27 June 2018

BPC-M-25-2018

Minutes of the 25th meeting of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC)

25-26 April 2018

Part I - Summary Record of the Proceedings

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chairman of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC) welcomed the participants to the 25th BPC meeting.

Regarding the BPC membership, the Chairman stated that there will be a new BPC member for Malta with the current BPC member Wayne Giordmaina becoming the alternate member. This is the last meeting for the Danish BPC member Jorgen Larsen, so a new Danish member will be present at future meetings.

The Chairman then informed the BPC members of the participation of 28 members, including 5 alternates.

6 advisers and 1 representative from accredited stakeholder organisations (ASOs) were present at the meeting. One representative from the European Commission also attended the meeting.

Applicants were present for their specific substances where details are provided in the summary record of the discussion for the substances and in Part III of the minutes.

2. Agreement of the agenda

The Chairman introduced the final draft agenda (BPC-A-25-2018_rev2) and invited any additional items. No items were added.

The agenda was then adopted. The final version of the agenda will be uploaded to the BPC CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.

The Chairman stated the closed agenda items: Item 7.3.

The Chairman informed the meeting participants that the meeting would be recorded for the purpose of the minutes and that the recording would be destroyed after the agreement of the minutes.

The list of meeting documents and the final version of the agenda are included in Part IV of the minutes.

3. Declarations of potential conflicts of interest to the agenda

The Chairman invited BPC members, alternates and advisers to declare any potential conflict of interest in relation to the agreed agenda. None was declared.

4. Agreement of the draft minutes and review of actions arising from BPC-24

The revised draft minutes from BPC-24 (BPC-M-24-2018), incorporating the comments received from members, were agreed.

The Chairman noted that the actions from BPC-24 have been carried out.

The Chairman informed the meeting on:

- Agenda item 6.3 of BPC-24: The discussion on the request from the Commission for a BPC opinion related to Article 38 of BPR will take place on 25 April at the EFF WG meeting. The first draft of the BPC opinion will be prepared by 18 May and the BPC members will be asked to send written comments by 1 June. The opinion will be revised as appropriate for discussion at BPC-26.
- Agenda item 6.3 of BPC-24: The request from the Commission for a BPC opinion related to Article 75(1)(g) of BPR: The first draft of the BPC opinion will be prepared by 4 May and the written commenting round for BPC members will run until 27 May. The opinion will be revised as appropriate for discussion at BPC-26.
- Agenda item 7.1 of BPC-24: The revised working procedure for active substance approval will be finalised and published on the BPC website. With respect to the tasks of the eCA in relation to indicating in the CAR if one of the conditions of Article 5(2) is met (for active substances meeting the exclusion criteria and for which the CAR is submitted after 1 September 2013).), the Chairman informed the meeting that ECHA proposes that this task can either be carried out before the submission of the CAR for peer review or after the information received during the public consultation is available. This proposal was agreed by the meeting and the working procedure will be revised accordingly.
- Agenda item 8.3 of BPC-24: The revised TAB entry for iodate was finalised. The CG meeting was informed in writing of the revised TAB entry.

The Chairman informed the meeting about the discussion at the last CA meeting on the ED criteria.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to upload the agreed minutes from BPC-24 to the BPC CIRCABC IG and to the ECHA website after the meeting.
- **Members:** to send written comments on the Article 38 BPC opinion by **1 June 2018**.
- **Members:** to send written comments on the Article 75(1)(g) BPC opinion by **27 May 2018**.
- **SECR**: to upload the presentation on the "Implementation of the criteria for endocrine-disrupting properties" to BPC CIRCABC IG.

5. Administrative issues

5.1 Housekeeping issues

The SECR highlighted the key aspects of the housekeeping rules including the safety and security rules.

5.2 Administrative updates and report from other ECHA bodies

The Chairman introduced document BPC-25-2018-01 prepared by ECHA for the Management Board meeting which contains the progress reports for each Committee

including the PBT and ED Expert Groups. The Chairman mentioned that improved coordination with respect to CLP, PBT and EDs as requested by the Commisison at the last meeting is under internal discussion within ECHA.

6. Work Programme for BPC

6.1 BPC Work Programme 2018-2019

6.2 Outlook for the BPC

The Chairman informed members that the Work Programme was revised after the last BPC meeting and uploaded to BPC CIRCABC IG. A public version was also published on the ECHA website.

