WG-IV-2014

Final minutes

08 December 2014

Minutes of WG-IV-2014

15-18 September 2014

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

Minutes of Analytical methods and physico-chemical properties WG

WG-IV-2014 (15 September 2014)

1. Welcome and apologies

The list of attendees is given in Annex 1.

2. Administrative issues

SECR gave an introduction to the key functionalities of the virtual meeting tool.

3. Agreement of the agenda

The Chair introduced the draft agenda and invited the participants to propose any additional item. Two additional points were included under item 7-AOB:

- Biocidal Product Family: Harmonisation of Phys.Chem. & M.O.A. Requirements (presented by IE)
- Conclusions of the WG APCP e-consultation: vapour pressure value in TNsG (presented by PL)

The agenda was then agreed by the WG.

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.

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 was declared.

The Chair informed the members of the following updates concerning CoI:

1) ECHA policy for managing the conflicts of interest has been updated at the March Management Board meeting with two consequences for BPC and BPC WG members

   a. There is a new declaration of interest (DoI) template that will replace Annex 2 to the BPC RoPs. The new template should be used when DoIs are updated next year, or if new core members are nominated;

   b. Members that have not submitted annual DoIs – the ECHA policy now explicitly states if members of ECHA bodies have not submitted an annual DoI, they shall not take part in meetings of the ECHA body.

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

The minutes were agreed with minor editorial comments.

The amendments to the text suggested by FR for *Item 6 – Establishment of a reference specification,* will be included in the document and then distributed to the Working Group members for final comments and endorsement (via e-mail) as agreed at APCP WG-III - 2014.

6. Discussion of active substances

6.1 Medetomidine (eCA UK) PT 21

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA. The CAR will be updated based on the agreements. The application proceeds to the BPC.

6.2 IPBC (eCA DK) PT 13

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA. The CAR will be updated based on the agreements. The application proceeds to the BPC.

6.3 Citric acid (eCA BE) PT 1

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA. The CAR will be updated based on the agreements. The application proceeds to the BPC.

7. AOB

7.1 Biocidal Product Family: Harmonisation of Phys.Chem. & M.O.A. Requirements

IE presented the document containing 3 hypothetical scenarios with regards to BPFs. The document was modified by IE following the comments received at the WG. The updated version was distributed via e-mail for the purposes of the e-consultation.

The opinions received from MSs with respect to the given scenarios should provide the grounds for a harmonised approach regarding the treatment of BPFs from a chemistry perspective.

Responses to the given scenarios can be emailed to IE: Finbar Brown before *6 October.* IE will circulate a summary of the responses received from the interested Member States.

7.2 Conclusions of the WG APCP e-consultation: vapour pressure value in TNsG

PL summarised the comments received during the e-consultation presented at APCP WG-III-2014. Based on these comments PL proposed to revise the 'Guidance on information requirements – Guidance on regulation (EU) no 528/2012 concerning the making available on the market and use of biocidal products (BPR) – (Version 1.0, July 2013)', point 5.2.2. *Air* to establish the value as 0.01 Pa.

A summary and conclusions will be distributed via e-mail to the Working Group members.

Minutes of Environment WG

WG-IV-2014 (16 September 2013)

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the participants indicating that there were 7 core members participating in the virtual meeting, in addition to 13 flexible members, 2 advisers and 3 rapporteurs. Two accredited stakeholder organisations (ASO) were participating at the meeting. Applicants were also participating 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

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 additional item to the agenda was proposed by ECHA: Under item 8.2 an update will be provided on ongoing developments within ECHA.

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. The Chair declared a conflict of interest with one of the active substances to be discussed and indicated that the respective agenda item will be chaired by Erik van de Plassche.

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

The Chair informed that comments were received from SE and PT for propiconazole and for the general minutes. The comments have been included in the respective minutes and the minutes were agreed.

Since no comments have been received on the minutes of the other points discussed at WG-III-2014, these have been considered as being agreed.

6. Discussion of active substances[1]

6.1 Medetomidine (eCA UK)

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the evaluating Competent Authority (eCA). The Competent Authority Report (CAR) will be updated based on the agreements. The application proceeds to the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC).

