toxicology -Ecotoxicology	Joint session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties
	16 September 2021	(joint session) on ED properties	(mam tox/ecoto) <sup>(2)</sup>
	h 09:00-13:00 17 September 2021		Oxamyl - AIR III (IT)     Fenpyroximate – AIR IV (AT)
	h 09:00-13:00		(1) Non-dietary exposure will be discussed on 14 September at 12:00-15:00
	(GMT+2, Rome)		(2) Joint session will be held on 16 September at 09:00-13:00
			Session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties (mam tox only) (3)
			Novaluron - MRL Art. 12     review (DE)
			(3) Session will be held on 17th September together with the toxicology discussion (there is not discussion on ecotox ED).
TC 61	15 September 2021	Environmental Fate and	Oxamyl - AIR III (IT)
	h 10:00-16:00	Behaviour	Fenpyroximate – AIR IV (AT)
	16 September 2021 h 10:00-16:00		
	(GMT+2, Rome)		

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 62	20 September 2021 h 14:00-18:00 and 21 September 2021 h 9:00-13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Fenpyroximate – AIR IV (AT)
TC 63	20 September 2021 h 10:00-17:00 21 September 2021 h 10:00-17:00 22 September 2021 h 10:00-17:00 23 September 2021 h 10:00-17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Oxamyl - AIR III (IT)  Fenpyroximate - AIR IV (AT)  Sheep fat - AIR IV (CZ)  The <b>ED discussion</b> of the substances Oxamyl and Fenpyroximate is organised under the Mammalian toxicology - Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 60

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III - Annex III Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;
AIR IV - Annex IV Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;





## PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES JULY 2021

Teleconf	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 59	01 July 2021 h 10:00 - 12:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Asulam – NAS mandated for re- assessment ED (FR) (dermal absorption in the context of negligible exposure assessment)
	, , , , , ,		

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* NAS New Active Substance under Reg (EU) No 1107/2009





## PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES JUNE 2021

Teleconf	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 55	14 June 2021 h. 10:00 - 17:00 15 June 2021 h. 10:00 - 17:00	Mammalian toxicology	Difenoconazole - AIR III (ES)  Penthiopyrad – ad-hoc mandate on confirmatory data (SE) - metabolite PAM  Propyzamide – ad-hoc mandate on confirmatory data – metabolites (SE)
	16 June 2021 h. 09:00 - 16:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties	Joint session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties (mam tox/ecotox)  • Difenoconazole - AIR III (ES) <sup>1)</sup> (1) Joint session will be discussed on 16 June at 09:00-13:00 GMT+2, Rome)  Session on microorganism  • Spodoptera exigua multicapsid nucleopolyhedrovirus (SeMNPV) - NAS 1107 (ES) <sup>2)</sup> (2) Microorganism session will be discussed on 16 June 2021 at 14.00-16.00 GMT+2, Rome)
TC 56	15 June 2021 h 10:00 - 17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Difenoconazole - AIR III (ES)
TC 57	24 June 2021 h 14:00 - 18:00 25 June 2021 h 09:00 - 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Difenoconazole - AIR III (ES)

TC 58	28 June 2021 h 10:00 – 17:00	Ecotoxicology	Difenoconazole - AIR III (ES)
	29 June 2021 h 10:00 – 17:00		The <b>ED discussion</b> of the substance Difenoconazole is organised under the Mammalian toxicology –Ecotoxicology (joint
	30 June 2021 h 10:00 - 17:00		session) on ED properties TC 55
	(GMT+2, Rome)		

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS - New Active Substance under Reg (EU) No 1107/2009





# PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES APRIL-MAY 2021

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 48	13 April 2021 h 10:00-17.00	Mammalian toxicology	Fluazinam - AIR IV (AT) including non-dietary exposure (1)
	14 April 2021 h 10:00-17.00		Fatty acids - Pelargonic acid - AIR IV (EL)
	15 April 2021	Mammalian	Penthiopyrad - Confirmatory data - metabolite PAM
	h 10.00-17:00	toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session)	Bifenazate – updated peer review - metabolite D3598 (SE)
	16 April 2021 h 09.00-18:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	on ED properties	Joint session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties (mam tox/ecotox)(2)
			<ul> <li>Fluazinam - AIR IV (AT)</li> <li>Fatty acids - Pelargonic acid - AIR IV (EL)</li> <li>Acibenzolar-S-methyl - Conf data conclusion (FR)</li> <li>Clodinafop - AIR III mandated for re-assessment of ED (EL)</li> <li>(1) Non-dietary exposure will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.</li> <li>(2) Joint session will be discussed 16 April at 09:00-18:00</li> </ul>
TC 53	15 April 2021 h 09:00-17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Bifenazate – updated peer review - (SE)
TC 49	20 April 2021 h 10:00-17:00 21 April 2021 h 10:00-17:00 22 April 2021 h 10:00-13:00	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Fluazinam - AIR IV (AT)  Fatty acids - Pelargonic acid - AIR IV (EL)

	(GMT+2, Rome)		
TC 50	26 April 2021 h 14:00-18:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Fluazinam - AIR IV (AT)
TC 54	27 April 2021 h 09.00-12.30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Bifenazate — updated peer review — (SE)
TC 51	26 April 2021 h 10.00-18.00  27 April 2021 h 10.00-18.00  28 April 2021 h 10.00-18.00  29 April 2021 h 10:00-18:00  30 April 2021 h 10:00-18:00  (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Fluazinam - AIR IV (AT)  Fatty acids - Pelargonic acid - AIR IV (EL)  The <b>ED discussion</b> of the substance Fluazinam and Fatty acids (pelargonic acid) is organised under the Mammalian toxicology -Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 48
TC 52	3 May 2021 h 13:30-18:00 4 May 2021 h 9:00-17:00 5 May 2021 h 9:00-13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	General peer review residues meeting  Topics:  Implementation of isomers guidance Q&A  Residues and MRLs on rotational crops (EFSA draft technical report)  Assessment of residues in honey. Update and Q&A  Guidance on extraction efficiency

<sup>\*</sup> the exact teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III, AIR IV - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;





# PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES MARCH 2021

Teleco nf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 44	15 March 2021 h 10:00 - 17:00	Mammalian toxicology	Diflufenican - AIR III (CZ)
	16 March 2021 h 10:00 - 17:00		Joint session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties (mam tox/ecotox) (1)
	17 March 2021 h 09:00 - 18:00	Mammalian toxicology –	Diflufenican - AIR III (CZ)
	(GMT+1, Rome)	(joint session) on ED properties	Benthiavalicarb – AIR III (PL)     ED meeting following the 3     month ED clock stop
,		proper des	(1) Joint session will be discussed 17 March at 09:00-18:00
TC 45	17 March 2021 h 09:00 - 17:00	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Diflufenican - AIR III (CZ)
	(GMT+1, Rome)		
TC 46	23 March 2021 h 14:00 - 18:00	Residues	Diflufenican - AIR III (CZ)
	24 March 2021 h 14:00 - 18:00		
	(GMT+1, Rome)		
TC 47	24 March 2021 h 10:00 - 13:00 / 14:00 - 17:00	Ecotoxicology	Diflufenican - AIR III (CZ)
	25 March 2021 h 10:00 - 13:00 / 14:00 -17:00 (GMT+1, Rome)		The <b>ED discussion</b> of the substance Diflufenican is organised under the Mammalian toxicology –Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 44

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;





# PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES JANUARY-FEBRUARY 2021

Teleconf	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 40	25 January 2021 h 10:00-17.00 26 January 2021 h 10:00-17.00 27 January 2021 h 10:00-17.00	Mammalian toxicology	Metribuzin - AIR III (EE) including non-dietary exposure (1)  Aluminium ammonium sulphate – AIR IV (IT)
	28 January 2020 h 09.00-13:00. (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology -Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties	Joint session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties (mam tox/ecotox) (2)  • Metribuzin – AIR III (EE)  • Aluminium ammonium sulphate – AIR IV (IT)  • Potassium hydrogen carbonate – AIR IV (NL)  (1) Non-dietary exposure will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting. (2) Joint session will be discussed 28 January at 09:00-13:00
TC 41	26 January 2021 h 14:00 - 18:00 27 January 2020 h 9:00-13:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Metribuzin – AIR III (EE)
TC 42	02 February 2021 h 14.00 - 18.00 03 February 2021 h 09:30 - 17:00 04 February 2021 h 9:00 - 13:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Residues	Metribuzin – AIR III (EE)  Folpet – AIR (III) follow up of PREV 16 meeting

Teleconf	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 43	01 February 2021 h 09.00-13.00 02 February 2021 h 10.00-16.00 03 February 2021 h 10.00-16.00 04 February 2021 h 10.00-16.00 05 February 2021 h 10.00-16.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Metribuzin – AIR III (EE)  Aluminium ammonium sulphate – AIR IV (IT)  The <b>ED discussion</b> of the substances Metribuzin and Aluminium ammonium sulphate is organised under the Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 40

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III, AIR IV Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;





### PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES DECEMBER 2020 – JANUARY 2021

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 38	14 December 2020 h 14:00 15 December 2020 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology	Carbon Dioxide – AIR IV (FR) – including non-dietary exposure
		Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties	Joint session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties (mam tox/ecotox) (2)  • Carbon Dioxide – AIR IV (FR) (1) discussed at the beginning of the meeting. (2) Joint session will be discussed 15 December at 11.00-13.00
TC 39	15 January 2021 h 09:00-18:00	Mammalian toxicology	Thiophanate-methyl and carbendazim – Ad-hoc mandate on clastogenic potential and potential setting of reference values in view of MRL setting (EFSA-Q-2020-00751)

- \* the exact meeting dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR IV Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;





## PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES NOVEMBER 2020

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 32	9 November 2020 h 14:00 11 November 2020 h 18:00	Mammalian toxicology	Calcium Carbonate – AIR IV (ES) including non-dietary exposure <sup>(1)</sup> Triflusulfuron – AIR IV (FR) <sup>(1)</sup> Straight Chain Lepidopteran Pheromones (SCLPs) – AIR IV (IT)
		Mammalian toxicology –Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties	Joint session on endocrine disruption (ED) properties (mam tox/ecotox) (2)  • Calcium Carbonate – AIR IV (ES)  • Triflusulfuron – AIR IV (FR)  • Straight Chain Lepidopteran Pheromones (SCLPs) – AIR IV (IT) (1) Non-dietary exposure will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting. (2) Joint session will be discussed 11 November at 13.00-18.00
TC 33	10 November 2020 h 09:00-17:00	Identity, Physical and Chemical properties	Straight Chain Lepidopteran Pheromones (SCLPs) – AIR IV (IT)
TC 34	12 November 2020 h 13:00-18:00	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Triflusulfuron – AIR IV (FR)
TC 35	13 November 2020 h 14:00-16:00	Session on micro- organisms  Mammalian toxicology	Bacillus amyloliquefaciens IT-45 - NAS 1107 (FR)

TC 36	23 November 2020 h 14.00 24 November 2020 h 12.30	Residues	Straight Chain Lepidopteran Pheromones (SCLPs) – AIR IV (IT) Triflusulfuron – AIR IV (FR)
TC 37	23 November 2020 h 14:00 24 November 2020 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Straight Chain Lepidopteran Pheromones (SCLPs) – AIR IV (IT) Triflusulfuron – AIR IV (FR) • The <b>ED discussion</b> of the
	(4 hours per day)		substances SCLPs and Triflusulfuron is organised under the Mammalian toxicology –Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 32

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III, AIR IV - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New active substance under Reg (EU) No 1107/2009





## PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES SEPTEMBER - OCTOBER 2020

Telecon	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 22	14 September 2020 h 14:00 16 September 2020 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology	Prothioconazole – AIR III (PL) – including non-dietary exposure <sup>(1)</sup>
		(joint session) on ED properties	Joint session on ED properties (mam tox/ecotox) (2)  • Prothioconazole – AIR III (PL)  • Discussion on a new test protocol in the ED testing strategy for NTOs (1) Non-dietary exposure will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting.  (2) Joint session will be discussed 16 September at 9.00-13.00.
TC 23	16 September 2020 h 13:00-18:00	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Prothioconazole – AIR III (PL)
TC 24	18 September 2020 h 13:00-17:00	Micro-organisms  Mammalian toxicology	Pepino Mosaic Virus, EU strain, mild isolate Abp1 – NAS 1107 (ES) Pepino Mosaic Virus, EU strain, mild isolate Abp1 – NAS 1107 (ES) Purpureocillium lilacinum PL 11– NAS 1107 (DK)
TC 25	28 September 2020 h 14.00 29 September 2020 h 12.30	Residues	Prothioconazole – AIR III (PL)

Telecon	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 26	28 September 2020 h 14:00 2 October 2020 h 13:00 (4 hours per day)	Ecotoxicology	Prothioconazole – AIR III (PL)  The ED discussion of the substance is organised under the Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 22
TC 27	12 October 2020 h 14:00 <b>15</b> October 2020 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties	S-Metolachlor – AIR III (DE) – including non-dietary exposure (1)  Fluoxastrobin – AIR III (DE)  Joint session on ED properties (mam tox/ecotox) (2) S-Metolachlor – AIR III (DE)  Fluoxastrobin – AIR III (DE)  (1) Non-dietary exposure will be discussed at the beginning of the meeting. (2) Joint session will be discussed 14 October at 9.00-13.00.
TC 28	14 October 2020 h 09:00 16 October 2020 h <b>17</b> :00	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	S-Metolachlor – AIR III (DE) Fluoxastrobin – AIR III (DE)
TC 29	19 October 2020 h 13:00 - 18:00 20 October 2020 h 09:00 - 14:00 21 October 2020 h 13:00 - 18:00	Ecotoxicology	S-Metolachlor – AIR III (DE)  Fluoxastrobin – AIR III (DE)  The ED discussion of the substances are organised under the Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 27
TC 30	20 October 2020 h 09:00-13:00	Residues	S-Metolachlor – AIR III (DE)
TC 31	22 October 2020 h 09:00-13:00 23 October 2020 h 09:00-12:00	Residues	Fluoxastrobin – AIR III (DE)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III, AIR IV - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New active substance under Reg (U) No 1107/2009





#### PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES

#### **JUNE - JULY 2020**

Telecon	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 15	04 June 2020 09:00-13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology	Fosetyl – AIR III (FR) – ad hoc mandate for re-assessment of ED properties
		(joint session) on ED properties	Flumioxazin – AIR II (CZ) – ad hoc mandate for re-assessment of ED properties
TC 16	15 June 2020 h 14:00 <b>17</b> June 2020 h <b>11:00</b> (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Prothioconazole — AIR III (PL) — including non-dietary exposure
	(GHT 12, Rome)		Daminozide – AIR III (CZ) – including non-dietary exposure
			Spiroxamine – <i>ad-hoc</i> mandate (DE)
		Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties	Joint session on ED properties  Prothioconazole - AIR III (PL)  Daminozide - AIR III (CZ)
TC 17	18 June 2020 h 14:00 19 June 2020 h 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Joint session micro- organisms	Beauvaria Bassiana 203 - NAS 1107 (NL)
		Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology	Metarhizium brunneum strain F52 and Metarhizium brunneum strain BIPESCO5 – AIR IV (NL)
TC 18	16 June 2020 h 10:00-17:00 18 June 2020 h 9:00-18:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Prothioconazole – AIR III (PL)  Daminozide – AIR III (CZ)

Telecon	Date*	Section	Substances**
<del>TC 19</del>	24 June 2020 h 14.00 25 June 2020 h 12.30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Prothioconazole - AIR III (PL)
TC 20	24 June 2020 h 09:00-13:00 25 June 2020 h 09:00-13:00 (GMT+2, Rome) (4 hours per day)	Ecotoxicology	Prothioconazole — AIR III (PL)  The ED discussion of the substance is organised under the Mammalian toxicology — Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 16 (15-18 June 2020)  Spiroxamine — ad-hoc mandate (DE)  Triclopyr — follow up discussion (aquatic organisms & non-target anthropods).
TC 21	13 July 2020 h 14:00 15 July 2020 h 14:00 (GMT+2, Rome) (4 hours per day)	Ecotoxicology	Daminozide – AIR III (CZ)  The ED discussion of the substance is organised under the Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) on ED properties TC 16 (15-18 June 2020)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III, AIR IV - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New active substance under Reg (U) No 1107/2009





#### PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCE

Teleconf. Date* Section	n Substances**
TC 14 28 May 2020 Ecotoxi 10:00-14:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	cology  Cyazofamid – (FR)  ad-hoc SANTE mandate on risk to non-target arthropods





### PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETING MICROORGANISMS MARCH 2020

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticide Peer Review 25	2 March 2020 h 14:00 6 March 2020 h 13:00	Joint session  Mammalian toxicology Residues Fate and Behaviour Ecotoxicology	Bacillus amyloliquefaciens QST 713 (former subtilis) – AIR III (DE) Pythium oligandrum M1- AIR IV (SE) Streptomyces K-61 – AIR IV (EE) Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. aizawai strain ABTS-1857 – AIR IV (NL) Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. aizawai strain GC 91 - AIR IV (NL) Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. Israelensis AM65-52 - AIR IV (SE) Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. Kurstaki strain SA-11-AIR IV (DK) Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. Kurstaki strain SA-11-AIR IV (DK)

- \* the exact meeting dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III, AIR IV Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012





### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

#### **MARCH 2020**

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 25	16 March 2020 h 10:00 20 March 2020 h 15:00	Mammalian toxicology	Abamectin – AIR IV (AT) Lenacil – AIR III (BE) Dithianon – ad-hoc request on confirmatory data additional information (EL) Sweet Lupin – NAS 1107 (NL) Gibberellin – AIR IV (SI) Gibberellic acid – AIR IV (SI) Mepiquat-chloride – AIR IV (FI)
		Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) <b>ED properties</b>	Abamectin - AIR IV (AT) Lenacil - AIR III (BE) Sweet Lupin - NAS 1107 (NL) Gibberellic acid - AIR IV (SI) Gibberellin - AIR IV (SI) Mepiquat-chloride - AIR IV (FI)
Pesticides Peer Review 26	23 March 2020 h 14:00 25 March 2020 h 18:00	Ecotoxicology	Mepiquat-chloride – AIR IV (FI) Gibberellic acid – AIR IV (SI) Gibberellin – AIR IV (SI) Abamectin – AIR IV (AT) Lenacil – AIR III (BE)
Pesticides Peer Review 27	23 March 2020 h 14:00 26 March 2020 h 13:00	Residues	Mepiquat-chloride – AIR IV (FI) Gibberellin – AIR IV (SI) Abamectin – AIR IV (AT) Lenacil – AIR III (BE)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 12	17 March 2020 h 09:00-17:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Abamectin – AIR IV (AT)
TC 13	19 March 2020 h 09:00-17:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Lenacil – AIR III (BE)

 $<sup>^{</sup>st}$  the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

 $<sup>^{**}</sup>$  AIR III, AIR IV - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New active substance under Reg (U) No 1107/2009

### PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES JANUARY -FEBRUARY 2020

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticide Peer Review 22	28 January 2020 h 09:00 29 January 2020 h 18:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Pyraclostrobin – AIR III (DE) Phosmet – AIR III (ES) follow up from PREV 07
		Mammalian Toxicology - Ecotoxicology (joint session on ED properties)	Joint session to assess ED properties:  Pyraclostrobin – AIR III (DE)  24-Epibrassinolide – NAS (AT) (ecotoxicology only)
Pesticide Peer Review 23	3 February 2020 h 14:00 5 February 2020 h 12:00	Residues	Pyraclostrobin – AIR III (DE) Phosmet – AIR III (ES) follow up from PREV 09
Pesticide Peer Review 24	3 February 2020 h 14:00 4 February 2020 h 18:00	Ecotoxicology	Pyraclostrobin – AIR III (DE) Cyazofamid - AIR III (FR) ad-hoc request on risk assessment for predatory mites

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 11	29 January 2020 10:00- 12:30 (GMT+1, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Pyraclostrobin – AIR III (DE)
	10:00- 12:30 (GMT+1, Rome)	Behaviour	

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III, AIR IV Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS - New Active Substance



### Overview of planned Pesticide Peer Review meetings 2020 dates

(Planned dates might be subject to change. This table is for information only, for final dates please consult the section "Dates and draft discussion points of upcoming meetings")

Meeting/Section	Start Date	End Date
Mammalian Toxicology	Monday 27 January 2020	Friday 31 January 2020
Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Tuesday 28 January 2020	30 January 2020
Residues	03 February 2020	06 February 2020
Ecotoxicology	03 February 2020	07 February 2020
Microorganisms (dedicated meeting, all sections)	02 March 2020	06 March 2020
Mammalian Toxicology	16 March 2020	20 March 2020
Environmental Fate and Behaviour	17 March 2020	20 March 2020
Ecotoxicology	23 March 2020	27 March 2020
Residues	23 March 2020	26 March 2020
Mammalian Toxicology-Ecotoxicology joint session (tele-webconference)	04 June 2020	04 June 2020
Mammalian Toxicology	15 June 2020	19 June 2020
Environmental Fate and Behaviour	16 June 2020	18 June 2020
Residues	22 June 2020	25 June 2020
Ecotoxicology	22 June 2020	26 June 2020
Mammalian Toxicology	14 September 2020	18 September 2020
Environmental Fate and Behaviour	15 September 2020	17 September 2020
Ecotoxicology	28 September 2020	02 October 2020
Residues	28 September 2020	01 October 2020
Mammalian Toxicology	09 November 2020	13 November 2020
Environmental Fate and Behaviour	10 November 2020	12 November 2020
Ecotoxicology	23 November 2020	27 November 2020
Residues	23 November 2020	26 November 2020





## PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES NOVEMBER 2019

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticide Peer Review 18	04 November 2019 h 09:00 08 November 2019 h 13:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Deltamethrin – AIR III (AT) Amidosulfuron – AIR III (FI) Metrafenone – AIR III (LV) Pyrimethanil – AIR III (CZ) Clodinafop – AIR III (EL) (setting of AOEL)
Pesticide Peer Review 19	11 November 2019 h 14:00 14 November 2019 h 13:00	Fate	Amidosulfuron – AIR III (FI) Pyrimethanil – AIR III (CZ) Metrafenone – AIR III (LV) 24-Epibrassinolide – NAS 1107 (AT)
Pesticide Peer Review 20	18 November 2019 h 14:00 21 November 2019 h 17:00	Residues	Deltamethrin – AIR III (AT) Amidosulfuron – AIR III (FI) Metrafenone – AIR III (LV) Pyrimethanil – AIR III (CZ)
Pesticide Peer Review 21	18 November 2019 h 14:00 22 November 2019 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Deltamethrin – AIR III (AT) Amidosulfuron – AIR III (FI) Pyrimethanil – AIR III (CZ)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 11	11 November 2019 09:00- 12:30 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	24-Epibrassinolide – NAS (AT)
TC 12	13 November 2019 09:00- 12:30 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Kieselgur – AIR IV (AT)
TC 13	25 November 2019 10:00- 12:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Metrafenone – AIR III (LV)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III, AIR IV Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS - New Active substance





# PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 2019

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticide Peer Review 11	2 September 2019 h 09:00 5 September 2019 h 18:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Ferric pyrophosphate – NAS 1107 (PL) Clofentezine – AIR III (ES) Triclopyr (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (PL) Triticonazole (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (AT) Chlorpyrifos – methyl – AIR III (ES) (follow up Pesticide Peer Review 01 session 1 01-05 April 2019)
Pesticide Peer Review 12	9 September 2019 h 14:00 13 September 2019 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Captan – AIR III (AT) Folpet – AIR III (AT) Chloropicrin – NAS 1107 (IT)
Pesticide Peer Review 13	16 September 2019 h 14:00 20 September 2019 h 13:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Clomazone (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (DK) Captan (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (AT) Folpet (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (AT) Chloropicrin (incl. non-dietary exposure) – NAS 1107 (IT)
Pesticide Peer Review 14	16 September 2019 h 14:00 19 September 2019 h 17:00	Ecotoxicology	Clofentezine - AIR III (ES) Ferric pyrophosphate - NAS 1107 (PL) Clomazone - AIR III (DK) Triclopyr - AIR III (PL) Triticonazole - AIR III (AT)
Pesticide Peer Review 15	17 September 2019 h 09:00 20 September 2019 h 13:00	Env Fate and behaviour	Captan – AIR III (AT) Folpet – AIR III (AT) Chloropicrin – NAS 1107 (IT) Clomazone – AIR III (DK) Triticonazole – AIR III (AT)

Pesticide Peer Review 16	23 September 2019 h 14:00 27 September 2019 h 13:00	Residues	Clofentezine – AIR III (ES) Captan – AIR III (AT) Folpet – AIR III (AT) Triclopyr – AIR III (PL) Triticonazole – AIR III (AT)
Pesticide Peer Review 17	16 October 2019 h 14:00 18 October 2019 h 17:00	Mammalian toxicology	General meeting on recurring issues in mammalian toxicology

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 08	12 September 2019 09:00- 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Chloropicrin – NAS 1107 (IT)
TC 09	27 September 2019 14:00- 17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology - Ecotoxicology (joint session) Re-assess ED properties following mandate SANTE	Asulam - NAS 1107 (UK/FR)
TC 10	8 October 2019 09:00- 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Clomazone – AIR III (DK)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

 $<sup>^{**}</sup>$   $\,$  AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New active substance under Reg (EU) No 1107/2009





# PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES MAY-JULY 2019

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticide Peer Review 05	7 May 2019 h 09:00 8 May 2019 h 17:00	Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) ED properties	Benfluralin - AIR IV (NO) Flufenacet - AIR III (PL) Milbemectin - AIR III (DE) Cyprodinil - AIR III (FR) Benalaxyl - AIR III (RO) Pydiflumetofen - NAS 1107 (FR)
Pesticide Peer Review 06	12 June 2019 h 09:00 14 June 2019 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Flutolanil – AIR IV (NL) including ED discussion Fenoxaprop-P-ethyl – AIR III (AT) including ED discussion Tritosulfuron– AIR III (SI) including ED discussion Diuron – AIR III (DE) including ED discussion ED properties: Metconazole – AIR III (BE) Diflubenzuron – AIR III (EL) Formetanate – AIR III (ES) Phosmet – AIR III (ES)
Pesticide Peer Review 07	17 June 2019 h 14:00 20 June 2019 h 18:00	Mammalian toxicology – session 1	Fenoxaprop-P-ethyl – AIR III (AT) Pirimicarb (inc. Non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (UK/SE) Diuron (incl. non-dietary exp.) – AIR III (DE) Phosmet (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (ES) Flutolanil (incl. non-dietary exp.) – AIR IV (NL)
Pesticide Peer Review 07	17 June 2019 h 09:00 21 June 2019 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology – session 2	Tritosulfuron- AIR III (SI) Metconazole - AIR III (BE) Formetanate (incl. non-dietary exp.) - AIR III (ES) Diflubenzuron (incl. non-dietary exp) - AIR III (EL)

Pesticide Peer Review 08	17 June 2019 h 09:00 21 June 2019 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Metconazole – AIR III (BE) Diflubenzuron – AIR III (EL) Formetanate – AIR III (ES) Phosmet – AIR III (ES)
Pesticide Peer Review 09	24 June 2019 h 09:00 28 June 2019 h 15:00	Residues	Metconazole - AIR III (BE) Diflubenzuron - AIR III (EL) Phosmet - AIR III (ES) Flutolanil - AIR IV (NL) Formetanate - AIR III (ES) Tritosulfuron- AIR III (SI)
Pesticide Peer Review 10	16 July 2019 h 09:00 17 July 2019 h 17:00	Mammalian toxicology – Ecotoxicology (joint session) re-assess ED properties following mandate SANTE	Mecoprop-P- AIR III (UK/IE) Dichlorprop-P- AIR III (IE) Mepanipyrim- AIR III (BE) Phenmedipham- AIR III (FI) Spinosad- AIR III (NL) Trinexapac-ethyl- AIR III (LT)

Teleconference	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 01	15 May 2019 h 09:00 - 13:00 (GMT+2 Rome)	Fate and behaviour	Fenoxaprop-P-ethyl – AIR III (AT)
TC 02	4 June 2019 h 14:00 - 16:00 (GMT+2 Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Phlebiopsis gigantea strains – AIR IV (EE)
TC 03	14 June 2019 h 09:00 - 15:00 (GMT+2 Rome)	Fate and behaviour	Phosmet - AIR III (ES)
TC 04	24 June 2019 h 09:00 - 13:00 (GMT+2 Rome)	Fate and behaviour	<del>Diuron – AIR III (DE)</del>
TC 05	26 June 2019 h 09:00 - 16:00 (GMT+2 Rome)	Fate and behaviour	Diflubenzuron – AIR III (EL) Flutolanil – AIR IV (NL)
TC 06	2 July 2019 h 09:00 - 13:00 (GMT+2 Rome)	Residues	Fenoxaprop-P-ethyl – AIR III (AT)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III, AIR IV - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 – New active substance under Reg (EU) No 1107/2009; Amendment approval conditions – Amendment of approval conditions under Reg (EU) No 1107/20



## PESTICIDE PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS APRIL 2019

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticide Peer Review 01	1 April 2019 h 09:00 5 April 2019 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology – session 1	Chlorpyrifos (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (ES) Chlorpyrifos-methyl (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (ES) Tolpyralate (SL-573) (incl. non-dietary exposure) – NAS 1107 (UK/DE) Dimethyl disulphide (incl. non-dietary exposure) – NAS 1107 (FR) Prosulfuron – Amendment approval conditions (FR)
Pesticide Peer Review 01	1 April 2019 h 14:00 5 April 2019 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology – session 2	Fludioxonil (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (FR) Propamocarb – AIR III (PT) Trifloxysulfuron - MRL application (FR) Ziram (incl. non-dietary exposure) – AIR III (IT)
Pesticide Peer Review 02	1 April 2019 h <b>14:00</b> 5 April 2019 h 13:00	Fate and behaviour	Chlorpyrifos – AIR III (ES) Chlorpyrifos-methyl – AIR III (ES) Tolpyralate (SL-573) – NAS 1107 (UK/DE) Dimethyl disulphide – NAS 1107 (FR)
Pesticide Peer Review 03	8 April 2019 h <b>14:00</b> 12 April 2019 h <b>13:00</b>	Ecotoxicology	Tolpyralate (SL-573) - NAS 1107 (UK/DE) Propamocarb - AIR III (PT) Fludioxonil - AIR III (FR) Ziram - AIR III (IT) Dimethyl disulphide - NAS 1107 (FR)



Pesticide Peer Review 04	10 April 2019 h <b>14:00</b> 12 April 2019 h 13:00	Residues	Tolpyralate (SL-573) - NAS 1107 (UK/DE) Propamocarb - AIR III (PT) Fludioxonil - AIR III (FR) Ziram - AIR III (IT)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 New active substance under Reg (EU) No 1107/2009; Amendment approval conditions Amendment of approval conditions under Reg (EU) No 1107/2009