The document distributed for this meeting is a revised version following consultations with MSCAs based on information received following the dissemination of the previous version. Members were invited to contact the SECR on possible changes by 7 May 2018 after which an updated version will be published on the ECHA website. Some changes already received are not yet incorporated in this version.

The Chairman stated that:

- For active substance approval the number of adopted opinions based on the published work programme for the Review Programme in 2018 is estimated to 49. In addition, 1 BPR new actives and 1 BPD new active is scheduled.
- For Union authorisation the number of scheduled opinions is estimated to 17. The Chairman stated that these numbers are per application, which can cover a biocidal product (family) applied for use in more than one product type.

The Chairman furthermore stated that:

- Due to the fact that no draft CARs were submitted for process flow 22 (submission deadline 2 October 2017) the March Working Group meeting was cancelled. Also the May Working Group meeting for may also be cancelled as no draft CARs were submitted for process flow 23 (submission deadline 22 January 2018). The relevant BPC meetings will not be cancelled as there are either backlog dossiers for active substance approval or Union authorisation applications to be discussed.
- The Chairman asked the eCAs with active substances scheduled for discussion at the June BPC meeting in to confirm to the SECR that they remain on track for theis meeting by May 15.
- The Chairman informed the meeting on actions scheduled by ECHA to speed-up the Review Programme.

Following a question from one of the members related to the evaluation of icaridin for PT 19 (see BPC-20 of 27 April 2017, agenda item 7.3), COM informed the BPC meeting that, as the CAR was submitted by the evaluating CA, DK, before 1 September 2013, the human data (as presented in the study of Ecker, W. (1997)) can be used in the evaluation to lower the safety margins resulting from tests or studies on animals. However, it was noted that, for CARs submitted after 1 September 2013 the principle of Annex IV para

1.1.3 fully applies. COM is further reflecting if this principle in Annex IV to the BPR would need to be modified. This issue may be discussed at a future CA meeting.

COM also reiterated comments from previous BPC meetings concering the need to make progress on the review programme. A number of actions were agreed at the last CA meeting and need to be implemented by all actors, and in particular Member States who must fuflfill their commitments.

Actions:

- **Members**: to send information on any further changes to the Work Programme (WP) to the SECR by **7 May 2018**.
- **SECR**: on the basis of the changes to update the work programme on the ECHA website and in the BPC CIRCABC IG.

7. Applications for approval of active substances

7.1 Draft BPC opinion on active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and for active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

The Chairman welcomed the applicant for this item. The ASOs were allowed to be present. The rapporteur introduced the substances and explained that they are backlog dossiers since the first CAR was submitted before 1 September 2013. The discussion at the Technical Meeting at that time could not be finalised since guidance on disinfection by-products was not available.

During the peer review it was concluded that the submitted dossier covers two active substances; ‘active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis’ and ‘active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid’. Therefore, the dossier was split in the two active substances for each product type. The assessment reports (AR) and the opinions were then discussed in detail (modifications are described in the open issues table).

With respect to classification and labelling it was agreed to harmonise the active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis with the already approved active chlorine evaluations. For active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid a classification and labelling proposal would need to be available for hypochlorous acid. SECR will reflect on how this is to be taken forward. With respect to disinfection by-products it was concluded to refer to the already approved active chlorine evaluations for chlorate. In addition, it was concluded that disinfection by-products would need to be addressed at product authorisation. One member raised concerns regarding bromide which could be an impurity in batches of sodium chloride used for the active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis. It was noted that bromide was not assessed in the risk assessment but could be relevant for the environmental and human health risk assessment. It was agreed that the reference specification for sodium chloride is the Pharmacopoeia specification, which , has a maximum content of bromine/bromide of 100 ppm. As such sodium chloride can be supplied by open sources but at product authorisation information needs to be provided that the source used complies with the Pharmacopeia specification.

It was also mentioned by one member that the revised reference specification following the Working Group discussions on active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid could not be peer reviewed by this Member State.

The opinions for active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis and for active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted by consensus.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur:** to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the BPC Secretariat by **8 June 2018.**
- **SECR:** to revise the draft opinion in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and carry out an editorial check in consultation with the rapporteur.
- **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **18 May 2018** and publish it on the ECHA website.