6.2 IPBC (eCA DK)

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA. The CAR will be updated based on the agreements. The application proceeds to the BPC.

6.3 Citric acid (eCA BE)

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA. The CAR will be updated based on the agreements. The application proceeds to the BPC.

6.4 $PNEC_{aquatic}$ Imidacloprid (eCA DE)

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the new information on the already approved active substance as presented by the eCA.

7. Technical and guidance related issues

7.1 Update on guidance development (ECHA)

The Chair presented the status on guidance development, e-consultations and requests to be sent to the Ad Hoc WG on Environmental Exposure.

Action NL: It was concluded to include also the Ad hoc EE WG in the discussion on the soil depth for PT 18; NL to send a summary of the points to be discussed to ECHA; ECHA will distribute the document to the Ad hoc EE WG for consultation (the point will be linked to the planned consultation on protection goals).

It was further stated that the issues identified to be consulted with the Ad hoc EE WG will be ranked, partly grouped and then sent to the members with a certain time window in-between in order to distribute the consultations evenly over time and to prevent peaks.

8. Any other business

8.1 Lessons learned from WG-III-2014

The Chair pointed out the following issues:

- It should be clearly indicated in the updated RCOM table if a point is **open** (i.e. to be discussed at the WG meeting) or **closed**.
- The following updates on the ad-hoc follow up procedure were presented:

  Some changes will be proposed in an updated Working Procedure that will be discussed in BPC-8 in December 2014

  ECHA proposal 1: The timing of the *ad hoc* follow-up will be established on a case-by-case basis at the WG meeting. The timing of the following WG and BPC meeting is taken into account in deciding the deadlines. The ultimate deadline is 12 days prior

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

to the next WG meeting so that the finalised minutes can be uploaded 10 days prior to the WG meeting, including the input from *ad hoc* follow-up.

ECHA proposal 2: An *ad hoc* follow-up is used only to finalise the technical discussions where the substance will be forwarded to the BPC. If an issue cannot be closed in an early WG discussion but the eCA wishes further input from other MSCAs, an e-consultation can be launched.

- Concerning early WG discussion, the WG members were invited to be very specific in the questions sent to the WG in order to receive the appropriate feedback on the respective open point(s).

In addition comments of the WG members were collected:

- NL asked for more flexibility: even if a point was considered closed before the meeting, there should be nevertheless case by case the possibility to re-open it for discussion during the meeting.

8.2 General issues for information

The Chair provided information on current ongoing developments at ECHA:

- The Biocides ESD webpage will be newly structured**.**
- The following project will be started in another ECHA unit: "Identification and preliminary analysis of update needs for EUSES"

  1. Identification of modifications needed for extending the fate modelling approach (SimpleTreat, SimpleBox) for different types of chemicals, e.g. metals, ionisable chemicals, gases.
  2. Identification of improvement and extension needs of the fate modelling within EUSES (including the STP, accumulation in the food chain and the distribution in the environment), based on experience and various research programmes that have taken place over the last years.

     There are no expectations regarding the need for update of the release module of EUSES.

- The following scoping document to be sent to the PBT expert group is currently under preparation in another ECHA unit: "How to address temperature dependence of biodegradation for the purpose of the assessment of degradation/persistence".

The Chair closed the meeting, indicating that the WG Environment meeting in November will be a physical meeting again.

Minutes of Human Health WG

WG-IV-2014 (17 September 2014)

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the participants indicating that 7 core members, one alternate core member and 21 flexible members were present. Three accredited stakeholder organisations (ASO) were also registered. 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 the agreement of the minutes. The list of attendees is given in Annex 1.

2. Administrative issues

SECR gave an introduction to the key functionalities of the virtual meeting tool.

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-III-2014

The minutes were agreed without further comments.

6. Discussion of active substances[2]

6.1 Medetomidine PT 21 (eCA UK)

The Working Group could not agree on the assessment factors used to derive reference values. An ad hoc follow-up was launched to solve the issue. The results of this ad hoc follow-up were provided 24 October.

