WG-I-2015

Final minutes

20 April 2015

Minutes of WG-I-2015

26-30 January 2015

Virtual meetings of the Analytical methods and physico-chemical properties, Human Health, Efficacy and Environment Working Groups of the Biocidal Products Committee

Minutes of Analytical methods and physico-chemical properties WG

WG-I-2015 (26 January 2015)

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the participants indicating the presence of five core members; an apology of one core member was received. One accredited stakeholder organisation (ASO) was present. Applicants were registered for their specific substance discussions.

Participants were informed that the meeting would be recorded solely for the purposes of writing the minutes and that this recording would be destroyed after drafting of the minutes. The recording will not be released to anybody and any other recording is not allowed.

2. Administrative issue

A presentation on the use of the tool 'AdobeConnect – virtual meeting tool' was provided by ECHA in support of the participants of the meeting.

3. Agreement of the agenda

The Chair introduced the draft agenda and invited any additional items. No additional items to the agenda were proposed. The agenda was agreed without changes.

4. Declarations of potential conflicts of interest in relation to the agenda

The Chair invited all members to declare any potential conflicts of interest in relation to the agreed agenda. None were declared by the WG members.

5. Agreement of the draft minutes from WG-V-2014

The minutes were agreed without further comments.

6. Discussion of active substances

6.1 Polyhexamethylene biguanide hydrochloride (PHMB) PT 01, 02, 03, 04, 06, 09, 11 (eCA FR)

6.1.1 PHMB – substance identification criteria for polymeric substances

The working group members agreed to apply the following criteria to be used to identify and to be considered for the specification of polymeric substances.

- The substance needs to fulfil the polymer criteria outlined in the guidance for monomers and polymers under REACH [http://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13632/polymers_en.pdf].
- The number-average molecular weight Mn and the weight average molecular weight Mw need to be determined.
- The polydispersity index (PDI) needs to be calculated.
- The chemical name of the polymer should be used together with the values of Mn and PDI as identifiers for a polymeric substance.
- The identity of end-groups of the polymeric substance might be also relevant as identifier on a case-by-case decision.
- Non-reacted monomers, dimers, oligomers and additives relevant for the reference specification.
- The total content of constituents < 1000 Daltons need to be determined.

Follow-up: ECHA will draft a one page paper on the criteria to be used for the identification of polymers.

6.1.2 Please refer to the confidential draft minutes of the substance.

6.2 Cyromazine PT 18 (eCA EL)

Please refer to the confidential draft minutes of the substance.

7. Any other business

7.1 Lessons learned

Minutes of Human Health WG

WG-I-2015 (27-28 January 2015)

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the participants indicating that eight core members and 12 flexible members were present. One accredited stakeholder organisation (ASO) was present. Applicants were registered for their specific substance discussions.

Participants were informed that the virtual meeting would be recorded solely for the purposes of writing the minutes and that this recording would be destroyed after the agreement of the minutes. The list of attendees is given in Annex 1.

2. Administrative issues

SECR presented the virtual tool for the meeting participants.

3. Agreement of the agenda

The Chair introduced the draft agenda and invited any additional items. No additional items to the agenda were proposed. The agenda was agreed without changes.

4. Declarations of potential conflicts of interest in relation to the agenda

The Chair invited all members to declare any potential conflicts of interest in relation to the agreed agenda. None were declared.

5. Agreement of the draft minutes from WG-V-2014

The minutes were agreed without further comments.

6. Discussion of active substances

6.1 Cyromazine (eCA EL) PT 18

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA except for the conclusion on a possible data requirement for genotoxicity; this remaining issue will be solved in an ad hoc follow-up by 19 February 2015. The application then proceeds to the BPC.

6.2 PHMB (eCA FR) PT 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA but the local risk characterisation has to be revised according to the guidance; the eCA will provide a draft document for an ad hoc follow-up discussion by 13 March and the ad hoc follow-up will be finalised by 31 March. The application then proceeds to the BPC.