7.2 Draft BPC opinion on carbendazim for PT 7 and 10

The Chairman welcomed the applicant and the rapporteur introduced the substance. The ASOs were allowed to be present. The rapporteur clarified that the substance was not assessed against the new ED criteria and clarified to the BPC members why the PT 9 opinions was not submitted together with PT7 and 10. The rapporteur explained that they did not submit the draft Assessment Report and the draft opinion for PT 9 since no safe use could be found for the environment when applying current guidance. COM was concerned about delays on the review of this substance as the CARs were submitted by the eCA before 1 September 2013. In particular for product type 9 and considering that this is an active substance subject to exclusion, the eCA should not have taken the decision to postpone further the review which should not be further delayed on such a substance.

The Assessment Report for PT 7 and 10 were agreed with some amendements.

With regard to the opinion it was agreed to add a footnote to the summary table on human health to reflect the restriction in Annex XVII of the Reach Regulation. Consequently, end-products which are mixtures and contain 0.1% or more carbendazim cannot be supplied to the general public.

A member proposed to include a provision on the use of articles treated with carbendazim containing biocidal products. The member considered that carbendazim treated articles shall be restricted to indoor use as the use of paints and plasters outdoor leads to unacceptable risks (which cannot be mitigated) for the environment. The rapporteur mentioned that they have followed the same principles and agreements that were made for a similar substance at Standing Committee level where it was agreed not to use specific restriction on treated articles to avoid unfair treatment between EU and non-EU countries. The member noted important differences to previous cases where no risks were identified during the service life of the treated article. In this case risk to environment when used outdoor is unacceptable with no possible RMM and in adition the substance is persistent. Therefore the member considered that the same argument cannot be used in this case. The rapporteur stated that not all treated articles will pose an unacceptable risk as it will depend on the concentration of active substance present.

COM referred to the discussions held on treated articles back in 2015 in the CA meetings and Standing Committee meetings, and recommended to follow the same approach as has been taken for the cases discussed at that time where it was decided to not include a restriction for treated articles. COM noted that the approach shall be reviewed at renewal stage for the concerned active substances when more experience has been gained and information on biocidal products and treated articles on the market is available. The Chairman noted that indeed no restriction was included for similar cases and argued for consistency as there is no change in guidance compared to the one agreed at Standing Committee and CA meeting levels. One BPC member highlighted that in those previous cases the exclusion criteria were not met. The BPC agreed not to change the opinion but to reflect the discussion held in the minutes.

A member noted that in previous opinions and assessment reports, reference has been made to primary exposure to the biocidal product and also primary exposure to the treated article by professionals and there is a need for consistency. SECR agreed to check the terms and come up with a specific terminology with regards to primary and secondary exposure related to biocidal products and treated articles. It was agreed that the text will remain as it is for the moment.

COM reminded that the BPC input on the identification of suitable alternatives to exclusion substances must be improved in its opinions.

The opnions were adopted by majority. SE noted that they didn't agree with the opinions for PT7 and PT10 and will submit a minority opinion.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur:** to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the BPC Secretariat by **8 June 2018.**
- **SECR:** to revise the draft opinion in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and carry out an editorial check in consultation with the rapporteur.
- **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **18 May 2018** and publish it on the ECHA website.

7.3 Draft BPC opinion on *Willaertia magna* C2c Maky for PT 11

The Chairman welcomed the applicant for this item. The rapporteur introduced the substance and the general issues related to the active substance. The rapporteur explained that due this being a new active substance of a particular nature, more time than usual had been given to the peer review phase. The substance was discussed in two Ad hoc Working Group for Micro-organisms (WG MO) meetings, in September 2017 and January 2018. In the first meeting the WG MO agreed to require new data from the applicant, and altogether ten new studies were subsequently evaluated between the two WG meetings and considered in the peer review. The ASOs were not allowed to be present.

The AR was agreed and the BPC opinion on the non-approval was adopted by the BPC by consensus, subject to changes agreed during the meeting.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur:** to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the BPC Secretariat by **8 June 2018.**
- **SECR:** to revise the draft opinion in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and carry out an editorial check in consultation with the rapporteur.
- **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **18 May 2018** and publish it on the ECHA website.

7.4 Assessment of endocrine disrupting properties in active substance approval

SECR presented the document, indicating the main changes with respect to the previous version discussed at BPC-24:

- ED conclusion would not be required if the eCA is proposing non-approval; in this case the peer review would be launched to confirm the eCA proposal.
- The documents to be provided to the ED EG by the eCA are: questions to the ED EG, a presentation covering the main questions and the draft CAR with as much information relevant for the ED assessment as possible.
- The conclusion required from the assessment is whether the substance should be "considered to have ED properties or not to have ED properties".
- Chapter 3 was included on communication.