#### **PESTICIDES UNIT**

### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

#### JANUARY - FEBRUARY 2019

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 190 Session 1	28 January 2019 h 14:00 1 February 2019 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology (session 1 in parallel with session 2)	Metiram - AIR III (IT) Mancozeb - AIR III (UK) Pyriproxyfen - AIR III (NL) Dimethomorph - AIR III (NL)
Pesticides Peer Review 190 Session 2	28 January 2019 h 14:00 31 January 2019 h 14:00	Mammalian toxicology (session 2 in parallel with session 1)	Pirimicarb – AIR III (UK) Pirimiphos-methyl – AIR III (UK) Tri-allate – Confirmatory data (UK) Fosetyl - AIR III, rediscussion ArfD (FR) Mecoprop-P non-dietary exposure assessment (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 191	28 January 2019 h 13:00 1 February 2019 h 14:00	Residues	Metiram - AIR III (IT) Mancozeb - AIR III (UK) Pirimicarb - AIR III (UK) Pirimiphos-methyl - AIR III (UK) Dimethomorph - AIR III (NL) Tri-allate - Confirmatory data (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 192 Session 1	11 February 2019 h 9:00 15 February 2019 h 17:00	Ecotoxicology  (session 1 in parallel with session 2)	Metiram – AIR III (IT) Mancozeb – AIR III (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 192 Session 2	11 February 2019 h <b>14:00</b> 15 February 2019 h <b>13:00</b>	Ecotoxicology  (session 2 in parallel with session 1)	Pirimicarb – AIR III (UK) Pirimiphos-methyl – AIR III (UK) Pyriproxyfen – AIR III (NL) Dimethomorph – AIR III (NL)



Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 200	22 January 2019 h 9:00 – 12.00 (GMT+1)	Ecotoxicology	Bacillus amyloliquefaciens AH2- NAS 1107 (NL)
TC 201	29 January 2019 h 9:00 - 13.00 (GMT+1)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Pyriproxyfen – AIR III (NL)

 $<sup>^{</sup>st}$  the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

 $<sup>^{**}</sup>$   $\,$  AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New active substance under Reg (U) No 1107/2009



#### **PESTICIDES UNIT**

#### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETING ON PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES AND ANALYTICAL METHODS

#### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW 189 DRAFT AGENDA

#### 14 NOVEMBER 2018 H 9:00 16 NOVEMBER 2018 H 13:00

#### 1. Status and discussions on CRD Guidance on physical, chemical and technical properties of PPPs

What is the status of the CRD Guidance on physical and chemical properties? When is the official distribution for comments by SCoPAFF expected?	DE
CRD/EU draft Phys-Chem and Storage Stability GD The Northern Zone (NZ) chemists commented together the storage stability part of the draft GD. The final draft version is going forward to policy colleagues, who will take it to the next available Standing Committee Meeting with the Commission (most likely to be October).  4 areas will be highlighted to the commission where further consideration is required for full harmonisation:  • Methods accepted for physical hazards (EC or UN methods)  • The requirement for studies to be conducted to GLP  • The need for long term storage stability data prior to authorisation in the Northern Zone  • The inclusion of a CAS statement for tank mixes.  What was the outcome?	FI
Guideline on physical, chemical and technical properties of Plant Protection Products (PPPs) under Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009  An updated version of the "old" UK guidance document was published on the UK HSE website in 2015. It has since been through two substantial commenting phases with other EU Member States, EFSA, Industry and wider Stakeholders with the aim of producing an EU harmonised guidance document. If the meeting would like we can provide an update on the status of this document and how it is now being taken forward within the European Commission.	UK



#### 2. Physical-chemical properties of a.s. and PPP

If there are two or more applicants with their own complete dossier, which endpoint will be included in the LoEP?	DE
In the renewal, there are often different values for each applicant in the LoEP.	
This is not regarded as reasonable, only one should be an endpoint.	
Furthermore, if the old value of the DAR is still acceptable, only this	
value should remain in the LoEP and only the DAR study should be listed in the references relied on.	
If there are several studies on the same endpoint from the same task	DK
force, should they then all be evaluated?	DI
If new data are provided as supportive even though the old study is still valid, should these new studies still be evaluated? Should they be	DK
relied on?	
Are all studies, that were evaluated and accepted, relied on? Or is it	DK
only those studies whose endpoints ends at the LOEP?  If the studies have been used for step 1 annex II data matching	DK
previously but submitted for supportive information, should they still be	
evaluated and included in the RAR? Should they be relied on?  Pure active substance:	DK
When data requirements state 'purified active substance' to be tested,	DK
is then one study representing the whole task force acceptable? We	
tend to think so. However, each Taskforce should fulfil the data requirement. Hence, if there is more than one taskforce, then each	
should submit a study for each end-point. Unless data protection from	
last review of the active substance has expired, then these data can be	
used, if they fulfil data requirement.  Active substance as manufactured:	DK
When data requirements state 'active substances as manufactured' to be tested, then it should be demonstrated for each of the technical active substances in each task force? For example when two task-forces of three companies each (total companies of 6 and 6 different	DK
technical materials), should then all 6 technical materials be tested to demonstrate appearance, solubility in organic solvents, flammability, self-heating, flash point, explosive properties and oxidizing properties? If not all technical materials should be tested - Should the batch in the	
studies represent one of the technical materials of the task force or could it just be a completely different batch?	
If not all technical materials should be tested - If the technical material can be both liquid and solid at room temperature, should both physical states be tested?	
According to SANCO/2012/11251, the RAR should contain the original	DE
data of the DAR and the supplementary data. The re-assessment of	
previously accepted studies is not intended unless it is necessary in the light of current scientific and technical knowledge.	
1. Except of new data requirements, what are the reasons to re-assess	
physchem. studies of the DAR?  2. In case that a DAR study is still accepted, the related supplementary	
data should be marked in the RAR as e.g. "additional information" and	
only the DAR study will be included in the list of references relied on.	
Can this be confirmed? Oxidising properties	DK
We experience active substance and PPP applicants to stop after the	DK
preliminary test when testing oxidizing properties according to A17 in	
Regulation 440/2008. According to this test method the preliminary	



test can only clarify if the test material has oxidizing the other way around. If the preliminary test is need to the full test. The preliminary test is for securing only be used to state the positive effect. The negative come from the full test or from a justification base structure. See Regulation 440/2008 A.17 section 1.4 is required when the preliminary test clearly individed substance has oxidising properties. When this is substance should then be subject to the full test.'  The statement in section 1.6.2.1 'The substance is oxidising if the reaction is vigorous. In any case open to doubt, it is then necessary to complete described below.' Refers to the positive reaction in the full test. If you are sure it was a positive reaction the full test.  Do you think there are cases where it is possible preliminary test and still conclude the test-material	egative, you have to ty reasons and can ve conclusion has to sed on the chemical 4 'No further testing icates that the test is not the case the to be considered as where the result is the full train test the preliminary test. ould continue to the you should not do the to stop after the	
In case that an endpoint is changed in the renewal,		DE
in the LoEP? For example by the addition "(new)".  Are studies still accepted, which were initiated befo without GLP, when they are scientifically still valid?  DE assumes that the guidance on GLP ger 7017/VI/95 (June 1996) is still applicable, so that t used.	neral requirements	DE
GLP status of "interim" shelf-life studies for authoris It is increasingly common for all of the storage sta data generation to be combined within one sta submission of the accelerated data in the form of a the basis of which we grant a time limited submission of the final report (2 year ambient she set as a data requirement for continued authorisation The UK GLP authority have recently indicated that compliance for interim reports may not be justified a question whether it is acceptable to make a regular grant authorisation) on the basis of an interim report discussing this with the UK GLP Authority but would other Member States treat interim reports.	ability and shelf-life udy i.e. the initial in interim report, on authorisation; the elf-life data) is then on. It any claims of GLP which has lead us to ulatory decision (to ort. We are currently	UK
What kind of deviations from the methods listed in to is acceptable? (e.g. MT 47.2 used instead of 47.3, or in-house method)		DE
For some technical properties, both, UN-RTDG or EE used to address the data requirements. The UN-RTD needed for CLP.  Are EEC methods still necessary for these properties methods be removed in the next revision of the met communication?	OG method is s? Should these	DE
Concerning the technical tests (persistent foam wettability), it is not clear if this test should be performed or not. The regulation (EC) 1107/2009, art 3 points GLP, refers to the directive 2004/10/CE. FR conside 2004/10/CE superseded the document 7109/VI/94 is According to the directive 2004/10/CE all stuniformation on properties of the substance and in the health and environment must be conducted un Fr considers that the technical properties should be	erformed under GLP t 19 concerning the ers that the directive Rev 6. udies that provide nnocuity concerning oder GLP. Therefore,	FR



GLP. Indeed, for example, an excess of foam can lead to an overflow of the tank and therefore increases the exposure or when the wettability is not good, it can lead to an increase of exposure as the granules can block the equipment.	
Acceptable limits have been set for technical properties such as 60 mL for persistent foaming, 70 for suspensibility When the results of the test are outside these limits it is indicated in the draft guidance document for the generation of data on the physical, chemical and technical properties of plant protection products under regulation from UK, that evidence must be submitted showing that there is no unacceptable risk to operators following use of the preparation through the appropriate application equipment. However, currently no field test allowing to demonstrate it is available and no validation criteria are described. How do the member states assess these data?	FR
Reg. 284/2013, Part A Section2, 2.5 Viscosity The Regulation 284 states: For liquid formulations the viscosity shall be determined at two shear rates and at 20°C and 40°C and reported together with the test conditions.  In the commission communication method OECD 114 is given to determine Viscosity. OECD 114 describes different methods. Only for rotational viscosimetry shear rates can be given.  In our opinion all the other methods can be used for Newtonian liquids as well. What is the view of other experts?	АТ
Field test for phys-chem parameters Follow up point 19 (chapter 3 page 46) discussion table PRAS 150. FR indicated that they are working on this issue. Are there any news?	AT

### 3. Status and discussions on Guidance documents SANCO/3030/99, SANCO/3029/99 and SANCO/825/00

Update SANCO/3030/99	NL
What is the status of the update of guidance document	İ
SANCO/3030/99	
Guidance SANCO 3030: This guidance is under revision. State of the	ES
work. The units for the linearity for the a.s. and impurities in technical	İ
material to be discussed. While units for impurities in w/v (e.g. mg/L)	İ
and in %w/w are adequate, we think that for active substances units in	İ
%w/w has no sense.	
Status of the revision of SANCO/825/00 and SANCO/3029/99 after the	BE
call to stakeholders to possibly identify points for consideration for	İ
revision. Consolidated comments from EFSA, MS, EU ref labs and	ı
industry were dispatched at the end of February 2018. What are the	İ
following steps and timing foreseen?	
Revisions of SANCO/3030/99 and SANCO 825	FI
What is the stage of the process?	
Status of guidance documents that are currently under revision	AT
3030/99	İ
3029/99 & 825/00	İ
Significant – non significant change (12638/2011)	ı
CRD guidance document (Pyhs-Chem)	
Update on guidance documents and their revisions would be important.	LT
Guidance document SANTE/11813/2017 rev. 0 on quality control and	ı
method validation procedures for pesticide residues and analysis in	ı
food and feed should also be taken into account.	l



### 4. Analytical methods

Update SANCO/3029/00  Many pre-registration methods are not fully validated to SANCO/3029/00, but may still be considered fit for purpose, e.g. when	NL
there is a zero residue situation. What should be the consequences when validation does not fully comply with the requirements? Should	
the guidance be updated to reflect that full validation may not be necessary in all cases?	
Assessment of methods used for the generation of pre-approval data (Reg. (EU) 283/2013)	LT
The methods used in a number of studies of tox and the other sections of assessment for data generation are not validated according to the	
SANCO/3029/99, i.e.:	
-Limited information is available on precision and accuracy that are derived from procedural recoveries;	
-Linearity is not fully covered or not addressed; -The methods are not sufficiently specific and confirmatory method are	
missing; -Insufficient number of recoveries per fortification level available; These issues, however, have been considered by applicants as minor	
deviations and methods still being fit for purpose. When and why it should be accepted that no new method validation is required?	
How should the final conclusion on the acceptability of such methods used in different sections of assessment be reached?	
Update SANCO/825/00	NL
The guidance document for post-registration monitoring methods is not	
consistent with the data requirements as laid down in 283 and	
284/2013/EU. The ILV for drinking water should be added. In addition,	
the criteria for requiring a method for blood and tissues should be amended.	
With implementation of Regulation (EU) 283/2013, monitoring methods	DE
for body fluids and tissues are required for all active substances, i.e. regardless of the classification. Many data gaps originate from this change.	
Nevertheless not much effort was put so far in deriving appropriate residue definitions for body fluids and tissues.	
Although it becomes sometimes evident that parent is not a suitable	
marker compound for monitoring (based on metabolism studies with	
rodents or livestock), it seems that parent is often set as the residue	
definition by default. Requiring methods for parent is often not reasonable. From our experience, awareness needs to be raised among	
toxicologists/residue chemists that a residue definition consisting of	
suitable marker compounds should be provided to analytical chemists	
for them to decide if matching methods exist or, if data gaps need to	
be set.	
We would like to share our experiences on the issue of monitoring methods and residue definitions for body fluids and tissues with other	
Member States.	
Analyte (residue definition) of the methods for body fluids and tissues	LT
(blood)?	DI
For PPP that are capsule suspensions: Do you have any experience/knowledge about the determination of the free fraction?	DK
One notifier had a method where the "free" non-encapsulated a.s.	
fraction was obtained by dispersion of the formulation in water for 30	
seconds followed by filtration to remove the encapsulated fraction. The	



notifier states that the complete operation should be completed in less than 2 minutes. Another notifier had a method where the "free" non-encapsulated a.s. fraction was obtained by dispersion of the formulation in water for 30 minutes.  Should the specified time be justified by e.g. reference to experimental data from the method development?  Any requirements in terms of sensitivity, e.g. LOQ <xx "free"="" active="" determination="" for="" methods="" of="" substance?<="" td="" the=""><td></td></xx>	
Applying the guidance document on evaluation of extraction efficiency in residue analytical methods (SANTE/10632/2017 Rev.3 of 22.11.2017).  1. With reference to the document, 5.1 Decision trees for post registration monitoring methods and pre-registration methods (Figure 1 and 3) indicate that the detailed expert judgement is needed when the compounds of DoR are present in non - extracted radioactive residue. Elaboration of these cases is rather complex issue and the input of experts of residue section assessing metabolism studies would be very important. As long as this is the issue for section 1 and residue section assessing metabolites, sharing experiences on expert judgements would be very important.  2. Bridging between matrices for addressing extraction efficiency. The guidance document (4.2) says that 'the extraction efficiency should be evaluated for all matrix groups or animal commodities for which residue analytical methods are required. One example for each matrix group or respective commodity is sufficient. The selection of matrix groups depends on the availability of sample material from metabolism studies or samples with incurred residues  Bridging between high water content and slightly acidic matrices is acceptable for slightly acidic matrices but should be justified by applicant.  When the bridging would not be acceptable?	LT
Extraction efficiency A new guidance is available for this issue. Extraction efficiency shall be included in the monitoring methods. Who assesses the results of extraction efficiency tests?	AT
SANTE/10632/2017 rev. 3 (22 November 2017) The Technical Guideline on the Evaluation of Extraction Efficiency of Residue Analytical Methods (SANTE/10632/2017) will have to be followed starting from 22.11.2019. It concerns 1) approval of NAS:s as well as renewals 2) authorisations of new ppp:s as well as reauthorisations, and 3) MRL:s. The GD is very complicated and would require some training. Could EFSA arrange this? Does any MS have experience using the GD?	FR
Concerning template for analytical methods We would very much appreciated if the template for analytical methods had a column added to it where references were given to the studies executed on other disciplines, e.g. eco tox and residues – and using an analytical method to generate pre-registration data. This would ease the assessment, and also the communication between the chemist and the assessors working on the other disciplines.	NZ