Post-WG note: since there is the need to assess additional scenarios, as well as perform new local risk characterisation, it was agreed to combine these two in an e-consultation. The eCA will provide the revised Doc IIB and IIC for all the PTs (PT 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 11)

by 3 April and the HH WG members and the applicant will be asked to provide comments and input no later than 24 April.

7. Technical and guidance related issues

7.1 Update on guidance development (ECHA)

Guidance Vol III – update to Part B/Chapter 3

SECR informed the members of the developments:

- The draft document is in the final stages of preparation and two responses were received from the members of the ad hoc WG on Human Exposure on the proposed restructuring. The draft document is planned to be provided for consultation in February. An invitation for PEG nominations has been sent and CAs had until 30 January 2015 to submit nominations.
- The Commission document on substances of concern was agreed at the CA meeting in November 2014. Since this document has already had a Commission public consultation and has been discussed and approved by the CAs with ECHA having participated in the commenting rounds, the document will be added to the Volume III Part B as an Appendix and by corrigendum. The document, reformatted as an appendix to Guidance, will be sent to the CAs for information and is foreseen for publishing in March/April 2015.

Guidance Vol V Micro-organisms

The Chair informed the members that ECHA, SE and NL have reviewed the draft guidance document that received 297 comments in the consultation of Aug/Sept 2014. A significant revision is currently in progress by SE and NL and a revised draft is expected to be available by the end of February; consequently a second PEG consultation is foreseen for March/April 2015.

7.2 Update on Ad hoc Working Group - Human Exposure

SECR informed that the four recommendations agreed so far by the Working group are publicly available on the ECHA website.

The recommendation on "Product application amount for repellents – exposure assessment" is under finalisation.

The recommendations being currently drafted cover the following topics:

- the most appropriate model to be used for the scenario of non-professional application of paints by brushing and rolling;
- the discussion on the 50% penetration factor for non-professional (amateur) clothing.

The recommendations intended to be prepared include:

- the revision of the HEEG Opinion 5 on "Human exposure assessment to biocidal products used in metalworking fluids (PT 13)";
- the scenario of hands disinfection in hospitals, including the scenario of hand washing by a soap, where the retention factor value will be discussed.

7.2 a) Non-professional use of antifouling paints: exposure assessment for a toddler

The recommendation was agreed by the WG members with minor modifications.

7.2 b) Methods and models to assess exposure to biocidal products in different products types

The recommendation was agreed by the WG members subject to minor modifications following further input to be sent in written by 6 February 2015.

7.3 Update on Ad hoc Working Group - Assessment of Residue Transfer to Food

SECR informed on the progress on the three guidance documents that are in an advanced status of preparation but still in a drafting phase:

- Guidance on Estimating Dietary Risk from Transfer of Biocidal Active Substances into Foods – Non-professional: the guidance should be finalised in Q1 2015 and then published on the ARTFood webpage as a pilot project.
- Guidance on Estimating Transfer of Biocidal Active Substances into Foods – Professional Uses: due to the complexity of the issue, the document is still under discussion among the ARTFood members.
- Guidance on Estimating Livestock Exposure to Active Substances used in Biocidal Products: the document is still under discussion among the ARTFood members; the final draft document should be finalised by ARTFood in Q2 2015.

8. Any other business

8.1 Lessons learned

Revised Working Procedures (WP) for active substance approval

The Chair informed that a revised version of the WP is available in CIRCABC and is expected to be agreed at BPC-9. The WP would then be applied and e.g. the 'peer review of closing point' will then be applied. This implies that the commenting MSCAs would need to check the updated RCOM and indicate within a week if they request a point to be opened for WG discussion when the eCA proposes closing it.

Another issue specifically mentioned was that a specific 'Submissions' folder has been opened in CIRCABC where any WG/BPC member can upload any documents. This should be used for providing e.g. CARs, ARs, draft opinions and RCOMs. No notifications are sent when uploading documents, so it is always necessary to inform SECR of the uploaded documents. SECR will then move the documents to the appropriate folder.

The WP contains schematic presentations of the old and new CAR structures; these were suggested to be used as the basis for the terminology.