The Competent Authority Report (CAR) will be updated based on the agreements of the Working Group and the ad hoc follow-up. The application then proceeds to the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC).

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

6.2 IPBC PT 13 (eCA DK)

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA. The CAR will be updated based on the agreements. The application proceeds to the BPC.

6.3 Citric acid PT 1 (eCA BE)

The Working Group members agreed on the evaluation of the eCA except for the reference value to be used in risk characterisation. This reference value was decided in an ad hoc follow-up that was finalised by 24 October.

The CAR will be updated based on the agreements of the Working Group and the ad hoc follow-up. The application then proceeds to the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC).

7. Technical and guidance related issues

7.1 Update on guidance development

Microbials guidance

SECR noted that the draft guidance for microorganisms is under consultation until 26 September.

Vol III Part B – human health

SECR informed that the revision of the human health guidance Vol III Part B has started and concerns only Chapter 3 on human exposure. No comments should be sent anymore as they cannot be taken into account at this stage because ECHA is now in the process of drafting the revised document. In this drafting, ECHA will take into account also the comments sent last year (2013) during the drafting of the first version of the document.

The first draft and a set of questions will be provided to the members of the ad hoc WG on human exposure; this is expected to take place by the end of October. The ad hoc WG members will have approximately 2-3 weeks in November to provide their input.

ECHA will then take into account all the input from the ad hoc WG in further revising the draft guidance document ready for the Partner Expert Group (PEG) consultation. In preparation for the PEG consultation, the requests to nominate members are expected to be sent in November 2014. The consultation is foreseen to be launched by the end of January 2015.

7.2 Guidance on Substances of Concern

This guidance document has been developed with COM in the lead and without ECHA involvement. SECR considered however the document to be well in line with the ECHA guidance and based on the comments received only minor changes are needed.

Several text changes and clarifications were proposed by the WG and this input will be forwarded to the SoC group led by COM that will then provide a final draft document to the CA meeting.

7.3 Update on Ad hoc Working Group - Human Exposure

The Chair mentioned that two recommendations are currently under preparation or under consultation:

- the "*NL Opinion on the use of models for the assessment of exposure to different biocidal products used in different product types*" provided by NL: the paper provides an overview of the models preferred by NL (up to 29 July 2014) for risk

assessment. The aim of the recommendation is to propose harmonised methods (models) and relevant information for the assessment of biocides exposure in different product types;
- the recommendation on "*Product application amount for repellents – exposure assessment*": further discussion will be needed to reach an agreement on the way forward.

The Chair indicated the recommendations planned to be drafted:
- the hand-to-mouth transfer scenario, which will be integrated with the outcome of the ad hoc follow-up of copper pyrithione concerning the scenario of children exposed to copper pyrithione containing products via dermal and oral route;
- 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 revision of the HEEG Opinion 5 on "*Human exposure assessment to biocidal products used in metalworking fluids (PT13)*".

The Chair also mentioned that the involvement of the ASOs in contributing to the recommendations of the Ad hoc WG on human Exposure will be better defined.

a) Recommendation of the Ad hoc Working Group - Human Exposure

Spraying models for assessing exposure to insecticides for low pressure downward uses

The proposed default dermal exposure value was derived with RISKOFDERM using the application rate of 3 L/min and resulted in increased values compared to the spraying model 1 of the TNsG 2002. The application rate of 3 L/min was selected as the worst-case when specific application rate data are not provided by industry.

The recommendation aimed at "*comparing the spraying model 1 of the TNsG 2002 with other available models in order to identify the most suitable approach for assessing exposure to insecticides for low pressure downward uses*". The recommendation was considered to succeed in this goal. The use of ART and RISKOFDERM to assess inhalation and dermal exposure, respectively, were considered more appropriate than other existing models.

Objections were raised only in relation to the proposed default dermal exposure value, while the proposed default inhalation exposure value was considered appropriate. It was suggested reinvestigating the proposed default dermal exposure value after obtaining real application rate data from industry, in order to derive a default value of more general applicability.