### 5. Status of the Guidance of isomers

Guidance of isomers. State of the work on this guidance.	ES
GD on assessment of isomers	FI
What is the stage of the process?	
Difenoconazole isomers: In EFSA Conclusion on the peer review of the pesticide risk assessment of the active substance difenoconazole (2011) it is stated that active substance difenoconazole is a mixture of diastereo isomers, but the possible preferential metabolism/degradation of each enantiomer in animals, plants and the environment was not investigated in the studies submitted in the dossier and was therefore not considered during the peer review. Moreover, the analytical methods used in the studies reported through all sections were not stereo-selective, and all values mentioned as "difenoconazole" have to be considered as "sum of isomers". Recently, one applicant conducted a study for determination of difenoconazole isomers, but with regard to the EFSA peer review of the pesticide risk assessment for the active substance difenoconazole, confirmatory data concerning the impact of isomers of difenoconazole was to be submitted within 2 years from the adoption of specific guidance. No specific guidance has been established according to our knowledge so these methods still aren't a requirement.  Will there be any guidance concerning the impact of difenoconazole diastereo isomers?	HR
TTC approach EFSA 2016: we think that the Guidance of equivalence (SANCO/10597/2003 -rev. 10.1) should be actualized taking into account the conclusions of the 2016 EFSA review on TTC approach.	ES
Update on guidance documents and their revisions would be important. Guidance document SANTE/11813/2017 rev. 0 on quality control and method validation procedures for pesticide residues and analysis in food and feed should also be taken into account.	LT

# 6. Identity, specifications, reference specifications, relevant impurities, batch data

Proposed topic	MS
Impurities	
Relevant impurities: the definition of "relevant impurity" should be clarified. It is necessary to establish criteria to consider when an impurity can be considered relevant. We have only information included in the guidance on equivalence (SANCO/10597/2003 –rev. 10.1). We think that this information is not enough.  In addition, the consideration of an impurity as relevant should be done at level of active substance evaluation (for approval), therefore we think that it would be necessary to have an alone document or guidance on this issue.  It could be helpful to take into account the ECHA Draft on Definition of relevant impurities (Date of draft: 11 July 2017), where two option are provided: 1. Definition based on hazard properties and 2. Definition based on hazard properties and concentration.	ES
Assessment of relevance of impurities. For the assessment of new unknown impurities of active substances and whether they are (eco)toxicologically relevant, the (Q)SAR modelling using DEREK, VEGA is being performed. It might be implied that the section 1 should assess the relevance of impurities based on the structures and comparability of substances then. Clarification on how much and to which extent the section 1 should be involved in relevance of the impurities assessment	LT



would be appreciated.	
Guidance on equivalence: ecotoxicological assessment of impurities.	ES
The proposal of the guidance based on a calculation is simply reduced	
to a consideration of the concentration and not to the intrinsic hazard of the impurity. To be discussed if this is an adequate approach.	
Residual solvents as impurities. Considerations of the ICH guidance as	ES
adequate to address this issue.	
Process solvents as possible relevant impurities in technical materials.	UK
What LOQ would be appropriate for the determination of a process solvent in a technical material? As an example:	
A second manufacturer is applying for technical equivalence and they	
use toluene as a solvent in the final manufacturing step. If toluene was	
not used in the manufacture of the reference source what LOQ should	
the second manufacturer use in their batch analysis for toluene? Is 1 g/kg sufficient? If they provide screening data to show levels are < 0.5	
g/kg should we require further data (full batch data using a validated	
method)? One approach is to apply a "margin of safety" factor to the	
C&L trigger level and use this as an indication of a suitable level at	
which the solvent would not be relevant and ask for data at that level.	
What approach do other Member States take?  Spectra are required for impurities considered of toxicological,	DK
ecotoxicological or environmental significance. The term is confusing as	
another term is used in the 'Guidance document on the assessment of	
the equivalence of technical materials of substances regulated under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009' (SANCO/10597/2003 – rev. 10.1, July	
2012). Here Significant impurities are all those components present in	
quantities $\geq 1$ g/kg in the active substance as manufactured. Whereas	
Relevant impurities are those of toxicological, ecotoxicological and/or	
environmental concern – even if present below 1 g/kg. We would tend to think that the spectra should be provided for those impurities that	
are considered relevant according to the equivalence GD. How do you	
interpret this?	
Reg. 283/2013, Part A Section1, 1.11 Analytical Profile of Batches	AT
It is stated: All of the representative batches shall be within the last five years of manufacture. Where data from the last five years of production	
are not available, a justification shall be provided.	
What kind of justification is acceptable? (i.e. QC Data, Lack of	
production,)	
Confirmation of analyte identification (active substance, relevant and significant impurities)	GR
In Reg. 283/2013, Section 1, points 1.10.2 & 1.10.3 regarding	
significant and relevant impurities, respectively, it is stated that	
"Information on how the structural identity of the impurities was	
determined shall be given".	
In addition, in SANCO/3029/99 rev. 4 (11/07/00), point 3.1.3 "Confirmation of analyte identification" it is reported that confirmatory	
techniques are required to support identification when the primary	
method of determination is not GC-MS or another highly specific	
method as HPLC-UV DAD.	
- Is HPLC-DAD considered suitable stand alone analytical technique for the identification of the active substances and impurities or should it be	
used as a second technique to confirm another primary?	
- Is the chromatographic peak collection followed by DAD or IR	
considered suitable analytical techniques for the identification of the	
active substances and impurities or should they be used as a second technique to confirm another primary?	
- A list/table of the accepted analytical techniques and an appropriate	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	



- Should the second/confirmatory technique be validated in terms of quantification?  LOQ for relevant and significant impurities – 5 batch analysis  In Reg 283/2013, Section 4, points 4.1.1 regarding additives, significant and relevant impurities it is stated that the experimental determination of LOQ shall not be required. In what means it will be demonstrated that the analytical method is suitable to quantify to the desired level? Is it acceptable to consider LOQ the lowest validated level?  Are specific values below the LOQ acceptable to be reported in the 5-batch table?  If an impurity is detected but not quantified in some of the batches but quantified in others what should be the value for the not-quantified impurity in the 5-batch table in order to perform the statistical analysis? Is it acceptable that for the calculation of the standard deviations (SD), values below the LOQ to be assumed equal to the LOQ and not detected impurities to be taken into account as zero?  Specifications  Minimum purity: In case more than one applicant provided a complete dossier and each specification is covered by tox and ecotox, then the minimum purity should be set to the lowest level of the acceptable specifications.  In the LoEP should be given only one minimum purity.  Identity/ specification of "naturally occurring substances"  Example: Diatomaceaous earth. AT is RMS for the Renewal Currently this is specified as 1000 g/kg diatomaceous earth with a relevant impurity of crystalline SiO2.  Therefore all the different metal oxids/salts present in Diatomaceaous earth are active substance. There is however an analytical method to determine the major component SiO2  How to specify such naturally occurring substances? Is an analytical method for the determination of the active substance in the preparation necessary?  When reference specifications need to be amended and what the consequences are is still often a point of discussion. It would be appreciated to discuss when there is the need to redefine the reference specificat	combination (primary/confirmatory) of them would be useful.	
Quantification?  LOQ for relevant and significant impurities – 5 batch analysis  In Reg 283/2013, Section 4, points 4.1.1 regarding additives, significant and relevant impurities it is stated that the experimental determination of LOQ shall not be required. In what means it will be demonstrated that the analytical method is suitable to quantify to the desired level? Is it acceptable to consider LOQ the lowest validated level?  Are specific values below the LOQ acceptable to be reported in the 5-batch table?  If an impurity is detected but not quantified in some of the batches but quantified in others what should be the value for the not-quantified impurity in the 5-batch table in order to perform the statistical analysis? Is it acceptable that for the calculation of the standard deviations (SD), values below the LOQ to be assumed equal to the LOQ and not detected impurities to be taken into account as zero?  Specifications  Minimum purity: In case more than one applicant provided a complete dossier and each specification is covered by tox and ecotox, then the minimum purity should be set to the lowest level of the acceptable specifications.  In the LoEP should be given only one minimum purity.  Identity's specification of "naturally occurring substances"  Example: Diatomaceaous earth. AT is RMS for the Renewal Currently this is specified as 1000 g/kg diatomaceous earth with a relevant impurity of crystalline SiO2.  Therefore all the different metal oxids/salts present in Diatomaceaous earth are active substance. There is however an analytical method to determine the major component SiO2  How to specify such naturally occurring substances? Is an analytical method for the determination of the active substance in the preparation necessary?  When reference specifications need to be amended and what the consequences are is still often a point of discussion. It would be appreciated to discuss when there is the need to redefine the reference specification and how to exactly address the issues that occur with equivalen		
In Reg 283/2013, Section 4, points 4.1.1 regarding additives, significant and relevant impurities it is stated that the experimental determination of LOQ shall not be required. In what means it will be demonstrated that the analytical method is suitable to quantify to the desired level? Is it acceptable to consider LOQ the lowest validated level? Are specific values below the LOQ acceptable to be reported in the 5-batch table?  If an impurity is detected but not quantified in some of the batches but quantified in others what should be the value for the not-quantified impurity in the 5-batch table in order to perform the statistical analysis? Is it acceptable that for the calculation of the standard deviations (SD), values below the LOQ to be assumed equal to the LOQ and not detected impurities to be taken into account as zero?  Specifications  Minimum purity: In case more than one applicant provided a complete dossier and each specification is covered by tox and ecotox, then the minimum purity should be set to the lowest level of the acceptable specifications.  In the LoP should be given only one minimum purity.  Identity/ specification of "naturally occurring substances" Example: Diatomaceaous earth. AT is RMS for the Renewal Currently this is specified as 1000 g/kg diatomaceous earth with a relevant impurity of crystalline SiO2.  Therefore all the different metal oxids/salts present in Diatomaceaous earth are active substance. There is however an analytical method to determine the major component SiO2  How to specify such naturally occurring substances? Is an analytical method for the determination of the active substance in the preparation necessary?  1. How to deal with equivalence assessments?  When reference specifications and the proposed to be amended and what the consequences are is still often a point of discussion. It would be appreciated to discuss when there is the need to redefine the reference specification and how to exactly address the issues that occur with equivalent sources.  Change of techn	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Minimum purity: In case more than one applicant provided a complete dossier and each specification is covered by tox and ecotox, then the minimum purity should be set to the lowest level of the acceptable specifications.  In the LoEP should be given only one minimum purity.  Identity/ specification of "naturally occurring substances" Example: Diatomaceaous earth. AT is RMS for the Renewal Currently this is specified as 1000 g/kg diatomaceous earth with a relevant impurity of crystalline SiO2. Therefore all the different metal oxids/salts present in Diatomaceaous earth are active substance. There is however an analytical method to determine the major component SiO2 How to specify such naturally occurring substances? Is an analytical method for the determination of the active substance in the preparation necessary?  1. How to deal with equivalence assessments?  When reference specifications need to be amended and what the consequences are is still often a point of discussion. It would be appreciated to discuss when there is the need to redefine the reference specification and how to exactly address the issues that occur with equivalent sources.  Change of technical specifications during renewal. Considerations of the disagreement between risk assessment and risk management and consequences. How to deal with data gaps regarding representativeness of batches used in tox and ecotox studies and compliance with art. 61 and 62 of Regulation 1107/2009.  Renewal: A clear statement regarding the reference specification is needed, taking all information from identity, tox. and ecotox. into account.  If the existing reference specification is covered by tox. and ecotox., this should remain the reference specification.  To be discussed what happens if both specifications (existing reference specification and new proposed) are not covered by tox. and ecotox  Reference Specification after Renewal of Active substances	LOQ for relevant and significant impurities – 5 batch analysis  In Reg 283/2013, Section 4, points 4.1.1 regarding additives, significant and relevant impurities it is stated that the experimental determination of LOQ shall not be required. In what means it will be demonstrated that the analytical method is suitable to quantify to the desired level? Is it acceptable to consider LOQ the lowest validated level?  Are specific values below the LOQ acceptable to be reported in the 5-batch table?  If an impurity is detected but not quantified in some of the batches but quantified in others what should be the value for the not-quantified impurity in the 5-batch table in order to perform the statistical analysis? Is it acceptable that for the calculation of the standard deviations (SD), values below the LOQ to be assumed equal to the LOQ and not detected	GR
dossier and each specification is covered by tox and ecotox, then the minimum purity should be set to the lowest level of the acceptable specifications.  In the LoEP should be given only one minimum purity.  Identity/ specification of "naturally occurring substances"  Example: Diatomaceaous earth. AT is RMS for the Renewal Currently this is specified as 1000 g/kg diatomaceous earth with a relevant impurity of crystalline SiO2.  Therefore all the different metal oxids/salts present in Diatomaceaous earth are active substance. There is however an analytical method to determine the major component SiO2 How to specify such naturally occurring substances? Is an analytical method for the determination of the active substance in the preparation necessary?  1. How to deal with equivalence assessments?  When reference specifications need to be amended and what the consequences are is still often a point of discussion. It would be appreciated to discuss when there is the need to redefine the reference specification and how to exactly address the issues that occur with equivalent sources.  Change of technical specifications during renewal. Considerations of the disagreement between risk assessment and risk management and consequences. How to deal with data gaps regarding representativeness of batches used in tox and ecotox studies and compliance with art. 61 and 62 of Regulation 1107/2009.  Renewal: A clear statement regarding the reference specification is needed, taking all information from identity, tox. and ecotox. into account.  If the existing reference specification is covered by tox. and ecotox., this should remain the reference specification.  If only the new proposed specification is covered by tox. and ecotox  Reference Specification after Renewal of Active substances  AT	Specifications	
Identity/ specification of "naturally occurring substances"	dossier and each specification is covered by tox and ecotox, then the minimum purity should be set to the lowest level of the acceptable specifications.	DE
Currently this is specified as 1000 g/kg diatomaceous earth with a relevant impurity of crystalline SiO2.  Therefore all the different metal oxids/salts present in Diatomaceaous earth are active substance. There is however an analytical method to determine the major component SiO2  How to specify such naturally occurring substances? Is an analytical method for the determination of the active substance in the preparation necessary?  1. How to deal with equivalence assessments?  When reference specifications need to be amended and what the consequences are is still often a point of discussion. It would be appreciated to discuss when there is the need to redefine the reference specification and how to exactly address the issues that occur with equivalent sources.  Change of technical specifications during renewal. Considerations of the disagreement between risk assessment and risk management and consequences. How to deal with data gaps regarding representativeness of batches used in tox and ecotox studies and compliance with art. 61 and 62 of Regulation 1107/2009.  Renewal: A clear statement regarding the reference specification is needed, taking all information from identity, tox. and ecotox. into account.  If the existing reference specification is covered by tox. and ecotox., this should remain the reference specification.  If only the new proposed specification is covered this should become the new reference specification.  To be discussed what happens if both specifications (existing reference specification and new proposed) are not covered by tox. and ecotox  Reference Specification after Renewal of Active substances		AT
consequences are is still often a point of discussion. It would be appreciated to discuss when there is the need to redefine the reference specification and how to exactly address the issues that occur with equivalent sources.  Change of technical specifications during renewal. Considerations of the disagreement between risk assessment and risk management and consequences. How to deal with data gaps regarding representativeness of batches used in tox and ecotox studies and compliance with art. 61 and 62 of Regulation 1107/2009.  Renewal: A clear statement regarding the reference specification is needed, taking all information from identity, tox. and ecotox. into account.  If the existing reference specification is covered by tox. and ecotox., this should remain the reference specification.  If only the new proposed specification is covered this should become the new reference specification.  To be discussed what happens if both specifications (existing reference specification and new proposed) are not covered by tox. and ecotox  Reference Specification after Renewal of Active substances  AT	Currently this is specified as 1000 g/kg diatomaceous earth with a relevant impurity of crystalline SiO2.  Therefore all the different metal oxids/salts present in Diatomaceaous earth are active substance. There is however an analytical method to determine the major component SiO2  How to specify such naturally occurring substances? Is an analytical method for the determination of the active substance in the preparation necessary?  1. How to deal with equivalence assessments?	
disagreement between risk assessment and risk management and consequences. How to deal with data gaps regarding representativeness of batches used in tox and ecotox studies and compliance with art. 61 and 62 of Regulation 1107/2009.  Renewal: A clear statement regarding the reference specification is needed, taking all information from identity, tox. and ecotox. into account.  If the existing reference specification is covered by tox. and ecotox., this should remain the reference specification.  If only the new proposed specification is covered this should become the new reference specification.  To be discussed what happens if both specifications (existing reference specification and new proposed) are not covered by tox. and ecotox  Reference Specification after Renewal of Active substances	When reference specifications need to be amended and what the consequences are is still often a point of discussion. It would be appreciated to discuss when there is the need to redefine the reference specification and how to exactly address the issues that occur with	NL
Renewal: A clear statement regarding the reference specification is needed, taking all information from identity, tox. and ecotox. into account.  If the existing reference specification is covered by tox. and ecotox., this should remain the reference specification.  If only the new proposed specification is covered this should become the new reference specification.  To be discussed what happens if both specifications (existing reference specification and new proposed) are not covered by tox. and ecotox  Reference Specification after Renewal of Active substances	Change of technical specifications during renewal. Considerations of the disagreement between risk assessment and risk management and consequences. How to deal with data gaps regarding representativeness of batches used in tox and ecotox studies and	ES
Reference Specification after Renewal of Active substances AT	Renewal: A clear statement regarding the reference specification is needed, taking all information from identity, tox. and ecotox. into account.  If the existing reference specification is covered by tox. and ecotox., this should remain the reference specification.  If only the new proposed specification is covered this should become the new reference specification.  To be discussed what happens if both specifications (existing reference	DE
		AT