WG agreeing on reference values

The Chair proposed that the WG should always agree on reference values and dermal absorption in order to ensure that common principles are applied. These issues would always be included in the discussion table. Other points could also be included as relevant, as also indicated in the revised WP. There were no objections to the proposals.

Principles for active substance discussions

The Chair indicated that delays in providing the updated RCOM will not be acceptable anymore as the whole peer review process suffers from even short delays because this affects the discussion tables.

As a general principle, the WG should never be considered to reach an agreement on a scientific issue concerning a substance unless the following conditions are fulfilled:

- The documents were provided at the latest 10 days before the meeting
- The members are thus able to study the issue and discuss with colleagues as relevant
- The applicant has an opportunity to defend their position

These rules are however neither binding nor fully sufficient and the procedural guidance needs to be consulted; e.g. documents may be provided later when explicitly agreed by Chair according to the rules of procedures. The applicants are also not always allowed in the discussions; this would be the case when confidential information of two applicants needs to be discussed.

Minutes of Efficacy WG

WG-I-2015 (28 January 2015)

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed all participants to the fifth Efficacy WG meeting. All core members participated except for Ms Iuliana Radu. In addition, one flexible member, one rapporteur and three stakeholder observers participated to the WG meeting. The Chair introduced also representatives of ECHA.

Participants were informed that the meeting would be recorded solely for the purposes of writing the minutes and that this recording would be destroyed after the agreement of the minutes. The list of attendees is given in Annex 1.

2. Administrative issues

The SECR gave a brief overview of some of the functions of the virtual meeting tool (AdobeConnect).

3. Agreement of the agenda

The Chair introduced the agenda items and invited participants to discuss any additional items at AOB. No additional agenda items were added.

Conclusions and actions

Members agreed on the proposed agenda.

4. Declarations of potential conflicts of interest in relation to the agenda

The Chair invited all members to declare any potential conflict of interest to the agenda items. None were declared.

5. Agreement of the draft minutes from WG-V-2014

SECR explained that there had been no comments on the minutes from the WG-V-2014 meeting. The ad hoc follow-up had been finalised and the follow-up on peracetic acid is about to start shortly.

Conclusions and action

The WG members agreed on the minutes with the proposed amendments.

6. Discussion of active substances[1]

6.1 Cyromazine (eCA EL)

There were two remaining open points in the discussion table. The first concerned the possibility of resistance development, which in the opinion of the eCA could not be excluded. Therefore some resistance management measures should be proposed.

[1] The details of the substance discussions are considered restricted. Only the non-restricted conclusions are reported here.

WG members expressed the importance to mention in the CAR the possibility of resistance development, which is essential for the product authorisation stage.

It was agreed to add a sentence regarding the possibility of resistance development to the CAR and indicate at the same time that detailed resistance management measures should be proposed at product authorisation stage, if relevant for the product. As the feed-through application is not intended to be covered by the applicants references to this use will be removed from the CAR.

The second issue concerned new uses identified by the applicant and extension of the target organisms group. As the new uses were not supported by the efficacy data it was agreed that only control of nuisance and biting flies had been sufficiently demonstrated for active substance approval and efficacy against other diptera taxa may be demonstrated at the product authorisation stage.

With these amendments the EFF WG agreed on the evaluation of the eCA.

6.2 PHMB (eCA FR)

There was one remaining open point in the discussion table concerning the intended uses and efficacy of the representative product. The eCA requested additional efficacy tests (phase 2, step2) to determine the application rate for mopping, spraying and wiping: uses for which the risk assessment had not been performed. It was concluded that based on submitted tests efficacy had been demonstrated sufficiently to include PHMB in the Union list for PT2, 3 and 4, as the provided tests show the basic activity of the active substance for all intended uses. It was also agreed the eCA should perform risk assessments based on the application rate from submitted data for dipping in PT2, 3 and 4, and for other uses rates claimed by the applicant should be used.

With these additions the EFF WG agreed on the evaluation of the eCA.