Although obtaining and processing data from industry was considered beneficial in deriving a default value of more general applicability, there was uncertainty related to the timeline of this exercise and delaying the agreement of this recommendation was considered detrimental for applicants and MSCAs undertaking their assessments.

In light of those considerations, the recommendation was amended by removing the default dermal exposure value and indicating that this value will be developed in due course based on exposure data provided by industry.

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

b) Recommendation of the Ad hoc Working Group - Human Exposure

Cleaning of spray equipment in antifouling use (PT21)

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

7.4 Update on Ad hoc Working Group - Assessment of Residue Transfer to Food (ARTFood)

Judit Janossy (Chair of ARTFood) informed that she handed over the chairing to Laura Ruggeri. The new Chair gave a brief update on the status of the TGDs under development.

8. Any other business

8.1 Lessons learned

This agenda item was skipped because of time limitations.

Minutes of Efficacy WG

WG-IV-2014 (18 September 2014)

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed all participants to the third Efficacy WG meeting. All core members participated except, Ms Iuliana Radu. In addition two alternate members, six flexible members and two stakeholder observers participated to the WG-IV 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

SECR gave a presentation on the virtual meeting tool (AdobeConnect) and housekeeping rules. The Chair invited all members to alert SECR of any particular difficulties they have experienced.

3. Agreement of the agenda

The Chair introduced the agenda items and invited participants to discuss any additional items at AOB.

Conclusions and actions

No additions to the agenda was proposed and members agreed on the agenda as proposed. All participants 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-III-2014

SECR introduced one additional sentence for Ampholyt 20 indicating that some members find the CAR's updating procedure not satisfactory.

For Propiconazole it was suggested to remove a part of the sentence saying *'bearing the approval by the CA meeting of the present guidance in mind'* and according to the comments, this part has been removed.

With respect to PT14 guidance the proposal has been received to add in section *1. Label claims and target species,* a sentence *'the claim "roof rats" alone will be deleted*'. The Chair explained that in the current version of the guidance this specific claim has not been deleted.

In section 2. *Testing, general considerations* editorial change has been made in the sentence: *Laboratory studies should follow the same protocols*. It was proposed to amend the phrase 'the same' to 'agreed'. The amendment has been made.

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

6. Discussion of active substances[3]

6.1 Medetomidine (eCA UK)

There were no open points concerning efficacy for discussion in the RCOM table, so the discussion table was only provided to record the agreement/disagreement of the WG.

WG agreed on the evaluation of the eCA.

6.2 IPBC (eCA DK)

There were no open points concerning efficacy for discussion in the RCOM table, so the discussion table was only provided to record the agreement/disagreement of the WG.

WG agreed on the evaluation of the eCA.

6.3 Citric acid (eCA BE)

eCA submitted together with the RCOM table a discussion paper entitled 'Citric Acid – Efficacy' to be used before the WG discussions to clarify efficacy issues. The Chair informed that it is not within the responsibility of the WG to decide about appropriate PT, however WG members supported the classification of tissues as PT1 biocidal product, as it what was agreed by the COM and CAs in 2004.

To obtain the legally binding opinion about proper classification of the product eCA was advised to submit a request to the COM in accordance with Article 3(3) of the BPR. The proposal has been accepted by eCA and WG.

WG members agreed that further data are needed to prove the efficacy of the tissue under realistic in-use conditions with regard to the claim made. In case the tissue will be defined as biocidal product, it was agreed that additional data should be submitted at the product authorisation stage. In case the tissue will be defined as treated article, it will not be possible to request such data, since a further authorisation is not required. Efficacy had not been demonstrated for treated articles in the assessment. This statement will be added in Chapter 3 of DOC I of the CAR.

6.4 PBO (eCA EL)

There were three open points in the discussion table. The first referred to the correct wording in the CAR related to the current legal text. ECHA informed that from 1 September 2014 the European Commission takes a decision on the active substances approval in accordance with Article 9 of the BPR.

