SCIENTIFIC PANEL on Plant Protection Products and their Residues

137th Panel Plenary meeting – OPEN to observers

17 – 18 June 2026
13:30-18:00 / 09:00-13:30
MINUTES - Agreed on 7th July 2026

EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY

Location: Teleconference

Attendees:

- Panel Members:
  Adriaanse Pauline, Choi Judy, Coja Tamara, Finizio Antonio, Giraudo Maeva, Kuhl Thomas, McVey Emily, Metruccio Francesca, Silvia Pieper, Scanziani Eugenio, Teodorovic Ivana, Van den Brink Paul, Wilks Martin
- Hearing Experts[1]:
  Justine Dastouet for the agenda item 8.1
- European Commission and/or Member States representatives:
  Not applicable
- EFSA:
  PREV Unit: Batista Leite Sofia, Binaglia Marco, Blazevic Marija, Castoldi Anna Federica, Chiusolo Arianna, Colas Mathilde, Crivellente Federica Adele, Giner Santonja German, Lanzoni Anna, Louisse Jochem, Mazzega Silvia, Mioč Andrea, Panzarea Martina, Scattareggia Marchese Adriana, Tiramani Manuela, Vianello Giorgia

  PLANTS Unit: Alvarez Fernando, Arena Maria, Auteri Domenica, Casu Alessia, Chavez Capilla Teresa, Fait Gabriella, Gilland Catriona, Gouliarmou Varvara, Kienzler Aude, Lava Roberto, Padilla Suarez Edith, Sharp Rachel Jane, Szentes Csaba, Ulrich Stephanie.
- Others:
  Not Applicable

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants and the observers.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of Interest of Panel members

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence[2] and the Decision of the Executive Director on Competing Interest Management3, EFSA screened the Annual Declarations of Interest filled by the Working Group members invited to the present meeting and the preparatory meetings listed under agenda item "Preparatory meeting/s with Risk Assessment". No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in these meetings have been identified during the screening process, and no interests were declared orally by the members at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Panel members introduction

A round of table was done allowing the Panel members to introduce themselves.

5. Presentation of Guidelines for observers

[1] As defined in Article 34 of the Decision of the Executive Director concerning the selection of members of the Scientific Committee, the Scientific Panels, and the selection of external experts to assist EFSA with its scientific work: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/expertselection.pdf
[2] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/policy_independence.pdf
[3] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/competing_interest_management_17.pdf

The guidelines for observers were presented.

6. Agreement of the minutes of the 136th Panel plenary meeting held on 22-23 April 2026, in Parma

The minutes of the 136th Panel plenary meeting were agreed by written procedure on 11th May 2026.

7. Update from Scientific Committee

The chair updated the Panel on ongoing activities of the Scientific Committee (SC), including both ongoing and new mandates on the following:

- Draft Guidance on Margin of Exposure (MoE)
- Draft Guidance on genotoxicity testing strategies
- Draft revised Guidance on risk assessment of nano and submicro particles in the food and feed chain
- Draft mandate for the development of a guidance on ADME/PBK

In addition, information on prioritisation of developmental projects as well as on the thematic discussion on New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) were also presented. The proposal of the SC to develop a common scientific glossary was explained.

8. Scientific output(s) submitted for discussion/adoption

8.1 Reviewing the literature on the methodologies available to study the long-term toxic and/or carcinogenic effects of PPP, in particular those resulting from interactions between components mixed in these products (EFSA-Q-2024-00432)

The draft statement reviewing mixture methodologies for assessing long-term toxicity and carcinogenicity of plant protection products (PPPs) was presented. The work addressed both component-based and whole-mixture approaches. A literature search with subsequent screening, data extraction and systematic evidence mapping of the results was conducted. Comments from reviewers (Ivana, Judy, Martin P) were discussed and addressed. The draft statement was endorsed unanimously by the Panel for public consultation.