7. Guidance

7.1 and 7.2 Structure and content of the Efficacy guidance, including Part C

SECR presented different possibilities to structure the guidance on Efficacy, in particular how texts on general issues could be dealt with. These general issues include various aspects of biocidal products evaluation, as well as evaluation of efficacy at active substance approval stage and of treated articles. Such texts could form Part C of the guidance, or be incorporated together with the PT-specific chapters in Part B. After some discussion if was agreed that some further information would be collected in writing to prepare for the March WG. SE also offered to re-draft the text on Treated Articles and use part of it as a general text on evaluation of efficacy.

Detailed discussions on the present texts on 'Role of efficacy at the active substance approval stage' and 'Treated Article' were deferred to the March meeting due to additional comments which had not yet been circulated.

The issue of technical annexes to the PT specific guidance was discussed. Such documents will require regular updating as they contain, for example, testing methods. For that reason it had previously been questioned if it would be possible to keep them sufficiently updated given ECHA's rather stringent procedure for revision of guidance. SECR explained that there was a possibility to update technical issues by using the 'corrigendum' procedure already in place for other guidance. In this way annexes (preferably called appendices to avoid confusion with legal annexes) could be kept up to date by regular revisions. Also links to relevant websites could be included in the appendices to allow readers to check information. Members agreed that this would be an appropriate way to deal with information.

It was agreed SECR would circulate an email with a link to Part A of the Efficacy guidance (Information requirements). Furthermore the RCOM with comments on the present

version of Part C would be completed with comments received from AT and NL and uploaded to CIRCA in preparation for the EFF WG in March. Members would also be asked for their views on the guidance documents on specific PTs published in the TNGs, what information should be covered by the general parts of the guidance, and about their availability for taking part in the drafting of such texts.

7.3 Guidance for PT 8

France and SECR described the development of the draft guidance since the last meeting. The requirements for field testing had been settled between FR and DE, and by that the guidance had been finalized. The document will shortly be uploaded on ECHA's website.

The Chair thanked FR for their excellent work with the document.

7.4 Overview of Efficacy guidance

SECR presented an updated version of the document 'Efficacy guidance' and members were encouraged to share views on priorities of coming guidance development.

One member asked if the guidance on drinking water methods could be uploaded to ECHA's website. SECR responded that contacts had been taken with UBA to request if the document could also be uploaded on ECHA's website. Furthermore a member expressed the need to prepare guidance for product families. It was agreed that such guidance should be further discussed in the next EFF WG in March 2015.

8. AOB

8.1 Update on the revision of the BPC working procedure for active substance approval

As requested in the EFF-WG-V 2014 SECR gave an update on the BPC working procedure for approval of active substances. The main changes concern clarifications of the procedures for various issues such as Applicant's actions in the process; accordance check criteria; disagreements in WG discussion; ad hoc follow-ups; CARs finalised at TM; Responsibilities and timelines; open issues document for the BPC, and dissemination of BPC opinions, assessment reports and study results.

8.2 Lessons learned

SECR gave a brief presentation summarizing the outcome of the first year of work by the EFF WG. It was concluded that all open points related to the active substance approvals had been finalised on time and very good progress had been made with the Efficacy guidance.

Minutes of Environment WG

WG-I-2015 (29-30 January 2015)

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the participants indicating that there were 8 core members and 1 alternate member present in addition to 14 flexible members and 2 rapporteurs. Two accredited stakeholder organisations (ASO) were present at the meeting. Applicants were also present for their specific substance discussions.

Participants were informed that the meeting would be recorded solely for the purposes of writing the minutes and that this recording would be destroyed after the agreement of the minutes.

2. Administrative issues

2.1 Virtual meeting tool

SECR provided a short introduction on how to use the virtual meeting tool.

3. Agreement of the agenda

The Chair introduced the draft agenda and invited any additional items. The following changes and additional items to the agenda were proposed:

- Item 8.2 "Update on on-going issues at ECHA" to be added, with information on scheduled Workshop (March 2015) "Review on the Active Substance Assessment Process".
- Item 6.3 "Overview on the guidance" will be discussed after the "discussion on active substances" (item 7).