In relation to the other two points and literature study recently submitted by the applicant and indicating efficacy of PBO on its own against house flies (target organism) it was agreed that a study summary of that report will be included in the updated version of the CAR. It is essential that the evaluation of the recently submitted study is performed with regard to concentrations relevant for the use and assessed in the CAR. Only in this case the study can be used to substantiate the efficacy against the target organisms.

7. Technical and guidance related issues

7.1 Work plan for Efficacy guidance

A presentation concerning the current status and work plan for efficacy guidance was given by SECR. Since the last WG the guidance on PT 22 has been finalised by FR and published.

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

The guidance for PT 8 and PT 2 are under revision by FR and NL, respectively, following consultation. The work on PT 8 will be finished soon but for PT 2 there were a high number of comments and NL has limited capacity to deal with them.

NL also informed about their work with PT 1, 3 and 4. For PT 1 a draft will soon be ready for circulation to the WG. There will also be a workshop in the Netherlands in October 2014 to further proceed with PT 3 and 4.

Conclusions and actions

There is in general good progress with the efficacy guidance documents. ECHA will discuss further with NL and try to find a way to assist with the finalisation of the PT 2 guidance.

AT promised to check with COM the status of the question related to mucous membranes and PT 1.

Update of the document 'The role of efficacy in the evaluation of active substances for Annex I inclusion'

A presentation of a draft roadmap for the drafting of the Guidance for BPR: Volume II Efficacy, Part C Evaluation, was given. SECR proposed that the present guidance 'The role of efficacy in the evaluation of active substances for annex I inclusion' should be used as a starting point for Part C Evaluation, following the conclusions in the Efficacy WG in its June meeting 2014 that the present guidance needs revision.

SECR proposed that the first draft of the revision should be prepared by a small group of people from the WG and SECR and will then be taken to the WG for further discussion.

Conclusions and actions

Members were in general agreement that the revision of the document should start. Division of tasks between WG members and SECR needs to be further explored.

ECHA will circulate an invitation to the drafting group via email.

7.2 Update of guidance for PT 14 (3)

A new draft of the guidance for PT had been prepared in co-operation between NL and DE, implementing changes agreed in the meeting of the Efficacy WG in June 2014. The main changes include that more species are covered (including testing protocols for voles), claim for rats requires testing of both *R. norvegicus* and *R. rattus*, the claims for resistance have been removed, mortality tests are no longer required, and test protocols for semi-field and sewer testing have been added. Furthermore, criteria for testing of shelf life of baits have been specified. Waivers are only allowed in a few very specific cases, and animal welfare is more emphasized.

Discussion of the draft guidance

Sewer claim: field studies acceptable? Field studies would in principle be acceptable, but it was emphasised that they are very difficult to perform in a controlled way. Thus, lab studies are clearly preferable.

Is control of squirrels within the scope of PT14? Following a brief discussion it was concluded that squirrels (e.g. control in houses) should be covered under PT14. It was noted that squirrels are protected in several member states.

Shelf life: lab or field trials preferred? Field studies would in principle be acceptable, but it was emphasised that they are very difficult to perform in a reproducible manner. Thus, lab studies are clearly preferable.

Field testing: distance between bait points/number of bait points? It was agreed that as long as justifications are given distance between and numbers of bait points could

be set by the applicant and ranges would be acceptable. Tests should be well-documented and should reflect the label. Apart from that no specific guidance would be needed.

Field testing: max 28 days? Field testing should normally be conducted for 28 days, but shorter or longer periods could be acceptable as long as the time used is justified. Up to 40 days was indicated as a suitable testing time.

Alternative census: Electronic remote detection systems, more info needed. Anyone having information about electronic remote detection systems is welcome to submit this to NL. It was however concluded that electronic system are of limited value as they cannot differentiate between one 'restless' animal and several ones with a more limited movement pattern. They may be useful in addition to feeding data.

More information on resistance? Some participants expressed a wish for more information about testing of products against resistant strains and resistance information for non-prof users on the label. This information could be included if NL is provided with suitable documentation.