The members largely supported the document. Several minor clarifications were however requested.

The wording on the nature of the ED EG was questioned, asking whether "informal, non-binding scientific advice" could be changed to a less inconclusive wording. SECR clarified that this wording is takenfrom the mandate of the ED EG. The intention of the ED EG is to provide scientific advice without making binding conclusions, as this would be in the remit ot the BPC. The role of the ED EG was considered very important in harmonising the ED assessments and the information required for the assessment.

SECR and COM urged the MSCAs to ensure that where necessary, the ED EG consultation is performed during the eCA evaluation to avoid the need to put CARs on hold during the peer review. COM further stressed the importance of ECHA Secretariat coordination on this activity, and further proposed that the WGs review the cases and decides whether the EDEG should be consulted (not the eCA alone). This would ensure some control and continuous improvement of the expertise of the WGs, and would limit some possible workload for the EDEG.

A clarification was asked with respect to the need to finalise the ED assessment for a substance and the legal requirement to submit the CARs according to the Review Regulation (EU) 1062/2014. COM informed that the need to finalise the ED assessment could be considered as valid reason for not submitting the CARs within the timelines of the Review Regulation, especially when the eCA has launched an ED EG consultation or requested further information from the applicant in order to conclude on the ED properties. However, it is important that Member States take action well in advance to clarify the ED status and inform ECHA secretariat of the precise state of play of their dossiers and their

ED evaluation. SECR urged the members not to submit CARs without a finalised ED assessment.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to revise the document and publish it on BPC CIRCABC IG

8. Union authorisation

8.1 Update on Union authorisation

An update on Union authorisation was given by the SECR to present: an overview of the current status of the applications in the ECHA's pipeline; an outline of the ongoing activities; and the planning for the discussions at the upcoming Working Group and BPC meetings.

It was mentioned that the first Union authorisation applications will be discussed during the 58th Standing Committee on Biocidal Products in May 2018 and they are expected to be granted in June 2018.

Actions:

- **SECR**: to upload the presentation to S-CIRCABC.

8.2 Proposal on the "fast-track procedure" on Union authorisation

SECR introduced the proposal for the "fast-track procedure" on Union authorisation. The procedure aims at minimising the involvement of the Working Group members to reduce their workload for those applications where the peer review of similar applications has already taken place. The Commission commented that this procedure should also rely on trust of the work performed by the eCA like for the mutual recognition procedures and therefore, in their opinion, this procedure should actually be considered as the standard procedure for Union authorisation. This view was not supported by several BPC members and the SECR.

SECR asked BPC members to provide their preliminary comments on the procedure.

General support was given by the BPC members to the proposal and the key points raised are summarised below:

<u>General note:</u>

- several members commented that the decision on the applicability of the "fast-track procedure" should take place after the first round of commenting, to allow the identification by the commenting Member States of potential issues in the Union authorisation applications;
- the same members highlighted that the decision on the applicability of the "fast-track procedure" should involve not only SECR and the eCA, but also the BPC and Working Group members. Member States' experts can identify potential issues of technical nature in the Union authorisation applications, especially when they have been already raised in the context of Mutual Recognition;

- therefore, general support was given to the fact that the Working Group members should be involved together with the BPC members in the initial commenting round after the accordance check performed by SECR.

Section 1 of the document: Introduction

- co-formulants with additional or different function and co-formulants impacting on efficacy should be added to the critical aspects that could affect the applicability of the "fast track procedure";
- "same use pattern(s)" should be described in more detail, to clarify that products with different application methods leading to different exposure scenarios and different user categories could not be considered to have same use pattern(s).

Section 3 of the document: Annex I

- the timeframes indicated in the workflow should be clarified and calculations of the overall timeline should be included in the document;
- it would be appropriate to clarify whether the commenting in writing by the Working Group members is intended to be handled by majority position, including only core members or flexible members as well, and whether tacit agreement is considered;
- it should be clarified whether the commenting in writing by the Working Group members is followed by a step for confirmation of their agreement.

SECR will take into consideration the input received during the meeting and will prepare a more detailed working procedure for the next BPC meeting.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to open a Newsgroup on the BPC CIRCABC IG.
- **Member:** to provide comments by **18 May 2018**.
- **SECR:** to prepare a more detailed working procedure for the next BPC.

9. Any Other Business

None.

10. Agreement of the action points and conclusions

Part II contains the main conclusions and action points which were agreed at the meeting.