4. Declarations of potential conflicts of interest in relation to the agenda

The Chair invited all members to declare any potential conflicts of interest in relation to the agreed agenda. None were declared.

The Chair explained that the Vice-chair has a conflict of interest with one active substance. Therefore the Chair will chair the whole discussion on that active substance.

5. Agreement of the draft minutes from WG-V-2014

The Chair informed that comments were received for the ESD PT13, ad hoc Environmental Exposure WG consultations on PT1 and PT 18 and on the general minutes. The updated minutes were adopted with no comments.

A general comment was also received on wet-to-dry sediment conversion from industry. It will be discussed bilaterally first, and might come to the WG if needed.

6. Technical and guidance related issues

6.1. Clarification of remaining open points following the consultation of the draft ESD for PT 19 (ECHA)

The following pre-defined points were discussed and concluded:

- *Mathematical approach for calculating soil and surface water concentrations including removal of active substances*: The majority of the WG members agreed to use the mathematical model according to the ESD for PT 18 (OECD ESD No. 14).
- *Number of swimmers using an insect repellent*: A value of 0.02 for F_{swim} should be used as default value for active substance approval. A footnote will be however added to the default value indicating that for product authorisation a higher value can be used (0.1) to cover areas with higher insect infestation.
- *Appropriateness of a short-term assessment for the 'swimming scenario'*: The WG agreed to keep the scenario as it currently is (long term assessment and given volume). However, there will be the possibility if needed and agreed by the WG to revise the default value of the volume in the future.
- *Tent scenario*: The majority of WG members agree to consider a tent which is pitched on the same parcel for 120 days, therefore a value of 120 should be kept in the ESD. The size of the tent as provided currently in the ESD was considered acceptable.
- *Further research on emissions from factory-repellent treated textiles*: The WG agreed to the consumption based approach provided in the ESD and the default value for F_{water} of 0.2.
- *Emissions from repellent-treated cats and dogs by washing/bathing*: The WG agreed not to include a separate scenario for emissions from repellent treated cats and dogs by washing/bathing at this stage. However, addition of the scenario will be subject for future revisions to the ESD. In case such a scenario is identified to be needed for product authorisation, the development will be initiated by the Ad hoc EE WG. In addition it was concluded that it should not be stated in the ESD that the emissions are negligible.
- *Soil depth when limited areas are affected in PT 19*: The majority of the WG members agreed to use a soil depth of 50 cm for limited areas affected in PT 19. It was noted by NL that this overrules previous decisions taken in 2007-2008.

6.2. PT 2 - Ad hoc EE WG consultation on scenarios to assess biocides as PT02 for private pool treatment (FR)

The following pre-defined points on the scenario proposed by FR were discussed and concluded:

- *Number of pools connected to the same STP*: The WG agreed on a tiered approach for active substance approval:

  Tier 1: consider 550 pools

  Tier 2: consider 100 pools

  If the substance fails Tier 1 a statement would need to be provided in the CAR that for product authorisation in Southern European countries the assessment needs to be refined.

  Northern European countries, a value of 100 pools should be assumed (for product authorisation).
- *Proposal to consider only releases to the STP concerning the water emission from the private swimming pools*: The WG concluded that for the approval of active substances it is acceptable to assess only the releases to municipal STP and consider application to permanent installed pools. For product authorisation an assessment for above ground small pools (including direct release) should be

performed.

- *Market share to be used for the risk assessment of substances listed in the OECD ESD Table, 1, 0.5 or the value from the OECD ESD Table*: The WG concluded a market share of 0.5 should be used for AS (beside substances which mode of action is based on chlorine) as first tier. The same approach as provided in other ESD should be followed (the market penetration can be lowered based on market data from the applicant).
  Action: A consultation of the Ad hoc EE WG will be initiated to prepare a recommendation on how to use market share data in order to derive a market penetration factor different from default values.
- *Pool volume to be considered*: The WG concluded that a pool volume of 48 m^3 as propose in ConsExpo should be used.
- *Annual release fraction of the pool content before overwintering*: The WG concluded that a value of 33% should be used in general for permanent pools; no differentiation is made between North and South Europe.
- On *additional comments* received on the scenario, the WG concluded the following: For the time period for peak emissions, a value of 60 days should be used. In the scenario however in order to simplify the calculations a value of 10 pools per day (for Southern countries) and 2 pools per day (for Northern countries) emitting during 60 days should be used.