included/highlighted in Review Report (COM) / EFSA conclusion. Status	
on this issue? (point 1 PRAS 150)  Reference specification:  1. Reference specification to be considered after renewal of an a.s. for equivalence: the situation remains in some cases quite unclear about the reference specification to be considered for equivalence assessments and there is not always a consistent approach within the equivalence reports – some examples:  - Propyzamide:	BE
From the final review report 2018 and Reg. (EU) 2018/755, the COM seems to have kept the old specification as the reference specification for renewal (min. of 920 g/kg is indicated in both documents) whereas it seems that both RMS and EFSA proposed to update the reference specification for renewal. In DAR, specification seems to be considered covered by (eco)tox batches. However, the review report stated that it cannot be concluded that the (eco)tox. batches were representative of the specification and that the presence and quantification of these impurities in the batches tested in (eco)tox. should be further investigated.	
Consequently, it is not fully clear which specification should be taken into account to perform equivalence assessments. From the information provided within review report and Reg. (EU) 2018/755, BE would take the initial reference specification as set for 1st approval but this seems to be not in agreement with the conclusions in the RAR and EFSA conclusions	
- Florasulam: a lot of equivalence reports since renewal but in some cases the Tier I is done against the old reference specification and in other cases to the new reference specification	
2. Setting a specification: 5-BA and QC data are available. If QC data indicates a lower purity than in the 5-BA but from the QC data it appears that it is not the majority of the batches that will present this lower purity, what is the best approach to set the specification? : lower the min. purity based on the results of the QC data (TC is as really produced) or leave the min. purity higher but with the consequence of a need of declaration from the applicant that batches outside the specification will be discarded (not for EU level) or re-blended to meet the specification (whereas this was not spontaneously proposed by the applicant) (case of isofetamid)	
3. Reference specification: pilot scale data vs. large scale data (i.e. isofetamid): although it is true that 283/2013 mentions that specification should be based on large scale data, a reference specification could be set on pilot scale data if they are the data assessed and considered covered (eco)toxicologically (i.e. most of the (eco)tox. tests performed with batches issued from this pilot scale production). Large scale data are indeed needed and assessed but have not to become systematically the reference specification because large scale.	
Co-formulants as active substances Some pesticide formulations contain a co-formulant which has been approved as an active substance. How should they be evaluated according to Reg.1107/2009? Should it be taken into account that the substance has been approved as the active (e.g. basic) substance or is it to be regarded as a co-formulant, e.g MSDS is sufficient? Should we consider the function of the co-formulant?	SK



Is there some difference if the basic substance has a function as preservative in the product (e.g. Sodium benzoate – approved as	
benzoic acid) or if it is merely the filler (e.g kaolin)	
How to present the ppp composition in the dRR in cases where variants of the active substance are formed during formulation (salts in first place)?	DE
· ,	
Should the excess of the reacting co-formulant be calculated?	
How to handle overdosage to compensate degradation of active substance?	DE
Is this accepted in other MS? Are there any other cases known than	
dimethoate?	
How to characterise the composition of a ppp in case a pre-solution is used as an alternative co-formulant?	DE

### 7. Microorganisms

Identity	FR
Microbial active substances are often produced in a continuous	
manufacturing process until the formulation of the microorganism	
active substance (no technical active substance). The continuous	
manufacturing process is used as the active substance is not stable and	
need to be formulated in order to be stored, transported or	
commercialised / or it is not economically interesting for applicant to	
stop the manufacturing process at technical active substance step.	
What do you require to characterise the active substance in this case?	
FR considers that it is necessary to provide at EU level (in the	
monograph or in a specification dossier) all information usually required	
for technical active substance to the formulated active substance here	
the plant protection product. These requirements should be provided	
for each new PPP manufactured with a continuous process.	
Stability	FR
The limit of 10% decreasing of active substance content in PPP is not	
applicable to the microorganism. The evaluation is based on the	
minimal certified value, in the appropriate microbial unit (CFU/g or	
ITU/g in the case of bioassay or OB/g or), of the microbial active	
substance in the formulation before and after storage.	
During the storage stability study, the content of the microbial active	
substance has to be higher the minimum certified value before and	
after storage as indicated in the OECD guidance document on storage	
stability of microbial pest control products.	
Therefore, as in the most of cases the microorganism PPPs are not	
stables 2 years at ambient temperature, FR considers that in the case	
the stability is proved after Y months (or weeks or years) at Z°C, it	
would be reported on the label: "Do not store at temperature higher	
than Z°C" and "Do not store more than Y months"	
Analytical method	FR
Currently, no guidance document on analytical method for the	
determination of microorganism is available and no criteria have been	
clearly established at EU level.	
The guidance document on analytical method for the determination of	
chemical active substance is not adapted for the analytical method	
used for microorganism	
Indeed, the determination of the microbial active substance can be	
performed by numeration of petri dishes or in the case of microbial	
active substances with a biopotency (effect of tone or metabolite) by	
the determination can be performed by bioassay.	



FR considers that positive and negative control and data on the repeatability are sufficient to validate a method. For the repeatability we consider ideally, the following criteria concerning the number of repetition:

- For bacteria: 5 batches have to be used, 3 samples have to be taken from each batch and for each sample. 3 Petri dishes have to be sowed. Ideally, the % RSD for each batch should lower or equal to 20 %.
- For fungi: 5 batches have to be used, 5 samples have to be taken from each batch and for each sample 3 Petri dishes have to be sowed. Ideally, the % RSD for each batch should lower or equal to 20 %. Do you consider that these criteria are sufficient? Do you consider that additional criteria should be required?

### 8. Equivalence, issues for PPP authorisation at MS level

How do we handle equivalence assessments as described below? In cases where COM not has agreed on an increase in purity stated in Vol. 4 specification and EFSA conclusion for the active substance in the renewal, at same time as also impurities have been changed in reference specification (Vol. 4). The question is which reference specification should be used for the impurities in an equivalence assessment, the DAR or the RAR specification? Propyzamide is one example concerning this issue.  Also, if we change in the specification regarding the impurities in renewal evaluations, should we then maintain the DAR specification of the active substance to be sure that the Vol. 4. renewal specification will be the valid one?	SE
Changing the reference specification after renewal of the a.s.  DE has been considering the process of reassessing equivalent sources in case of changing the reference specification after renewal of the active substance. What was the outcome?	FI
After the renewal of active substance, in the case where the changing of the reference specifications is clearly reported in the RAR or in the Efsa conclusion, how do the member states manage the status of existing equivalence reports? Do you follow the document sent by Germany (Dirk Wolffram) to member states in December 2016?  For the assessment of the specifications of active substance at EU level or in equivalency report, the difficulty is to know if the technical active substance contains some relevant impurities. The identity of impurities below 1g/kg are generally unknown. Then you would need to do a theoretical assessment based on the manufacturing process and the starting materials, to consider whether it is possible any hazardous byproducts are formed during synthesis of the active. In order to be able to do it, FR considers that the MSDS should be provided to facilitate the identification of potentially relevant impurity present in the starting materials.	FR
New relevant impurities analysis in formulation as an outcome of the EU renewal of AS approval.  New relevant impurities of the active substances require the validated methods for their determination in formulations with the sufficiently low LOQ considering their low concentrations (e.g below 0.01 %) in formulation. This is not always feasible to timely address by the applicant. Can the absence of method that does not demonstrate acceptable LOQ be considered a data gap for the product's authorization?	LT



Concerning properties of the variant of the active substance	NZ
Concerning authorization of PPP - how should we respond when the AS	
is formulated as e.g. a salt that has not been assessed at EU-level?	
These compounds could have properties of concern for e.g. mammalian	
and/or eco-toxicology and CLP. Should data and/or information	
concerning physchem therefore be requested? This topic is also	
relevant for PPPs that call for renewal of authorization based on	
renewed approval of glyphosate. Hence, we would appreciated it if this	
topic was discussed with glyphosate in mind	

### 9. Others

Identity of PPP and the decision on acceptability of alternative co- formulants	LT
There would be the need of the EU harmonized approach among MSs.	
It would be good to fully clarify the definitions 'alternative co-	
formulant' which is also called "option' by applicant and 'equivalent co- formulant'. Should the focus be drawn on the CLP in the risk	
assessment or identicality as a close similarity (CAS, structure,	
manufacturer, detailed composition) should be considered?	
To which extent could the alternative co-formulant contain a rather	
different substance or mixture that would not trigger CLP and would not change significantly phys-chem properties of formulation (e.g.	
presence of low content glycerol?)	
This is important to consider as long as different MS come to different	
decisions of alternative co-formulants	. –
Limits for co-formulants in the formulation (based on enquiries of applicants).	LT
We have been enquired by a non notifying company on possibility to	
authorize a formulation A which was claimed to be identical to the	
original product B authorized based on expiry of the data protection for	
B (Article 34, Reg.1107/2009). In the same time we have been questioned on permissible deviations, i.e. limits to deviate from the co-	
formulants contents specified. There insignificant deviations from the	
contents specified meant (e.g. batch to batch variations). Our	
understanding, however, was that based on criteria of the	
SANCO/12638/2011, any changes including the smallest ones would be regarded as a formulation change. And the two formulations are not	
likely to be identical based on their full composition details when	
manufactured by different sources (not under licence). Other points of	
view would be appreciated.  Bridging of package materials: Which changes can be tolerated?	DE
How is this handled in other MS? Does national guidance exist?	DL
In Croatia, recently there are many cases where applicants require	HR
prolongation of shelf-life for more than 2 years (e.g. 3 years). They	
conduct studies (for the formulation type) according to Technical Monograph n°17, 2nd Edition to demonstrate the stability of the	
product but not with all the studies necessary for the formulation type	
(e.g. In WG formulation there is no study for the wet sieve test).	
Should we consider this as a criteria for a negative evaluation if we	
have that same study in the 2 years shelf-life study?  Harmonisation on data requirements for different types (mandatory)	DE
and recommended) of tank mixtures: Could this point be included in	
the CRD Guidance or in the next revision?	
We would like to discuss the necessity to prepare CLH report,	CZ
respective to use the newest template where CLH is a part of RAR in	



case of AIR IV substances (sheep fat, fish oil, fat distillation residues	
etc.)	
New dRAR-CLH template	FI
The new dRAR-CLH templates should be used for those active	
substances the applications of which have been delivered after	
6.10.2017. For FI, this means that our first case (AIR4) will start next	
May (FI is the RMS for quizalofop-p-ethyl). Does any MS have	
experience using the new template and assessing physical hazards?	
Should the phys chem tests be performed according to the EC or UN	
test guidelines? In addition, there are three phys chem properties in	
the new dRAR-CLH template that have not been part of phys chem	
active substance assessment before and are not included in the 283	
Regulation: viscosity, granulometry and relevant degradation products	
Discrepancy Reg. 283/2013 with the CLP regulation 1272/2008	AT
Follow up point 12 (chapter 3 page 41) discussion table PRAS 150.	
As the "new combined Volume 1" of actives also includes the former	
CLH -report and shall be used by ECHA for classification as well we	
should urgently discuss how to deal with this issues.	
There are some points in CLP not required by 283/2013 and some use	
other tests.	
There have also been questions from companies/consulters how to deal	
with the differences.	
Classification methods according to Com. Reg. 283/2013 and 284/2013	CZ
seem to be equal. Are there any rules when we can ask for EEC A	
methods and when UN RTDG?	
Variants. There is no formal EU or zonal agreement on how to deal with	ES
variants. For example the case of the renewal of the 2,4 D: during the	
renewal of the 2,4-D, the 2,4-D EHE was not considered and there was	
a problem with the renewal of the products according to art. 43	
SDS should be in accordance to Reg. 2015/830. Should they be	ES
actualized every 2 years as it is stated in the Guidance document of	
Phys/Chem?	
Field tests	FI
In our last General Phys Chem meeting 2 years ago in Parma, FR	
announced that it is currently working on this subject, by collecting	
information from professionals of agricultural equipment /practices. The	
idea was that further field tests could be used to demonstrate that the	
preparation can be effectively applied in case the results of laboratory	
testing do not meet the acceptable criteria and are not fully relevant regarding the intended conditions of use. What is the stage of the	
process?	
Expert meeting phys-chem / Zonal Authorisation	AT
Follow up point 3 (page 62) discussion table PRAS 150. Is DE still	^ '
willing to organize this / IS there a need?	
Zonal authorisation meeting	FI
In our last General Phys Chem meeting 2 years ago in Parma, DE	' *
suggested taking the initiative of organizing a zonal authorisation	
meeting (e.g. "equivalent" co-formulants, change of formulation). What	
happened since?	
As Finland is currently the chair of the Northern Zone (NZ) and as	
Tukes (Finnish Safety and Chemicals Agency) is the competent	
authority of the Plant Protection Product Regulation in Finland, Tukes	
decided to arrange a NZ Physical Chemistry face-to-face meeting in	
Helsinki 26-27.9.2018. The NZ chemists found it very important that a	
face-to-face meeting concerning the physical chemical properties,	
analytical methods and identity of plant protection products and the	