Part II - Main conclusions and action points

Agreed at the 25th meeting of BPC

25-26 April 2018

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority positions	**Action requested after the meeting (by whom / by when)**
Item 2 - Agreement of the agenda	
The final draft agenda was agreed without changes.	**SECR:** to upload the agreed final agenda to the BPC CIRCABC IG as part of the draft meeting minutes after the meeting.
Item 4 - Agreement of the minutes and review of actions from BPC-24	
The revised version of the minutes of BPC-24 was agreed as proposed subject to several editorial modifications.	**SECR:** to upload the agreed minutes to the BPC CIRCABC IG and to the ECHA website.
SECR informed the meeting that the Article 38 request for a BPC opinion was discussed at the EFF WG meeting on 25 April. The first draft of the BPC opinion will be prepared by the SECR by 18 May for a commenting round with the BPC after which it will be revised for BPC-26.	**SECR:** to open a Newsgroup for commenting on the draft opinion on **18 May 2018** **Members:** to send written comments on the Article 38 BPC opinion by **1 June 2018**.
SECR informed the meeting that the first draft of the BPC opinion on request of COM for an Article 75(1)(g) will be prepared by the SECR by 4 May for a commenting round with the BPC after which it will be revised for BPC-26.	**SECR:** to open a Newsgroup for commenting on the draft opinion on **4 May 2018** **Members:** to send written comments on the Article 75(1)(g) BPC opinion by **27 May 2018**.
SECR informed the meeting that the revised TAB entry for iodate was finalised. The CG meeting was informed in writing of the revised TAB entry.	
SECR informed the meeting about the implementation of the criteria for endocrine-disrupting properties (Regulation (EU) 2017/2100) in the active substance approval process following the last CA meeting.	**SECR:** to make the presentation on the implementation of the criteria for endocrine-disrupting properties available via BPC CIRCABC IG.

Item 6 - Work programme for BPC	
6.1 Revised Work Programme 2018-2019 **6.2 Outlook for BPC**	
	Members: to send information on any further changes to the Work Programme (WP) to the SECR by **7 May 2018.** **SECR:** on the basis of the changes to update the WP on the ECHA website and in the BPC CIRCABC IG.
Item 7 - Applications for approval of active substances	
7.1 Draft BPC opinion on active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and for active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5	
The BPC adopted by consensus the opinions for the approval of the active substance/PT combination.	**Rapporteur:** to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **8 June 2018.** **SECR:** to revise the draft opinions in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and carry out an editorial check in consultation with the rapporteur. **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinions to COM by **18 May 2018** and publish it on the ECHA website.
7.2 Draft BPC opinion on carbendazim for PT 7 and 10	
The BPC adopted by majority the opinion for the approval of the active substance/PT combination.	**Rapporteur:** to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **8 June 2018.** **SECR:** to revise the draft opinions in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and carry out an editorial check in consultation with the rapporteur. **Member:** to submit the minority position by **2 May 2018**. **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinions to COM by **18 May 2018** and publish it on the ECHA website.
7.3 Draft BPC opinion on *Willaertia magna c2c Maky* for PT 11	
The BPC adopted by consensus the opinion for the non-approval of the active substance/PT combination.	**Rapporteur:** to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **8 June 2018**. **SECR:** to revise the draft opinion in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and carry out an editorial check in consultation with the rapporteur. **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **18 May 2018** and publish it on the ECHA website.

7.4 Assessment of endocrine disrupting properties in active substance approval	
The BPC agreed on the document.	**SECR:** to revise the document and publish it on BPC CIRCABC IG.
Item 8 – Union authorisation	
8.1 Update on Union authorisation	
The meeting was informed about the developments on Union authorisation.	**SECR:** to upload the presentation on BPC CIRCABC IG.
8.2 Proposal on the "fast-track procedure" on Union authorisation	
The BPC agreed on the proposal.	**SECR:** to open a Newsgroup on the BPC CIRCABC IG. **Members**: to provide comments by **18 May 2018.** **SECR:** to prepare a more detailed working procedure for the next BPC.
Item 9 – Any other business	
-	