6.3. Update on guidance development, e-consultations and issues to be sent to the Ad hoc EE WG (ECHA)

The Chair presented and updated the status on guidance development, e-consultations and consultations of the Ad hoc EE WG.

7. Discussion of active substances[2]

7.1 PHMB (eCA FR)

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the evaluating Competent Authority (eCA). The eCA can prepare the updated Competent Authority Report (CAR) and proceed to the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC).

7.2 Cyromazine (eCA EL)

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the evaluating Competent Authority (eCA). The eCA can prepare the updated Competent Authority Report (CAR) and proceed to the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC).

8. Any other business

8.1 Lessons learned

The Chair pointed out the following for information:

- *Revised Working Procedures (WP) for active substance approval*:

  The revised version of the WP is available at CIRCABC and is expected to be agreed at BPC-9 (Feb 2015):

[2] The details of the substance discussions are considered restricted. Only the non-restricted conclusions are reported here.

⇒ The 'peer review of closing points' will be applied (see "Lessons learned" of WG-V-2015)

⇒ A specific 'Submissions' folder has been opened in CIRCABC where any WG/BPC member can upload any documents.
- SECR will move the uploaded documents to correct folders
- No notifications are sent but all members can see all submissions
- Please inform SECR when you have uploaded documents.

- *General issues*:

⇒ Delays in providing the updated RCOM are not acceptable as the whole peer review process suffers from even short delays because this affects the discussion tables.

A general approach to avoid confusion was suggested: the WG should never be considered to reach an agreement on a scientific issue concerning a substance unless:
- the documents were provided at the latest 10 days before the meeting
- the members are thus able to study the issue and discuss with colleagues as relevant
- the applicant has an opportunity to defend their position.

⇒ If existing emission scenario/agreed default values are changed or a new scenario is introduced, they should preferably be discussed by the Ad hoc EE WG upfront.

⇒ Draft/final agenda: please check the final agenda uploaded with discussion tables 10 days before the WG meeting week; there are major changes possible compared to the draft agenda.

⇒ SECR to cross-check that ASOs are included in non-substance specific consultations of the ENV WG or Ad hoc EE WG.

There were no additional comments from the WG members.

8.2 Update on on-going issues at ECHA

The Chair invited Simon Gutierrez to report on the Workshop "Reviewing the Biocidal Active Substance Assessment Process" scheduled for 5th March 2015.

The aim of the Workshop is to analyse the process as a whole, evaluate how ECHA has been performing and identify issues to improve on efficiency.

Not only BPC and WG member but everyone from MS involved in the active substance evaluation are invited to participate. A pre-announcement letter was sent to the MSCA. Invitations are to be sent shortly, and a draft agenda will follow.

⇒ WG members specifically request that it should be stressed that also WG members should attend to the Workshop.

o0o

List of Attendees (Annex I)

Analytical methods and physico-chemical properties WG

Core members
MUEHLE Ulrike (DE)
GATOS Panagiotis (EL)
HUIZING Tjaartjan (NL)
WARBURTON Anthony (UK)
Alternate core members
WEBER Philippe (FR)
Flexible members
VAN BERLO Boris (BE)
MARTINEZ CABALLERO Marta (ES)
GONZALEZ Lorena (ES)
KARHI Kimmo (FI)
KORKOLAINEN Tapio (FI)
DOMKA Anna (PL)
CATALDI Lucilla (IT)
CEBACEK Petra (SI)
Rapporteurs
THIERRY-MIEG Morgane (FR)