General provisions (norms and criteria)

It was proposed by NL that for all type of rodenticides efficacy has to be demonstrated in at least two types of tests for each target organism claimed: field trials and lab trials or, alternatively, semi field trials. After some discussion it was concluded that members were in agreement that two types of tests should be done. It was however clear that there need to be more discussions and better background information on which type of test a semi field trial could replace.

Regarding acceptable mortality in tests it was agreed that ≥90% mortality within a relevant time frame should be regarded as a standard requirement for all types of tests. It was noted that ≥90% is a sensible value for anticoagulants. In order to promote the development of new types of products (less toxic, more humane), a mortality <90% could be acceptable when used as an accompanying method, but not as a stand alone product. However, mortality <50% is too low, even as accompanying method. This information should be added to the guidance.

In a bait choice feeding test and sewer test (if claimed) % of ingested bait should normally be ≥20%, but could be lower if mortality is ≥90%. If ingestion <20%, justification should be given. Killing is most important, not the ingestion.

In a semi-field test: ≥90% mortality.

In a field test: the percentage of census diet consumed after compared to before should normally be ≥10%. When other types of quantitative monitoring are used, they should sufficiently show the decrease of the population (≥90%).

Chapter 2.1 Test animals

It was decided to remove the sentence "Field trials ….are not considered animal experiments."

Conclusions and actions

To agree on the issue of which tests that can be replaced by the semi-field trials DE promised to come back with a document explaining the pros and cons of the various tests. DE will also provide a list with defined time frames for all rodent species for which the relevant time frame is known.

Efficacy WG members can comment in writing – deadline is 6 October 2014. After revision the document will be consulted with CAs and STO for approximately 6 weeks. Publication on ECHA's webpage is foreseen for early 2015.

The Chair thanked NL and DE for their excellent work with the revision of the document.

8. Any other business

8.1 Lessons learned

The Chair opened the floor for views regarding the way the Efficacy Working Group meetings are organised.

Regarding the virtual format members thought it worked fairly well if the agenda was not too long. The present meeting (from 11.30 to 17.45 with 50 min lunch break) was found to be too long. There should also have been a couple of shorter breaks.

The virtual tool could also be better utilised by using the chat function and if needed break the meeting for some minutes to allow everybody to express their views via the chat.

Discussions on active substances were generally found to be more suited for the virtual format than work on guidance. It was also concluded that there is little point in having both discussions on substances and guidance in the same virtual meeting. Instead shorter (half-day) discussions would be better.

Members also gave some general positive feedback: meetings were in general well organised and it was an asset to be able to focus a meeting only on efficacy.

Conclusions and actions

ECHA will take the opinions expressed by the members into account when planning the future meetings. ECHA should also decide on the date and format of the next WG meeting as soon as possible.

List of Attendees (Annex 1)

Analytical methods and physico-chemical properties WG

Core members
SIX Therese (FR)
MUEHLE Ulrike (DE)
HUIZING Tjaart-Jan (NL)
HUSZAL Sylvester (PL)
WARBURTON Anthony (UK) Rapporteur
Alternate core members
WEBER Philippe (FR)
Flexible members
THANNER Gerhard (AU)
LEPAGE Anne (BE) Rapporteur
KARHI Kimmo (FI)
BROWN Finbar (IE)
CATALDI Lucilla (IT)
CEBACEK Petra (SI)
Adviser(s)
Stakeholder(s)
MIHAI Camelia (CEFIC)

ECHA Staff
KENIGSWALD (Chair)
RODRIGUEZ UNAMUNO Virginia
TAPIO Susanna
AIRAKSINEN Sanna
JANOSSY Judit
SAEZ RIBAS Mónica
Rapporteurs
VAN BERLO Boris (BE)
LARSEN Jörgen (DK)
Applicants
I-Tech
IBPC Task Force
Kimberly Clark Europe