respective active substances was held, and consequently, all the northern zone countries wanted to take part even though we had no funding for the meeting. So, we were altogether 9 persons from 7 different countries. Thus, could DE reconsider arranging a zonal authorisation meeting? Most probably it would be very popular  A general attitude to evaluation of AIR IV substances can be discussed.  Implementation of "Practical guidance compiling dossiers and assessment reports, final"  This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document  Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications  Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition  Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones.  Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review
funding for the meeting. So, we were altogether 9 persons from 7 different countries. Thus, could DE reconsider arranging a zonal authorisation meeting? Most probably it would be very popular  A general attitude to evaluation of AIR IV substances can be discussed.  Implementation of "Practical guidance compiling dossiers and assessment reports. final"  This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document  Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications  Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition  Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones.  Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope
different countries. Thus, could DE reconsider arranging a zonal authorisation meeting? Most probably it would be very popular  A general attitude to evaluation of AIR IV substances can be discussed.  Implementation of "Practical guidance compiling dossiers and assessment reports_final"  This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document  Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition  Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones.  Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable.  Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing e
A general attitude to evaluation of AIR IV substances can be discussed.  Implementation of "Practical guidance compiling dossiers and assessment reports_final"  This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document  Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of t
A general attitude to evaluation of AIR IV substances can be discussed.  Implementation of "Practical guidance compiling dossiers and assessment reports_final"  This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document  Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications  Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition  Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones.  Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration o
Implementation of "Practical guidance compiling dossiers and assessment reports_final" This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150, AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or per review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal: What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
Implementation of "Practical guidance compiling dossiers and assessment reports_final" This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150, AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or per review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal: What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
assessment reports_final"  This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150, AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
This document was discussed at the last PSN meeting in June 2018 and commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150, AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this? How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal: What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
commenting was launched. We would like to consider the implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document  Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications  Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition  Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones.  Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
implementation of this guidance in terms of practicability (especially as regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150, AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU? Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change? Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal: What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
regards data gathering methods, overview table).  EFSA Working Document  Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
EFSA Working Document Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150, AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal: What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
Different documents summarizing PRAPER/PRAS meetings are in existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
existence. There is an EFSA working document (2007), summary documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. ES There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
documents of the PRAS 120,150,  AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
AT would like to know if these documents can be combined to have an up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
up to date version of all MS/EFSA expert decisions.  Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
Analytical method requirements for zonal applications Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
Should the ILV for drinking water be addressed for all zonal dossiers which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
which need to be evaluated according to 284/2013/EU?  Change in chemical composition  Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones.  Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
Change in chemical composition Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
Sometimes a change in composition of the product is evaluated at national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones.  Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
national level and sometimes it is assessed at zonal. It would be useful to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
to have a harmonised approach on this issue in all zones. Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
Has to the applicant submit the dRR for relevant sections in any case or it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
it depends on the degree of change?  Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
Art 34 of the Regulation 1107/2009 can be applied when the composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable. Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
composition of the generic and the reference product is comparable.  Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
Our question is what is comparable in MS view from physchem perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active ES substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
perspective?  Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active ES substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
Revision of the equivalence reports after the renewal of active substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously)
substances. How to deal with this?  How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports. There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
How to proceed after comments received to the equivalence reports.  There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
There is not harmonization between all MMSS.  Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
Equivalence assessments. Would it be relevant to further amend or peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
peer review the equivalence assessments in case when any new information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
information is coming to MSs? Would the amendment of Article 38 fit into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
into the scope of the Regulation (EU) 1107/2009 revised?  Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
Art. 43 and existing equivalent sources after renewal:  What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
What is the experience and approach of the other Member States regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
regarding the re-consideration of the existing sources (previously
considered equivalent) after renewal of the active substance?
- What is checked? Only min. purity and max. rel. impurity or the
overall specification?
- Data requested?: new GLP 5-BA/at least QC data/re-analysis of
(some) batches from the previous 5-BA study when batches previously
assessed are older than 5 years or when re-analysis for a component
occurred with a certain delay (exp: more than 2 years). At the TC 150,
it was suggested that 5-BA should be requested.
Guidance on art. 43 is not fully clear on this point and mentions the
following: "The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying
that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference
source." which gives quite a large margin for interpretation on what is
expected to be submitted.
- Are DE and other MSs using the DE proposal of working document



	entitled Working document on the Assessment of Technical Active	
	Substances Sources after the Renewal of Approval (presented in the	
	PAI but apparently not accepted)? - Maybe useful to decide for a naming convention for updated	
	equivalence reports (Active substance equivalence Notifier Source MS	
	YYYY-MM-DD_UPDATE_YYYY-MM-DD?)?	
	A question is also raised on who is finally responsible to update the	
	equivalence report after re-consideration of an existing alternative	
	source. The guidance on art. 43 mentions that in principle it is the RMS	
	of the active substance at EU level who should do it but in practice, it	
	seems that it is rather the zRMS who amends the equivalence report	
	when starting the assessment of a PPP according to art. 43.  Sources of active substance(s) authorized in PPPs (controls on the	BE
	market)	DL
	In BE, only the sources of a.s. and their min. purity as declared and	
	approved in the BE dossier (i.e. based on equivalence reports available	
	on circabc and notification of the authorization holder to BE of his wish	
	to add a new source of an active substance in his BE product(s)) are	
	accepted (art. 44 1107/2009 and 58 of KB BE 28/02/1994).	
	In the LoS, quite often the manufacturer declares the min. purity of the	
	a.s. purchased by company XX but this min. purity is stated/indicated to be the same to the min. purity as set in the Impl. Reg. whereas the	
	real min. purity of that source is higher. So the LoS does not mention	
	the true min. purity of that source as assessed and accepted in the	
	equivalence report.	
	BE is of the opinion that even if the min. purity of the source is well in	
	agreement with the agreed EU level, the declared min. purity of the	
	concerned source of a.s. should be as set in the equivalence report,	
	mention of the min. purity as reported in the Impl. Reg. is not	
I	cufficient	
	sufficient. What is the approach of the other MSs?	
	What is the approach of the other MSs?	GR
		GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs? Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7)	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference source. In this case, the RMS should only check the declared	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference source. In this case, the RMS should only check the declared	GR
	Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference source. In this case, the RMS should only check the declared minimum purity and the maximum content for relevant impurities"  To our understanding the RMS can address this issue with a statement regarding the minimum purities and relevant impurities. Nevertheless,	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference source. In this case, the RMS should only check the declared minimum purity and the maximum content for relevant impurities"  To our understanding the RMS can address this issue with a statement regarding the minimum purities and relevant impurities. Nevertheless, no comment on significant impurities or updated equivalence report is	GR
	Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference source. In this case, the RMS should only check the declared minimum purity and the maximum content for relevant impurities"  To our understanding the RMS can address this issue with a statement regarding the minimum purities and relevant impurities. Nevertheless, no comment on significant impurities or updated equivalence report is mentioned. Is this acceptable by the other Member States?	
	Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference source. In this case, the RMS should only check the declared minimum purity and the maximum content for relevant impurities."  To our understanding the RMS can address this issue with a statement regarding the minimum purities and relevant impurities. Nevertheless, no comment on significant impurities or updated equivalence report is mentioned. Is this acceptable by the other Member States?  Changes in the composition: The assessment of impact on the	GR
	What is the approach of the other MSs?  Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference source. In this case, the RMS should only check the declared minimum purity and the maximum content for relevant impurities."  To our understanding the RMS can address this issue with a statement regarding the minimum purities and relevant impurities. Nevertheless, no comment on significant impurities or updated equivalence report is mentioned. Is this acceptable by the other Member States?  Changes in the composition: The assessment of impact on the properties of the formulation cannot be expected without test which is	
	Assessment of Technical Active Substance Sources after the Renewal of Approval (Art 43)  In case that the reference specifications of an active substance are changed during the renewal process, what should be the procedure with the sources which were considered equivalent based on comparison with the old reference specification. This is important for the Article 43 process where the sources are used for the renewal of plant protection product.  According to Guidance document SANCO/2010/13170 rev. 14 (7 October 2016) it is referred:  "Where change of the reference minimum specification occurs, including impurity maximum levels, authorisation renewal dossiers can only rely on those sources already declared equivalent and compliant with the new criteria. The applicant may provide a reasoned argument justifying that its source can still be considered equivalent to the EU reference source. In this case, the RMS should only check the declared minimum purity and the maximum content for relevant impurities."  To our understanding the RMS can address this issue with a statement regarding the minimum purities and relevant impurities. Nevertheless, no comment on significant impurities or updated equivalence report is mentioned. Is this acceptable by the other Member States?  Changes in the composition: The assessment of impact on the	



and have different CAS No. but are present in the same proportion in the old/new composition?	
the old/new composition?  Extrapolation between packaging materials: In the Guidance document for the generation and evaluation of data on the physical, chemical and technical properties of plant protection products under regulation (EC) no. 1107/2009 5. New relevant impurities analysis in formulation as an outcome of the EU renewal of AS approval.  New relevant impurities of the active substances require the validated methods for their determination in formulations with the sufficiently low LOQ considering their low concentrations (e.g. below 0.01 %) in formulation. This is not always feasible to timely address by the applicant. Can the absence of method that does not demonstrate acceptable LOQ be considered a data gap for the product's authorization? of the EU parliament and council on placing plant protection products on the market, it is stated: "For aqueous based formulation types e.g. SL, SC, LS, CS or FS, extrapolation between any plastic material types is acceptable. Extrapolation from plastic material to metals is not acceptable. For organic solvent containing formulations e.g. EC, EW, SE or OD, extrapolation from HDPE to HDPE co-extruded with any of the following; EVOH, fluorinated HDPE and polyamide is acceptable. Extrapolation between plastic material types e.g. HDPE to PET is not acceptable."  Since HDPE and PET are very different plastic materials, is it really acceptable that in aqueous formulation types extrapolation is	HR
acceptable? For example SC formulation can consist of many co- formulants that could impact on packaging material for which there is no shelf-life study conducted.	
Also, in the Guidance document it is stated: "for where it is proposed that a preparation is to be packaged in a bulk container (a container of size greater than 20 L), it is recognised that it is impractical to conduct EN 44 EN stability tests in the large containers. Therefore results from smaller volume containers (1 L upwards) may be used to extrapolate to the larger containers."  Some Member states in the zonal evaluation procedure, don't accept bulk containers (larger than 20 L) if the shelf-life study in conducted in	
1 L containers. What can we do in this case? Is 1 L acceptable for extrapolation of bulk containers or not?	
CRD Guidance document proposal, Section Exrtapolation of packaging materials  Is this approach agreed within the EU experts / EFSA?	AT
During the shelf life stability study, the modification of the packaging should be « measured ». However, there is not clear criteria to consider the packaging as acceptable or not. For example, if after the shelf life the packaging is modified (the form, or the weight, or seepage) what is it considered as an unacceptable modification?	FR
Guidance document Significant – non significant change (12638/2011) This guidance is also used to determine equivalence of generic products. If the formulation type of the generic is different, but the Active/co-formulants are nearly identical, can the product be claimed equal? (i.e. Types: ME/EC or SC/SL)	AT
Tank mixes of pesticides This is the issue for overall risk assessment. Considering the importance of tank mixes the method of analysis could be developed for the determination of both active substances (and relevant impurities) in the mix?	LT
How do member states assess the procedure for cleaning the tank	FR



mixture/machinery provided in the PPP dossier? Does an acceptable residue limit in the tank available?	
Data Protection of studies reported in EFSA Reasoned Opinion: Is there data protection for the studies that are reported in EFSA reason opinions on the modification of the existing MRLs for active substances but that are not presented in the relevant assessment reports for these active substances?	GR



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### November 2018

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 186	21 November 2018 h 09:00 22 November 2018 h 17:00	Mammalian toxicology	Benthiavalicarb – AIR III (PL) Ethephon – AIR III (NL)  2,4-D – discussion on metabolites (EL) Imazamox – discussion on metabolites (FR) Tri-allate – Confirmatory data (UK) Mandipropamid –Art. 10 (NL and UK Ethiprole –Art. 10 import tolerance (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 187	27 November 2018 h 14:00 29 November 2018 h 13:00	Residues	Ethephon – AIR III (NL) Benthiavalicarb – AIR III (PL) Tri-allate – Confirmatory data (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 188	27 November 2018 h 9:00 29 November 2018 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Ethephon – AIR III (NL) Benthiavalicarb – AIR III (PL) Sulfoxaflor – Confirmatory data (CZ)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 198	20 November 2018 h 9:00 - 13.00 (GMT+1)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Ethephon – AIR III (NL)
TC 199	22 November 2018 h 9:00 - 13.00 (GMT+1)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Benthiavalicarb – AIR III (PL) Tri-allate – Confirmatory data (UK)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;



# Pesticides Peer Review 185 Ecotoxicology general recurring issues 9-12 October 2018

### Preliminary agenda

	Topic	Presenter
9.00-9.15	Welcome, introduction and scope of the meeting	EFSA
9/10 - Session General	Issues	
9.15-18.00		
Chair:		
Item 1	Residue trials in the ecotox for residue decline	EFSA
Item 2(tbc)	Extrapolation of studies between different agro-climatic conditions(tbc)	Southern zone (ES) (tbc)
Item 3	How to consider studies when the analytical methods are not validated	EFSA
	RA for products with more than one a.s.	
Item 4	Tests with formulations containing more active substances with different degradation time	EFSA Southern zone (GR - IT)
10/10 - Session Genera	al Issues	
9.00-13.00		
Chair:		
Item 1	Criteria to define how substances translocate in plants	EFSA
Item 2	Equivalence of batches	EFSA and Northern zone
Item 3	Use of lower limit (EC10, HC5) as endpoint in the risk assessment	Southern zone (IT)
10/10 - Session Birds a	and Mammals and Aquatics	
14.00-18.00		
Chair:		



Item 1(tbc)	Use of historical controls (tbc)	EFSA
Item 2	High Koc substances – what impact on the risk assessment does this have (e.g. for fish)	EFSA
Item 3	Alternative test design in Myriophyllum studies	Southern zone (IT)
Item 4	How to express the endpoint for sediment dwelling organisms	EFSA
11/10 Session Aquatics,	NTAs	
9.00-18.00		
Chair:		
	Aquatics:	
Item 1	Representativeness of mesocosm studies when the risk assessment at lower tiers is triggered by a nonfreshwater species (e.g. Mysidospsis) and for EPT	Southern zone (IT) NL (for EPT) (tbc)?
	NTA:	
	1)Use of De Jong Guidance/Extrapolation of field studies between crops	EFSA for points 1, 5
	2)Aged residue trials and recovery	Southern zone (ES) (tbc) and Northern zone for point
Item 2	3)Minimum time considered acceptable for an in-field recolonisation	2
	4)VDF (Vegetation Distribution Factor) of 5 instead of 10	Southern zone (IT) for point 3  NL for point 4? (tbc)
	5)Risk assessment for NTA when contact exposure is not relevant	
12/10 Session Soil organ	isms, AOB	
9.00-13.00		
Chair:		
Item 1	Soil organisms:	EFSA
	Use of De Jong Guidance/issue on the exposure measurement	



12.00-13.00	Wrap up and conclusion	
	3)TK/TD opinion	EFSA
	<ol><li>Risk assessment for banana</li></ol>	Southern zone (ES) (tbc)
Item 2	1)Risk assessment for rice	Southern zone (IT)



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### JULY - SEPTEMBER 2018

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 182	3 September 2018 h <b>09:00</b> 7 September 2018 h 17:00	Mammalian toxicology	Bromoxynil – negligible exposure (FR) Cyprodinil – AIR III (FR) including non-dietary exposure Benfluralin - AIR IV (NO) Pydiflumetofen – NAS 1107 (FR) Fenamiphos – AIR III (EL) Benalaxyl – AIR III (RO)
Pesticides Peer Review 183	3 September 2018 h 14:00 7 September 2018 h 17:00	Ecotoxicology	Thiacloprid – AIR III (UK) Benfluralin - AIR IV (NO) Benalaxyl – AIR III (RO)
Pesticides Peer Review 184	10 September 2018 h 14:00 13 September 2018 h 17:00	Residues	Benfluralin - AIR IV (NO) Pydiflumetofen - NAS 1107 (FR) Fenamiphos - AIR III (EL) Thiacloprid - AIR III (UK) Benalaxyl - AIR III (RO) Cyprodinil - AIR III (FR)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 189	10 July 2018 10:00 -13:00 and 15.00 - 17.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Fluensulfone – Establishment ADI and ARfD (UK)
TC 190	6 September 2018 9:00 - 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Pydiflumetofen – NAS 1107 (FR)
TC 191	10 September 2018 10:00 - 14:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Thiacloprid – AIR III (UK) including non-dietary exposure



TC 192	11 September 2018 9:00 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Benfluralin - AIR IV (NO)
TC 193	12 September 2018 9:00 - 12:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Tricyclazole – Art.10 import tolerance (IT)
TC 194	13 September 2018 9:00 - 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Cyprodinil – AIR III (FR)
TC 195	13 September 2018 9:00 -13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Benalaxyl – AIR III (RO)

 $<sup>^{</sup>st}$  the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III /AIR IV- Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### **MAY - JUNE 2018**