ECHA Staff
KREBS Bernhard (Chair)
RODRIGUEZ UNAMUNO Virginia
TAPIO Susanna
AIRAKSINEN Sanna
LISBOA MARTO Susana
Applicant(s)
Lonza
Hokochimie
Novartis
Apologies
HUSZAL Sylvester (PL)
Accredited Stakeholder Organisations
MIHAI Camelia (CEFIC)

Human Health WG

Core members
HOLTHENRICH Dagmar (DE)
RITZ Vera (DE)
DE LENTDECKER Chloe (FR)
DE SAINT-JORES Jeremy (FR)
BOS Carina (NL)
NIKOLOPOULOU Dimitra (EL)
GHITULESCU Rita (RO)
BRESCIA Susy (UK)
Flexible members
BOYE PETERSEN Annika (DK)
GONZALEZ Lorena (ES)
MARTINEZ Marta (ES)
HÄMÄLÄINEN Anna-Maija (FI)
HYVÄRINEN Tuija (FI)
REY Marion (FR)
ARAPAKI Niki (EL)
CHARISTOU Agathi (EL)
GAUSTAD Astrid (NO)
UJMA-CZWAKIEL Monika (PL)
CEBASEK Petra (SI)
LÅSTBOM Lena (SE)
Advisors
CEDERBERG Håkan (SE)
Rapporteurs
THIERRY-MIEG Morgane (FR)

ECHA Staff
AIRAKSINEN Antero (Chair)
ESTEVAN MARTINEZ Carmen
JANOSSY Judit
PECORINI Chiara
RUGGERI Laura
MYOHANEN Kirsi
GUTIERREZ Alonso Simon
TAPIO Susanna
Accredited Stakeholder Organisations
MIHAI Camelia (CEFIC)
WAGNER Kristina (Animal Welfare Organisations)
Applicants
Hokochimie
Novartis
Lonza

Efficacy WG

Core members
ATTIG Isabelle (FR)
GERRITSEN Lonne (NL)
GIATROPOULOS Athanasios (EL) - Rapporteur
KECK Marianne (AT)
HAMEL Darka (HR)
LEPAGE Anne (BE)
SIKORSKI Martha (DE)
Alternate core members
MAXIMILIEN Yann (FR)
Flexible members
FRANK Ulrike (SE)
Rapporteurs
THIERRY-MIEG Morgane (FR)

ECHA Staff
THUVANDER Ann (Chair)
SZYMANKIEWICZ Katarzyna
SCHAKIR Yasmin
Applicants
Novartis
Hokochimie
Lonza
Accredited Stakeholder Organisations
MIHAI Camelia (CEFIC)
CAZELLE Elodie (AISE)
ASTON David (EWPM)
Apologies
RADU Iuliana (RO)

Environment WG

Core members
LEFÈBVRE Frederic (BE)
KOIVISTO Sanna (FI)
ALEXANDRE Stéphanie (FR)
CHION Béatrice (FR)
PETERSOHN Eleonora (DE)
KEHRER Anja (DE)
OKKERMAN Peter (NL)
KANDRIS Ioannis (EL) - Rapporteur
Alternate members
PACHITI Irene (EL)
Flexible members
PENTTINEN Sari (FI) - only on 30.1
AHTING Maren (DE)
MICHAELIS Katja (DE)
COSTA Lenia (PT)
SMIT Els (NL)
MUNCH CHRISTENSEN Anne (DK)
GONDOLF Anette (DK)
DIAS Victor (FR)
HARALDSEN Terje (NO)
KRYSZCZUK Artur (PL)
VAN DER GEEST Bert (SI)
HAHLBECK Edda (SE)
LANE Clare (UK)
WALTON Chris (UK)

ECHA Staff
SCHIMMELPFENNIG Heike (Chair)
GUTIERREZ Simon (Vice Chair)
WIK Anna
LIPKOVA Adriana (remote)
Rapporteurs
THIERRY-MIEG Morgane(FR)
Experts
ANTHE Mechthild – only on AP 6.1
Accredited Stakeholder Organisations
MIHAI Camelia (CEFIC)
DAINELLI Dario (AISE)
Applicants
Lonza
Hokochimie
Novartis