8.2 Metabolites common to several active substances (EFSA-Q-2024-00560)

The Panel was informed of recent discussions and progress within the Working Group, including the re-evaluation of peer reviewed genotoxicity studies and a technical hearing with applicants to receive clarifications on specific studies conducted with the common metabolites. Next steps and planning were also shared.

8.3 Waiving the dog studies in the regulatory process for agrochemical approval (EFSA-Q-2024-00199)

An overview of the revised draft Opinion and the main comments of the Panel reviewers (Emily, Eugenio, Thomas) was given. The draft Opinion was adopted unanimously by the Panel for its publication. The possibility of organising follow-up activities, e.g., workshop with stakeholders, was also discussed.

8.4 Request for revision of Terrestrial Ecotoxicology Guidance (EFSA-Q-2024-00463 and EFSA-Q-2024-464)

The main general aspects of the protocol for the development of the of the guidance on the risk assessment of PPP to non-target arthropods, in-soil organisms and non-target terrestrial plants were introduced as well as main comments received during the public consultation. Comments from the Panel reviewers were discussed and the draft output was unanimously endorsed for its publication by the Panel. An overview of the on-going parallel activities to adress both mandates, e.g. definition of Specific Protection Goals proposals (SPGs) and the statement on indirect effects, was also given.

8.5 Update of the guidance on Submission of scientific peer-reviewed open literature for the approval of pesticide active substances under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 (EFSA-Q-2024-00585)

An update on the timelines for addressing the mandate was presented. The main comments provided by the Panel reviewers (Francesca, Silvia, Thomas) on the interpretation of the terms of reference (ToR) were presented and discussed.

9. Q/A session

Two Q/A sessions for addressing questions received from observers were held at the end of each day. Questions posed by the observers during the meeting were answered by the Panel and EFSA. See Annex II.

10. Other updates

10.1 SC work programme 2027-2029

The Panel discussed ideas for possible cross-cutting methodological approaches that could be proposed for the work programme of the SC for the next two years.

10.2 Report on the outcome of the Expert Feedback survey

The Panel was informed about the outcome of the feedback survey experts were invited to respond to. The main purpose of the survey and follow-up discussion was to help EFSA to better understand the experts' needs, their perceptions and possible suggestions for the future.

10.3 EC Roadmap towards phasing out animal testing and future implementation

Highlights of the European Commission roadmap recently published were provided. The Panel engaged in discussing what could be done to increase the use of NAMs and overcome all those factors limiting their implementation in the regulatory fields.

11. AOB

Panel reviewers (Judy, Silvia and Thomas) for the EFSA Report on uncertainty analysis and risk characterisation for thyroid developed in the context of the EFSA-SANTE action plan on

cumulative risk assessment of pesticides were appointed. The Report will be presented for its possible endorsement to the next PPR Plenary.

12. Preparatory meeting with risk assessment

Since the last 136th Plenary meeting, no preparatory meetings with risk assessment discussions were held.

13. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on on 29–30 September, in Parma.

Annex I List of Observers (online, only)