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 179	18 June 2018 h 14:00 22 June 2018 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology	Flufenacet- AIR III (PL) Methiocarb - AIR III (UK) 1,3-Dichloropropene - NAS 1107 (ES) Propanil - NAS 1107 (IT)
Pesticides Peer Review 180	25 June 2018 h 14:00 28 June 2018 h 13:00	Residues	Flufenacet- AIR III (PL) Clodinafop - AIR III (EL) Methiocarb - AIR III (UK) 1,3-Dichloropropene - NAS 1107 (ES) Propanil - NAS 1107 (IT)
Pesticides Peer Review 181	18 June 2018 h 14:00 22 June 2018 h 18:00	Ecotoxicology	Flufenacet- AIR III (PL) Clodinafop - AIR III (EL) Milbemectin - AIR III (DE) Methiocarb - AIR III (UK) Napropamide-M - NAS 1107 (UK) 1,3-Dichloropropene - NAS 1107 (ES) Propanil - NAS 1107 (IT)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 178	22 May 2018 9.00 - 13.00 and 14.00- 18.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Flufenacet- AIR III (PL)
TC 179	23 May 2018 9.00 - 13.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Clodinafop – AIR III (EL)



TC 180	<b>7 June</b> 2018 10.00 - 12.00 and 13.00 - 16.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Napropamide-M – NAS 1107 (UK)
TC 181	<b>4 June</b> 2018 10.00 - 12.30 and 14.00 - 16.30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Napropamide-M - NAS 1107 (UK)
TC 182	<b>6 June</b> 2018 10.00 - 13.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Napropamide-M - NAS 1107 (UK)
TC 183	5 June 2018 9.00 - 12.00 and 14.00 - 16.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Milbemectin – AIR III (DE)
TC 184	7 June 2018 9.00 - 12.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Milbemectin – AIR III (DE)
TC 185	12 June 2018 9.00 - 13.00 and 14.00 - 18.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	1,3-Dichloropropene – NAS 1107 (ES)
TC 186	19 June 2018 9.00 - 12.00 and 14.00 - 16.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Propanil - NAS 1107 (IT)
TC 187	21 June 2018 10.00 - 14.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Methiocarb – AIR III (UK)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS - New Active Substance under Art.12 of 1107/2009



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### **APRIL - May 2018**

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 175	9 April 2018 h 14:00 12 April 2018 h 17:00	Mammalian toxicology	Cypermethrin – AIR III (BE) Alpha-cypermethrin – AIR III (BE) Clopyralid – AIR III (FI) Florpyrauxifen benzyl – NAS 1107 (IT)
Pesticides Peer Review 176	23 April 2018 h 14:00 27 April 2018 h 12:00	Residues	Dimethoate - AIR III (IT) Alpha-cypermethrin - AIR III (BE) Cypermethrin - AIR III (BE) Clopyralid - AIR III (FI) Florpyrauxifen benzyl - NAS 1107 (IT) Carvone - AIR III (NL)
Pesticides Peer Review 177	23 April 2018 h 9:00 27 April 2018 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Dimethoate - AIR III (IT) Alpha-cypermethrin - AIR III (BE) Cypermethrin - AIR III (BE)
Pesticides Peer Review 178	24 April 2018 h 9:00 25 April 2018 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology	Dimethoate – AIR III (IT)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 172	12 April 2018 9.00 -12.00 and 14.00-17.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Alpha-cypermethrin – AIR III (BE) Cypermethrin – AIR III (BE)
TC 173	19 April 2018 9.00 -13.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Clopyralid – AIR III (FI)
TC 174	<b>18 May 2018</b> 9.00 -13.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Carvone – AIR III (NL)



- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New Active Substance under Art.12 of Reg (EU) No 1107/2009



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCE APRIL 2018

TC 188 27 April 2018 Mammalian Flumioxazin 10.00 -12.00 Toxicology Negligible expo	osure – (CZ)



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### **FEBRUARY - MARCH 2018**

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 172	19 February 2018 h 14:00 22 February 2018 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology	Ethoprophos – AIR III (IT) Ethoprophos – AIR III (IT) exposure *** Beta-cyfluthrin – AIR III (DE) Mefentrifluconazole (BAS 750F) – NAS 1107 (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 173	26 February 2018 h 14:00 28 February 2018 h 17:00	Residues	Dichlorprop-P - AIR III (IE) Beta-cyfluthrin - AIR III (DE) Fosetyl - AIR III (FR) Ethoprophos - AIR III (IT) Mefentrifluconazole (BAS 750F) - NAS 1107 (UK) 1-Methylcyclopropene - AIR III (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 174	26 February 2018 h 14:00 02 March 2018 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Beta-cyfluthrin – AIR III (DE) Dichlorprop-P – AIR III (IE) Ethoprophos – AIR III (IT)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 163	06 February 2018 09.00 - 12.00 and 14.00 - 16.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Beta-cyfluthrin – AIR III (DE)
TC 164	06 February 2018 09.00 - 13.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Dichlorprop-P – AIR III (IE)
TC 165	08 February 2018 09.00 - 13.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Fosetyl – AIR III (FR)



TC 166	20 February 2018 09.00 – 12.00 and 14.00 – 17.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Dichloprop-P - AIR III (IE)  1-Methylcyclopropene - AIR III (UK)
TC 167	23 February 2018 09.00 - 12.00 and 14.00 - 17.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Fosetyl – AIR III (FR)
TC 168	26 February 2018 09.00 - 13.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	1-Methylcyclopropene – AIR III (UK)
TC 170	6 March 2018 9.00 - 13.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Mefentrifluconazole (BAS 750F) – NAS 1107 (UK) 1-Methylcyclopropene – AIR III (UK)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS - New Active Substance
- \*\*\* TC 169 Mammalian Toxicology section on ethoprophos exposure has been included in Pesticides Peer Review 172 Mammalian Toxicology meeting as teleconference. The discussion will be via telewebconference on 20 February 2018 from 14:00 to 17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCE MARCH 2018

		Substances
0	Mammalian Toxicology	Diquat: Updated peer review concerning the non-dietary exposure risk assessment – (UK)
	018 0 ome)	0 Toxicology



### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCE

### FEBRUARY 2018

Teleconf.	Date	Section	Substance
TC 175	27 February 2018 09:00-12:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Glyphosate (toxicological profile of the N-acetyl metabolites in the context of the assessment of the impact of glyphosate residues in feed on animal health under Art.31 and the review of all existing MRLs under Art.12 of Reg.396/2005)



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW AD-HOC TELECONFERENCE JANUARY 2018

Teleconf.	Date	Section	Substances*
TC 162a	11 January 2018 09:00 -10.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Asulam - NAS 1107 (UK)
TC 162b	11 January 2018 10.00 -13.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Residues	Asulam - NAS 1107 (UK)

<sup>\*</sup> NAS - New Active Substance



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCE JANUARY 2018

Teleconf.	Date	Section	Substances*
TC 171	25 January 2018 09.00 - 11.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Dimethenamid-P – AIR III (DE)

\* AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS - New Active Substance



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### **NOVEMBER - DECEMBER 2017**

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 170	11 December 2017 h 14:00 14 December 2017 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology	Spinosad – AIR III (NL) Trinexapac-ethyl – AIR III (LT) General discussion:  Genotoxicity of products  QSARs principles  Read-across principles  Guidance on residue definition  Guidance on dermal absorption  Current and future developmental activities in the area of pesticides
Pesticides Peer Review 171	13 December 2017 h 9:00 15 December 2017 h 13:00	Residues	Triazole derivative metabolites – confirmatory data (UK) Spinosad – AIR III (NL) Trinexapac-ethyl – AIR III (LT)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 154	16 November 2017 09.00-12.00 14.00-17.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian toxicology	Rimsulfuron – AIR III (SI)
TC 155	16 November 2017 09.00-12.00 14.00-17.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Rimsulfuron – AIR III (SI)
TC 156	17 November 2017 14.00 - 17.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Rimsulfuron – AIR III (SI)



TC 157	5 December 2017 14.00 - 17.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Microorganism – combined mammalian toxicology, residues and ecotoxicology	Beauveria bassiana PPRI 5339 – NAS 1107 (NL)
TC 158	5 December 2017 09.00 - 13.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Spinosad – AIR III (NL)
TC 159	6 December 2017 09.00 - 12.00 14.00 - 17.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Spinosad – AIR III (NL)
TC 160	8 December 2017 9.00 - 12.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Trinexapac-ethyl – AIR III (LT)
TC 161	19 December 2017 9.30-12.30 14.00-16.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Microorganism – combined mammalian toxicology and environmental fate	Bacillus subtilis IAB/B503 - NAS 1107 (NL)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - New Active Substance Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### SEPTEMBER - OCTOBER 2017

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 167	2 October 2017 h 9:00 4 October 2017 h 13:00	Residues	Copper compounds – AIR III (FR) Phenmedipham – AIR III (FI) Desmedipham – AIR III (FI)
Pesticides Peer Review 168	4 October 2017 h 14:00 6 October 2017 h 17:00	Mammalian toxicology	Copper compounds – AIR III (FR) Phenmedipham – AIR III (FI) Desmedipham – AIR III (FI)
Pesticides Peer Review 169	9 October 2017 h 9:00 10 October 2017 h 17:00	Ecotoxicology	Copper compounds – AIR III (FR) Phenmedipham – AIR III (FI) Desmedipham – AIR III (FI)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 150	25 September 2017 9.00-12.00 and 14.00-16.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Microorganism – combined mammalian toxicology, residues and ecotoxicology	Beauveria bassiana PPRI 5339- NAS 1107 (NL)
TC 151	5 October 2017 13.30-17.30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Phenmedipham – AIR III (FI) Desmedipham – AIR III (FI)
TC 152	17 October 2017 9.00-12.00 and 14.00-17.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Copper compounds – AIR III (FR)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;



### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCE

### **OCTOBER 2017**

TC 153 18 October 2017 Mammalian Propargite – MRL applica	
09:00-13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)  Toxicology Setting an import tolerar citrus fruits and teas (IT	lerance in



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

#### SEPTEMBER - OCTOBER 2017

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 162 Session 1	11 September 2017 h 14:00 14 September 2017 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology – session 1 (in parallel with session 2)	XDE-777 - NAS 1107 (UK) Indoxacarb - AIR III (FR) Dimethenamid-P - AIR III (DE) Triazole derivative metabolites - confirmatory data (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 162 Session 2	11 September 2017 h 14:00 14 September 2017 h 13:00	Mammalian toxicology – session 2 (in parallel with session 1)	Chlorothalonil – AIR III (NL) Tolclofos-methyl – AIR III (SE) Thiophanate-methyl – AIR III (SE)
Pesticides Peer Review 163	13 September 2017 h 14:00 15 September 2017 h 13:00	Environmental fate and behaviour	XDE-777 - NAS 1107 (UK) Dimethenamid-P - AIR III (DE) Chlorothalonil - AIR III (NL) Tolclofos-methyl - AIR III (SE) Thiophanate-methyl - AIR III (SE)
Pesticides Peer Review 164	19 September 2017 h 9:00 22 September 2017 h 13:00	Residues	XDE-777 - NAS 1107 (UK) Dimethenamid-P - AIR III (DE) Chlorothalonil - AIR III (NL) Tolclofos-methyl - AIR III (SE) Thiophanate-methyl - AIR III (SE) Indoxacarb - AIR III (FR)
Pesticides Peer Review 165	18 September 2017 h 14:00 22 September 2017 h 18:00	Ecotoxicology	XDE-777 - NAS 1107 (UK) Dimethenamid-P - AIR III (DE) Chlorothalonil - AIR III (NL) Tolclofos-methyl - AIR III (SE) Thiophanate-methyl - AIR III (SE)
Pesticides Peer Review 166	9 October 2017 h 14:00 13 October 2017 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology – neonicotinoids Art.21 review	Clothianidin Imidacloprid Thiamethoxam



Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
	7 September 2017	Mammalian	Ampelomyces quisqualis AQ10 –
	14.00-17.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	toxicology	AIR III (FR)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* NAS New Active Substance
  AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012



## PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCE

### **JUNE 2017**

		Section	Substance
TC 148 29 June 2 14:00-17 (GMT+2,	7:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Glyphosate – Art. 31 (possible impact on animal health) (DE)



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### **MAY-JULY 2017**

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 159	06 June 2017 h 14:00 09 June 2017 h 13:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Methoxyfenozide – AIR III (UK) Zoxamide – AIR III (LV) Pethoxamid – AIR III (AT) Flurtamone – AIR III (CZ) Glyphosate – Art. 31 (endocrine disrupting properties) (DE)
Pesticides Peer Review 160	14 June 2017 h 09:00 16 June 2017 h 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Methoxyfenozide – AIR III (UK) Zoxamide – AIR III (LV) Pethoxamid – AIR III (AT) Flurtamone – AIR III (CZ) Glyphosate – Art. 31 (endocrine disrupting properties) (DE)
Pesticides Peer Review 161	13 June 2017 h 09:00 14 June 2017 h 13:00	Residues	Methoxyfenozide – AIR III (UK) Zoxamide – AIR III (LV) Pethoxamid – AIR III (AT)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 141	17 May 2017 9:00-12:00 / 14:00-17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Methoxyfenozide – AIR III (UK)
TC 142	21 June 2017 13:30.00-17:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Etoxazole – AIR III (EL)
TC 143	27 June 2017 14:00-15:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Etoxazole – AIR III (EL)
TC 144	28 June 2017 9:00-12.00 / 14:00-16:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Trifloxystrobin – AIR III (UK)



TC 145	04 July 2017 13:30-17:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Etoxazole – AIR III (EL)
TC 146	05 July 2017 13:30-17:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Trifloxystrobin – AIR III (UK)
TC 147	06 July 2017 9:00-12:00 / 14:00-17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Trifloxystrobin - AIR III (UK)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012;



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### MARCH-APRIL 2017

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 155	20 March 2017 h 14.00 22 March 2017 h 13.00	Mammalian Toxicology	Forchlorfenuron - AIR III (ES) Tribenuron-methyl - AIR III (SE) Propiconazole - AIR III (FI) Gliocladium catenulatum - AIR III (HU)
Pesticides Peer Review 156	27 March 2017 h 14.00 28 March 2017 h 17.00	Residues	Forchlorfenuron - AIR III (ES) Tribenuron-methyl - AIR III (SE) Propiconazole - AIR III (FI)
Pesticides Peer Review 157	06 April 2017 h 09.00 07 April 2017 h 13.00	Ecotoxicology	Tribenuron-methyl - AIR III (SE) Propiconazole - AIR III (FI) Asulam - NAS 1107 (UK)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 139	22 March 2017 9.00-13.00 / 14.00-17.00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Environmental Fate and Behaviour	Tribenuron-methyl - AIR III (SE)
TC 140	4 April 2017 09.00-13.00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Asulam - NAS 1107 (UK)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; NAS 1107 - new active substance under Reg (EC) No 1107/2009



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS FEBRUARY 2017

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 151	6 February 2017 h 14.00 10 February 2017 h 13.00	Mammalian toxicology	Metazachlor - Conf data (UK) Mecoprop-P - AIR III (UK) Laminarin - AIR III (NL) Chlorpropham - AIR III (NL) Bromoxynil - AIR III (FR) Mepanipyrim - AIR III (BE) Terbuthylazine - Conf data (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 152	9 February 2017 h 9.00 10 February 2017 h 17.00	Environmental fate and behaviour	Laminarin - AIR III (NL) Chlorpropham - AIR III (NL) Metazachlor - Conf data (UK) General discussion: instructions on best practice for evaluating batch adsorption studies (UK)
Pesticides Peer Review 153	13 February 2017 h 14.00 14 February 2017 h 17.00	Residues	Chlorpropham - AIR III (NL) Bromoxynil - AIR III (FR) Mepanipyrim - AIR III (BE)
Pesticides Peer Review 154	13 February 2017 h 9.00 15 February 2017 h 17.00	Ecotoxicology	Mecoprop-P - AIR III (UK) Chlorpropham - AIR III (NL) Bromoxynil - AIR III (FR) Mepanipyrim - AIR III (BE)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; Conf data – confirmatory data



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETING AND TELECONFERENCES SEPTEMBER - NOVEMBER 2016

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 148	24 October 2016 h <b>09.00</b> 26 October 2016 h 18.00	Mammalian toxicology	Bifenazate- AIR III (SE) Imazosulfuron - AIR III (SI) Thiram - AIR III (FR) Oxasulfuron - AIR III (IT) Exchange of views on the assessment of endocrine disrupting properties in mammalian toxicology and ecotoxicology***
Pesticides Peer Review 149	24 October 2016 h 14.00 26 October 2016 h 18.00	Ecotoxicology	Bifenazate- AIR III (SE) Imazosulfuron - AIR III (SI) Thiram - AIR III (FR) Exchange of views on the assessment of endocrine disrupting properties in mammalian toxicology and ecotoxicology***



Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 139	15 September 2016 9:00 - 18:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Joint Mammalian toxicology Environmental fate and behaviour Ecotoxicology microorganism discussion	Pseudomonas chlororaphis MA 342 - AIR III (NL)
TC 140	18 October 2016 9:00 - 12:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Imazosulfuron - AIR III (SI)
TC 141	20 October 2016 9:00 – 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Bifenazate- AIR III (SE) Thiram – AIR III (FR)
TC 142	3 November 2016 13:30 - 17:30 (GMT+1, Rome)	Residues	Thiram – AIR III (FR)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> In view of the on-going discussions on the criteria for the determination of endocrine disrupting properties, EFSA proposes an exchange of views between mammalian toxicology and ecotoxicology experts. A joint meeting will take place on 26 October 2016, adjacent to the normal peer review discussions in mammalian toxicology and ecotoxicology.