Environment WG

Core members
LEFÈBVRE Frederic (BE)
KOIVISTO Sanna (FI)
ALEXANDRE Stéphanie (FR)
CHION Béatrice (FR)
KEHRER Anja (DE)
PETERSOHN Eleonora (DE)
OKKERMAN Peter (NL)
Flexible members
BUCHNER Iris (AT)
GONDOLF Anette (DK)
PASANEN Jaana (FI) - Adviser
AHTING Maren (DE)
SETZER Sacha (DE)
AAMODT Solveig (NO)
NIEBRZYDOWSKA Agnieszka (PL)
HUSZAL Sylwester (PL)
COSTA Lenia (PT)
HAHLBECK Edda (SE)
WALTON Christopher (UK)
O'LEARY Joanna (UK)
Advisers
HAUZENBERGER Ingrid (AT)

ECHA Staff
SCHIMMELPFENNIG Heike (Chair)
VAN DE PLASSCHE Erik (Chair for one agenda item)
GUTIERREZ Simon
SAEZ RIBAS Monica
WIK Anna
Rapporteurs
LEPAGE Anne (BE) – Flexible member
LARSEN Jörgen (DK)
GIBSON Richard (UK)
Stakeholder observers
STODDART Gilly (PETA)
HAMILTON Heather (Green Chemistry Network)
Applicants
I-Tech
SCC GmbH
Troy GmbH
Kimberly Clark Europe

Human Health WG

Core members
DE LENTDECKER Chloe (FR)
DE SAINT-JORES Jeremy (FR)
HOLTHENRICH Dagmar (DE)
RITZ Vera (DE)
NIKOLOPOULOU Dimitra (EL)
GHITULESCU Rita (RO)
BRESCIA Susy (UK) Rapporteur
Alternate core members
BOSMAN Saskia (NL)
Flexible members
LEPAGE Anne (BE) Rapporteur
BOYE PETERSEN Annika (DK) Rapporteur
HÄMÄLÄINEN Anna-Maija (FI)
HYVÄRINEN Tuija (FI)
PALOMÄKI Jaana (FI)
REY Marion (FR)
ARAPAKI Niki (EL)
CHARISTOU Agathi (EL)
VIOLA Bona (HU)
BREEN Alan (IE)
GAUSTAD Astrid (NO)
FRYDENLUND Jorid (NO)
HUSZAL Sylwester (PL)
UJMA-CZWAKIEL Monika (PL)
CEBASEK Petra (SI)
MARTINEZ Marta (ES)
GONZALEZ Lorena (ES)
LÅSTBOM Lena (SE)
Advisors
HECKER Dorothee (DE)
DIXON Steve (UK)

ECHA Staff
AIRAKSINEN Antero (Chair)
ESTEVAN MARTINEZ Carmen
JANOSSY Judit
PECORINI Chiara
RUGGERI Laura
TAPIO Susanna
Accredited Stakeholder Organisations
MIHAI Camelia (CEFIC)
COREA Namali (A.I.S.E)
Applicants
I-TECH
IBPC Task Force
KIMBERLY CLARK EUROPE

Efficacy WG

Core members
ATTIG Isabelle (FR)
GERRITSEN Lonne (NL)
GIATROPOULOS Athanasios (EL)
KECK Marianne (AT)
HAMEL Darka (HR)
LEPAGE Anne (BE)
SIKORSKI Martha (DE)
Alternate core members
GEENEN Petra (NL)
CAZUC Viorel (RO)
Flexible members
HAHLBECK Edda (SE)
SCHMOLZ Erik (DE)
HUSZAL Sylwester (PL)
MARTINEZ Marta (ES)
GONZALES Lorena (ES)
Rapporteurs
LOW Andrew (UK)
LEPAGE Anne (BE)
GIATROPOULOS Athanasios (EL)

ECHA Staff
THUVANDER Ann (Chair)
SZYMANKIEWICZ Katarzyna
RUGGERI Laura
SAEZ RIBAS Monica
ESTEVAN MARTINEZ Carmen
WIK Anna
SCHAKIR Yasmin
Applicants
I TECH AB
IPBC Task Force
Kimberly Clark Europe
Endura SpA
Accredited Stakeholder Organisations
MIHAI Camelia (CEFIC)
BUCKLE Alan (CEFIC expert for AP 7.2)
Apologies
RADU Iuliana (RO)