Section A6.12 Human Case Report

Annex Point IIA6.12(3) 6.12.1 Medical surveillance data on manufacturing plant personnel (3)

Official use only

1 REFERENCE

1.1	**Reference**	Kehrig, B. & W. Steffens (2003): Occupational Medical Experiences with Dichlofluanid in the FU-Plant, Dormagen. Bayer AG, 19-DEC-2003, unpublished.
1.2	**Data protection**	Yes
1.2.1	Data owner	Bayer CropScience AG
1.2.2	Companies with letter of access	Bayer Chemicals AG
1.2.3	Criteria for data protection	Data submitted to the MS after 13 May 2000 on existing a.s. for the purpose of its entry into Annex I/IA.

2 GUIDELINES AND QUALITY ASSURANCE (NOT APPLICABLE)

3 MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1	**Substance**	Dichlofluanid ("Euparen") Production period: since [redacted] Annual production volume at the FU plant: [redacted]
3.2	**Persons exposed**	
3.2.1	Sex	–
3.2.2	Age/weight	–
3.2.3	Known Diseases	–
3.2.4	Number of persons	18
3.2.5	Other information	–
3.3	**Exposure**	–
3.3.1	Reason of exposure	Occupational
3.3.2	Frequency of exposure	–
3.3.3	Overall time period of exposure	–
3.3.4	Duration of single exposure	–
3.3.5	Exposure concentration/dose	–
3.3.6	Other information	–
3.4	**Examinations**	Full physical examination with orientating neurological status (reflexes, sensibility, coordination) and skin status Laboratory examinations: blood sedimentation rate, blood count, AST, ALT, γ-GT, creatinine, cholesterol, glucose, urine status Technical examinations: audiogrann, ergometry, visual acuity testing, spirography, chest X- ray, sonography (if necessary)

Section A6.12 **Human Case Report**

Annex Point IIA6.12(3) 6.12.1 Medical surveillance data on manufacturing plant personnel (3)

3.5	**Treatment**	–
3.6	**Remarks**	–
		4 RESULTS
4.1	**Clinical Signs**	No adverse somatic effects were determined.
4.2	**Results of examinations**	–
4.3	**Effectivity of medical treatment**	–
4.4	**Outcome**	–
4.5	**Other**	–
		5 APPLICANT'S SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION
5.1	**Materials and methods**	Occupational medical surveillance of workers exposed to dichlofluanid was performed annually on a routine basis, not directly related to exposures, since [redacted].
5.2	**Results and discussion**	Except for two cases of allergic skin disease without further symptoms, no adverse effects could be determined. The two workers changed their scope of duties so that there were no relevant medical sequelae.
5.3	**Conclusion**	No adverse somatic effects were reported.

Evaluation by Competent Authorities	
	Use separate "evaluation boxes" to provide transparency as to the comments and views submitted
	EVALUATION BY RAPPORTEUR MEMBER STATE
Date	9/02/05
Materials and Methods	
Results and discussion	
Conclusion	
Remarks	The UK CA agrees with the applicant's assessment.
	COMMENTS FROM ... *(specify)*
Date	*Give date of comments submitted*
Materials and Methods	*Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state*
Results and discussion	*Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state*
Conclusion	*Discuss if deviating from view of rapporteur member state*
Remarks	