Last Name	First Name	Name of Affiliation
Armoogum	Manisha	Staphyt
Bagrjanceva, Ph.D.	Jana	National Institute of Public Health
Bastl	Renate	BASF SE
Bowen	Rachael	ERM
Bowen	Damian	ERM
Brierley	Dale	Health and Safety Executive - Chemical Regulation Division
Čapková	Katarína	The National Institute of Public Health
Colli	Monica	Biotecnologie BT
Cumming	Emily	HSE
Danielsson	Lars	Tuber-Ad
De Pablos alcazar	Irene	Syngenta Crop Protection AG
Eriksson	Viveca	SAF
Estalagem	Soraia	Fine Agrochemicals Ltd
Fusco	Emanuele	Guardia di Finanza
Giaki	Katerina	Technical University of Denmark (DTU)
GINER	Marta	DEVREG CONSULTA
Gonzalez	Martin	TRICHODEX
Górak	Monika	Synthos Agro Sp. z o.o.
Grant	Claire	Apex Scientific Consulting
Heise	Tanja	Federal Institute of Risk Assessment
Herman	Lisa	Proefstation voor de Groenteteelt / Research center for vegetable production
Moyle	Justine	ERM
Klusakova	Irena	NIPH Prague
Markakis	Kostas	EUROPEAN CROP CARE ASSOCIATION
Matlhare	Monnapule	FEICA
Mawer	Sophie	Health and Safety Executive
Medina Collado	Diego	Kerona Scientific
Millan	Jeanne	Staphyt
Moll	Marcel	German Fruit Trade Association
Montes Niño	Alfredo	Unión Internationale des Laboratoires Indépendants - UILI
Montoro Caceres	Marta	Corteva Agriscience Denmark A/S
Novakova	Nadezda	Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture
Osadolor	Osahon	Cargill
Ozcoban	Afranur	Republic of Türkiye Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Padovani	Alexandre	FMC Corporation
Perez	Maria	Albaugh
Pieper	Christina	German Institute for Risk Assessment
Ralls	Sally	Chemicals Regulation Division, HSE

Renahan	Tess	PETA Science Consortium International e.V.
Rodrigo	Silvia	Albaugh
Ruiz	Francisco	Ascenza Agro SA
Samson	Kesolofetse	Botswana Medicines Regulatory Authority
Seguí López-Peñalver	Betania Cecilia	Universidad Internacional de Valencia
Serre	Mathilde	Utrecht University
Shepherd	Hester	Health and Safety Executive (HSE)
Sonnenburg	Anna	German federal Institute for Risk Assessment
Stavropoulou	Angeliki	FEDIOL
Šumberová	Hana	National Institute of Public Health
Turley	Nicky	CRD, HSE
Pyropolis	Iannis	Metrolab SA
Ünlü	Onur	Ondokuz mayıs university
UROIC	Kalle	Bayer AG, CropScience Division
Walter	Christine	Regulatory Science Associates
Westerhout	Joost	RIVM
Wondimagegn	Belayneh	CIHEAM BARI
Wyatt	Joe	Chemicals Regulation Division
Zusková	Eva	National Institute of Public Health

Annex II List of questions from observers and answers

No	OBSERVER	QUESTION	ANSWER
Questions related to agenda item 8.1			
1	**Mr. Kostas Markakis** ECCA, Greece	Could EFSA clarify whether the purpose of this work is exclusively to provide an inventory of available methodologies, or whether the Panel foresees that some of these methodologies could eventually be proposed as routine regulatory requirements for plant protection products under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009?	This systematic evidence map represents an inventory with the scope to identify whether in literature there's anything new or predominant over current methodologies, already used and in place. Therefore, at this stage there are no proposals replacing what is currently being done.
2	**Mr. Kostas Markakis** ECCA, Greece	During the literature review, has the Working Group identified robust evidence demonstrating that long-term carcinogenic effects arising specifically from interactions between components of authorised plant protection products occur at exposure levels relevant to current regulatory assessments?	No, the work is on methodologies and was not designed to comment on specific cases or different exposure levels.
3	**Mr. Kostas Markakis** ECCA, Greece	Following publication will there be a webinar/training for implementation?	No, implementation is expected as this is a scientific opinion not including any regulatory step.
Questions related to agenda item 8.2			
4	**Mr. Kalle Uroic**	Is there any public commenting phase foreseen? What are the	Thank you for the question. The EC mandate foresees that