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

#### JUNE - AUGUST 2016

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 145	7 June 2016 h 09.00 9 June 2016 h 13.00	Ecotoxicology – bee confirmatory data neonicotinoids	Clothianidin - conf data bees (BE) Imidacloprid - conf data bees (DE)
Pesticides Peer Review 146	12 July 2016 h 9.00 14 July 2016 h 13.00	Mammalian toxicology	Cyflumetofen – conf data (NL) Propineb - AIR III (IT) Iprodione - AIR III (FR) Acetamiprid – AIR III (NL)
Pesticides Peer Review 147	18 July 2016 h 14.00 21 July 2016 h 18.00	Ecotoxicology	Propineb - AIR III (IT) Iprodione - AIR III (FR) Acetamiprid - AIR III (NL) Penflufen - amendment approval conditions (UK)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 136	12 July 2016 9:00 - 18:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Iprodione - AIR III (FR) Penflufen – amendment approval conditions (UK)
TC 137	1 August 2016 13:30 - 18:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Propineb - AIR III (IT)
TC 138	4 August 2016 9:00 - 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Propoxycarbazone-sodium - AIR III (SE)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

<sup>\*\*</sup> AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012; conf data - confirmatory data



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETING AND TELECONFERENCES APRIL – June 2016

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 144	07 April 2016 h 09.00 08 April 2016 h 13.00	Ecotoxicology	Carfentrazone-ethyl - AIR III (BE) Propyzamide - AIR III (SE)

Teleconf.	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 128	05 April 2016 9:30 - 12:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Carfentrazone-ethyl - AIR III (BE)
TC 129	06 April 2016 9:00 - 17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Carfentrazone-ethyl - AIR III (BE) Propyzamide - AIR III (SE)
TC 130	07 April 2016 14:00 - 17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Carfentrazone-ethyl - AIR III (BE)
TC 131	12 April 2016 9:00 - 17:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Propyzamide - AIR III (SE)
TC 132	14 April 2016 14:00 - 16:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Propyzamide - AIR III (SE)
TC 133	11 May 2016 9:30 – 12:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Flazasulfuron – AIR III (ES)
TC 134	31 May 2016 9:30 - 12:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Mesosulfuron-methyl – AIR III (FR)
TC 135	21 June 2016 9:00 - 17:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Mesosulfuron-methyl – AIR III (FR)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* AIR III Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### JANUARY - MARCH 2016

Teleconf	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 126	23 February 2016 9:00 - 13:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Cyazofamid – AIR III (FR)
TC 127	25 February 2016 9:00 - 13:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Environmental fate and behaviour	Silthiofam – AIR III (IE) Picoxystrobin – AIR III (CZ)

Meetings	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 137	12 January 2016 h 09.00 15 January 2016 h 13.00	Mammalian Toxicology	Linuron – AIR III (IT) Imazamox – AIR III (FR) Oxathiapiprolin – NAS (IE) Iodosulfuron – AIR III (SE) Cyclaniliprole – NAS (AT)  Special mammalian toxicology expert meeting: for detailed agenda items see appendix A
Pesticides Peer Review 138	14 January 2016 h 14.00 15 January 2016 h 16.00	Residues	Linuron – AIR III (IT) Imazamox – AIR III (FR) Iodosulfuron – AIR III (SE) Cyclaniliprole – NAS (AT)
Pesticides Peer Review 139	27 January 2016 h 09.00 29 January 2016 h 17.00	Ecotoxicology	Linuron – AIR III (IT) Iodosulfuron – AIR III (SE) Cyclaniliprole – NAS (AT) Fluquinconazole – Conf. data (IE)



Meetings	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 140	27 January 2016 h 09.00 28 January 2016 h 17.00	Environmental fate and behaviour	Oxathiapiprolin - NAS (IE) Iodosulfuron - AIR III (SE) Flurtamone - AIR III (CZ) Cyclaniliprole - NAS (AT)
Pesticides Peer Review 141	23 February 2016 h 09.00 26 February 2016 h 13.00	Mammalian toxicology	Maleic hydrazide – AIR III (DK) 2,4-DB – AIR III (BE) Flurtamone – AIR III (CZ) Cyazofamid – AIR III (FR) Silthiofam – AIR III (IE) Picoxystrobin – AIR III (CZ)
Pesticides Peer Review 142	23 February 2016 h 09.00 25 February 2016 h 17.00	Ecotoxicology	Flurtamone – AIR III (CZ) 2,4-DB – AIR III (BE) Coniothyrium minitans – AIR III (NL) 8-hydroxyquinoline – amendm appr (ES) Cyazofamid – AIR III (FR) Silthiofam – AIR III (IE) Picoxystrobin – AIR III (CZ)
Pesticides Peer Review 143	01 March 2016 h 09.00 02 March 2016 h 13.00	Residues	Maleic hydrazide – AIR III (DK) 2,4-DB – AIR III (BE) Flurtamone – AIR III (CZ)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

NAS - New Active Substance

AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012

Conf data – Confirmatory data

Amendm appr – Amendment of approval conditions

<sup>\*\*</sup> the specific points for discussion will be those indicated as 'Expert Consultation' in the Evaluation Table



#### APPENDIX A

- 1) Data requirements according to Regulation 283/2013 and 284/2013 in particular with regards to the AIR III substances
  - New issues
  - In vitro metabolism
  - Phototoxicity/photomutagenicity
- 2) Genotoxicity testing and follow up on positive in vitro results
- 3) Assessment of the toxicological profile of metabolites and impurities
- 4) Assessment of endocrine disruptive properties and proposals for classification
- 5) Literature search



## PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

### **OCTOBER - DECEMBER 2015**

Teleconf	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 118	<b>15 October 2015</b> 9:00 - 12:30 14:00 - 16:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Ethofumesate – AIR III (AT)
TC 119	9 October 2015 9:00 – 12:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Pendimethalin – AIR III (NL)
TC 120	<b>15 October 2015</b> 9:00 – 12:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Residues	Pendimethalin – AIR III (NL)
TC 121	20 October 2015 9:00 – 16:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Pendimethalin – AIR III (NL) Ethofumesate – AIR III (AT)
TC 122	20 October 2015 9:00 – 12:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Pyridaben – Conf data (NL)
TC 123	22 October 2015 9:00 - 16:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Pendimethalin – AIR III (NL) Ethofumesate – AIR III (AT)
TC 124	<b>19 November 2015</b> 9:00 – 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Mesotrione – AIR III (UK)
TC 125	26 November 2015 9:00 - 13:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Isoxaflutole – AIR III (IT)



Meetings	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 134	25 November 2015 h 09.00 27 November 2015 h 13.00	Mammalian Toxicology	Mesotrione – AIR III (UK) Fenamidone – AIR III (CZ) Isoxaflutole – AIR III (IT) Foramsulfuron – AIR III (FI)
Pesticides Peer Review 135	08 December 2015 h 14.00 09 December 2015 h 17.00	Residues	Mesotrione – AIR III (UK) Fenamidone – AIR III (CZ) Isoxaflutole – AIR III (IT) Foramsulfuron – AIR III (FI)
Pesticides Peer Review 136	09 December 2015 h 14.00 11 December 2015 h 13.00	Ecotoxicology	Mesotrione – AIR III (UK) Fenamidone – AIR III (CZ) Isoxaflutole – AIR III (IT) Foramsulfuron – AIR III (FI)

<sup>\*</sup> the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

AIR III - Annex I Renewal under Reg (EU) No 844/2012 Conf data – Confirmatory data

<sup>\*\*</sup> the specific points for discussion will be those indicated as 'Expert Consultation' in the Evaluation Table



#### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW TC 117 MAMMALIAN TOXICOLOGY

#### **29 SEPTEMBER 2015**

Teleconf	Date*	Section	Substances
TC 117	29 September 2015 9:00 - 12:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Glyphosate – AIR II (DE) – Discussion on classification following IARC monograph
		J,	

\* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter

AIR II - Annex I renewal



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' TELECONFERENCES JULY - AUGUST 2015

Teleconf	Date*	Section	Substances**
TC 114	17 July 2015 9:00 - 12:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Isofetamid – NAS (BE)
TC 115	22 July 2015 9:00 - 12:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Beauveria bassiana strain 147 - NAS (FR) Beauveria bassiana strain NPP111B005 - NAS (FR)
TC 116	26 August 2015 10:00 – 12:00 (GMT+2, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Isofetamid – NAS (BE)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- $\ensuremath{^{**}}$  the specific points for discussion will be those indicated as 'Expert Consultation' in the Evaluation Table

NAS - new active substance



# PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES MAY - JUNE 2015

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**
Pesticides Peer Review 130	26 May 2015 h. 14:00 29 May 2015 h. 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Reynoutria Sachalinensis extract - NAS (1107) (UK) Picolinafen - AIR II (DE) Diquat - AIR II (UK) Oxyfluorfen - Conf. data (ES) Dodine - Conf. data (PT)
Pesticides Peer Review 131	27 May 2015 h.09:00 29 May 2015 h.13:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Picolinafen – AIR II (DE)  Diquat – AIR II (UK)***  Reynoutria Sachalinensis extract – NAS (1107) (UK)  Diflubenzuron and PCA – Art.21 (SE)
Pesticides Peer Review 132	03 June 2015 h. 14:00 04 June 2015 h. 13:00	Residues	Diquat – AIR II (UK) Diflubenzuron and PCA – Art.21 (SE)
Teleconference			
TC 112	06 May 2015 09:00-12:00 13:30-16:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Reynoutria Sachalinensis extract – NAS (1107) (UK)
TC 113	07 May 2015 09:00-12:00 13:30-16:30 (GMT+2, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Picolinafen – AIR II (DE) Oxyfluorfen – Conf. data (ES)

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* the specific points for discussion will be those indicated as 'Expert Consultation' in the Evaluation Table
- \*\*\* please note that due to the complexity of the operator, worker, bystander and resident exposure assessments of diquat, a dedicated discussion on this topic is foreseen on **28 May 2015**, <del>14.00-17.00</del> **09.00-11.00** and exposure experts can join via teleconference

AIR II – Annex I renewal NAS – new active substance Conf. data – confirmatory data



#### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

## JANUARY - MARCH 2015

Meeting	Date*	Section	Substances**					
Pesticides Peer Review 125	25 February 2015 h. 09:00 27 February 2015 h. 13:00	Mammalian Toxicology	Glyphosate – AIR II (DE) Isoproturon – AIR II (DE) Famoxadone – AIR II (UK) Thifensulfuron-methyl – AIR II (UK)					
Pesticides Peer Review 126	24 February 2015 h.14:00 26 February 2015 h.13:00	Fate and Behaviour	Glyphosate – AIR II (DE) Famoxadone – AIR II (UK) Thifensulfuron-methyl – AIR II (UK)					
Pesticides Peer Review 127	03 March 2015 h. 14:00 05 March 2015 h. 13:00	Residues	Glyphosate – AIR II (DE) Thifensulfuron-methyl – AIR II (UK) Epoxiconazole – Conf. data (DE)					
Pesticides Peer Review 128	03 March 2015 h. 14:00 05 March 2015 h. 13:00	Ecotoxicology	Glyphosate – AIR II (DE) Isoproturon – AIR II (DE) Thifensulfuron-methyl – AIR II (UK) Epoxiconazole – Conf. data (DE)					
Pesticides Peer Review 129	18 March 2015 h. 09:00 20 March 2015 h. 17:00	Ecotoxicology	Thiamethoxam – (FR) Imidacloprid – (DE) Clothianidin – (BE) Art.21 – bees – uses other than seed treatments					
Teleconference								
TC 108	08 January 2015 09:30-12:30 (GMT+1, Rome)	Mammalian Toxicology	Benzovindiflupyr – NAS (1107) (FR)					
TC 109	08 January 2015 14:00-18:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Fate and Behaviour	Benzovindiflupyr – NAS (1107) (FR)					
TC 110	13 January 2015 09:30-11:30 (GMT+1, Rome)	Residues	Benzovindiflupyr – NAS (1107) (FR)					
TC 111	13 January 2015 14:00-18:00 (GMT+1, Rome)	Ecotoxicology	Benzovindiflupyr – NAS (1107) (FR)					

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* the specific points for discussion will be those indicated as 'Expert Consultation' in the Evaluation Table



#### PESTICIDES PEER REVIEW EXPERTS' MEETINGS AND TELECONFERENCES

#### **OCTOBER - DECEMBER 2014**

Meeting	Date*	Sec	ction	Substances**			
Pesticides Peer Review 120	04 November 2014 h. 14:00 06 November 2014 h. 13:00	Physical Chemical Properties		This meeting is to discuss general items on physical and chemical properties, identity and analytical chemistry. No discussions on specific active substances will take place			
Pesticides Peer Review 121	19 November 2014 h.09:00 20 November 2014 h.18:00	Fate and Behaviour		Bentazone – AIR II (NL)  Mandestrobin – NAS (1107) (AT)  Flupyradifurone – NAS (1107) (NL)			
Pesticides Peer Review 122	17 November 2014 h. 14:00 18 November 2014 h. 18:00	Mammalian Toxicology		Tricyclazole – NAS (1107) (IT) Bentazone – AIR II (NL) Mandestrobin – NAS (1107) (AT) Flupyradifurone – NAS (1107) (NL)			
Pesticides Peer Review 124	03 December 2014 h. 14:00 05 December 2014 h. 18:00	Eco	otoxicology	Bentazone – AIR II (NL)  Mandestrobin – NAS (1107) (AT)  Flupyradifurone – NAS (1107) (NL)			
Teleconference							
TC 105	21 October 2014 14:00 – 18:00 (GMT+2, Ron	ne)	Ecotoxicology	Tricyclazole – NAS (1107) (IT)			
TC 106	04 November 2014 14:00 – 17:00 (GMT+1, Ron	ne)	Residues	Bentazone – AIR II (NL)			
TC 107	27 November 2014 09:30 – 13:30 (GMT+1, Ron	ne)	Residues	Flupyradifurone – NAS (1107) (NL)			

- \* the exact meeting/teleconference dates and times will be stated in the invitation letter
- \*\* the specific points for discussion will be those indicated as 'Expert Consultation' in the Evaluation Table

NAS – new active substance AIR II – Annex I renewal