No	OBSERVER	QUESTION	ANSWER
	Bayer, DE	next steps until the final publication?	EFSA will conduct a harmonised assessment of the metabolites, including data collection, literature review and toxicological characterisation, leading to a Scientific Opinion. A public commenting phase is not specified in the mandate. The outcome will therefore be a Scientific Opinion, to be delivered within 36 months from acceptance of the mandate (Sep 2027).
Questions related to agenda item 8.3			
5	**Ms. Christina Pieper** BfR, Germany	There are still shortcomings hindering the implementation of the Scientific Opinion on waiving dog studies, such as a lack of OECD TG on comparative metabolism studies and clear guidance on PBK studies, including clear requirements, as well as information on the relevance, external bias and reliability/internal bias. Furthermore, more case studies could help to harmonise the implementation of this opinion. Are there any future plans for a way forward?	EFSA is currently discussing potential action points to further foster the goal of waiving dog toxicity studies. Regarding the abovementioned challenges, there has been progress made on the regulatory level, which will facilitate the implementation of this Scientific Opinion (SO). First, while an OECD TG on comparative in vitro metabolism (CIVM) studies is not available, there is a SO from the PPR Panel with recommendations on study design and data interpretation of CIVM studies*. Next, there are ongoing activities on the use of PBK modelling, such as the update of the OECD

No	OBSERVER	QUESTION	ANSWER
			guidance document on characterisation, validation and reporting of PBK models as well as the impending establishment of an EFSA cross-cutting working group on ADME and PBK modelling. Finally, an EFSA guidance document on the critical appraisal of evidence is under review and pending publication. * EFSA PPR Panel et al, 2021. Scientific Opinion of the Scientific Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues (PPR Panel) on testing and interpretation of comparative in vitro metabolism studies. EFSA Journal;19(12):6970. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2021.6970.
Questions related to agenda item 8.4			
6	**Mr. Kostas Markakis** ECCA, Greece	Will EFSA assess and communicate the practical implications that different options for Specific Protection Goals may have on the outcome of risk assessments compared with the current approaches?	EFSA will present the scientific ground to support risk managers for considering different options along with some consequences for risk assessment (e.g. implication for the field study requirements, time for recolonisation, indirect effects). An impact assessment can be performed only once the GDs are finalized.

No	OBSERVER	QUESTION	ANSWER
7	**Mr. Kostas Markakis** ECCA, Greece	To what extent does the Working Group anticipate that existing ecotoxicological studies generated under current guidance frameworks will remain usable under the revised guidance, and will transitional considerations be addressed?	The WG is not yet in a position to anticipate how the higher tier risk assessment will be addressed in the three Guidance Documents (GD). It depends on the agreed SPGs and on the implementation of the protocol for the GD revision which will support the development of the lower tier risk assessment schemes.
8	**Mr. Kostas Markakis** ECCA, Greece	Regarding the mandate on indirect effects on biodiversity, how does EFSA envisage maintaining a clear distinction between scientific assessment and risk management decisions, especially where broader ecosystem considerations may involve societal choices?	In the statement, under public consultation, it is recommended that the SPG for the terrestrial organisms should encompass indirect effects and this means that maintaining the current differentiation between the risk assessment and risk management will not be impacted. For indirect effects due to the removal of pest/weeds, a more cohesive strategy is suggested, since these are not part of the risk assessment.
9	**Ms. Silvia Rodrigo Montoro** Albaugh, Spain	Once finalized, are there any plans for a training course for all parties involved?	Dissemination and training will be organized, as needed.
Questions related to agenda item 8.5			
10	**Mr. Kostas Markakis**	On the update of the GD on submission of scientific peer-reviewed	When mentioning "future developments" refers to the time of the

No	OBSERVER	QUESTION	ANSWER
	ECCA, Greece	open literature, I noted that you have included "expected future developments" which goes a littler bit beyond the "current scientific knowledge at the time of application" that is in Regulation 1107/2009. This is a quite hot topic which is currently under discussion in the context of the omnibus simplification. My question is: did you discuss this topic with DG SANTE?	guidance publication - to ensure sustainability of the guidance and not to restrict to the ones in place when the guidance is adopted. To apply to any application that happens after the adoption of the guidance but not applicable in the future in respect of the time of the application.