oOo

Part III - List of Attendees

Members	European Commission
BORGES Teresa (PT)	CHATELIN Ludovic (DG SANTE)
BROVKINA Julija (LV)	
CEBASEK Petra (SI)	**Advisers**
CHEZAU Aurelie (FR)	BANASOVA Maria (SK)
COSTIGAN Michael (UK)	GREGERSEN Nina Falk (DK)
DRAGOIU Simona (RO)	KINZL Maximilian (SK)
GAVRIEL Alexandros (CY)	MOLNAROVA Jana (SK)
GIORDMAINA Wayne (MT)	VAN DER GEEST Bert (SK)
GONZALEZ MARQUEZ Maria Luisa (ES)	WEINHEIMER Viola (DE)
HAHLBECK Edda (SE)	
JAGER Stefanie (DE)	**Accredited Stakeholder Observers**
KOIVISTO Sanna (FI)	MIHAI Camelia (CEFIC)
LANS Martine (NL)	
LARSEN Jørgen (DK)	**ECHA Staff**
MERISTE Anu (EE)	AIRAKSINEN Antero
MIKOLASKOVA Denisa (SK)	ESTEVAN MARTINEZ Carmen
RANDALL Marit (NO)	GUTIERREZ ALONSO Simon
RUSCONI Manuel (CH)	KREBS Bernhard
VACEK Tomas (CZ)	KURONEN Terhi
VAGIAS Vasileios (EL)	MULLER Gesine
VAN BERLO Boris (BE)	PECORINI Chiara
VRHOVAC FILIPOVIC Ivana (HR)	PRIHA Outi
ZIGRAND Jeff (LU)	VAN DE PLASSCHE Erik
Alternate members	
CARBERRY Stephen (IE)	
CRESTI Raffaella (IT)	
HUSZAL Sylwester (PL)	
PUERGY Reinhild (AT)	
SZENTGYORGYI Timea (HU)	

Applicants	Apologies
MEAKIN Nick (Aqualution Systems Ltd) for active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and for active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5	
BENTALA Hafida (Troy Chemical Company BV) for Carbendazim for PT 7 and 10	
PLASSON Fabrice (Amoeba) for Willaertia Magna C2c Maky for PT 11	
Experts accompanying applicants	
WORTHINGTON Mark, accompanying MEAKIN Nick, for active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and for active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5	
GALLER Martina, accompanying BENTALA Hafida, for Carbendazim for PT 7 and 10	
VAN MALDEGEM Koen, accompanying PLASSON Fabrice, for Willaertia Magna C2c Maky for PT 11	

Part IV - List of Annexes

Annex I List of documents submitted to the members of the Biocidal Products Committee

Annex II Final agenda of BPC-25

Annex I

Documents submitted to the members of the Biocidal Products Committee for the BPC-25 meeting

Meeting documents			
Agenda Point	**Number**	**Title**	
2	BPC-A-25-2017_rev2	Draft agenda	
4	BPC-M-24-2018	Draft minutes from BPC-24	
5.2	BPC-25-2018-01	Administrative issues and report from the other Committees	
6.1	BPC-25-2018-02	BPC updated Work Programme 2017-2018	
6.2	BPC-25-2018-03	Outlook for the BPC	
7.4	BPC-25-2018-17	Assessment of endocrine disrupting properties in active substance approval	
8.2	BPC-25-2018-18	Proposal on the “fast-track procedure” on Union authorisation	
Substance documents			
Agenda Point	**Number**	**Substance-PT**	**Title**
7.1	BPC-25-2018-04A	Active chlorine sodium PT 1	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-04B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-04C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-05A	Active chlorine sodium PT 2	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-05B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-04C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-06A	Active chlorine sodium PT 3	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-06B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-04C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-07A	Active chlorine sodium PT 4	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-07B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-04C		Open issues

	BPC-25-2018-08A	Active chlorine sodium PT 5	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-08B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-04C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-09A	Active chlorine hypochlorous acid PT 1	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-09B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-09C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-10A	Active chlorine hypochlorous acid PT 2	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-10B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-09C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-11A	Active chlorine hypochlorous acid PT 3	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-11B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-09C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-12A	Active chlorine hypochlorous acid PT 4	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-12B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-09C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-13A	Active chlorine hypochlorous acid PT 5	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-13B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-09C		Open issues
7.2	BPC-25-2018-14A	Carbendazim PT 7	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-14B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-14C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-15A	Carbendazim PT 10	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-14B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-15C		Open issues
7.3	BPC-25-2018-16A	Willaertia Magna C2c Maky PT 11	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-25-2018-16B		Assessment report
	BPC-25-2018-16C		Open issues
	BPC-25-2018-16D		Replies from MS on legionella
	BPC-25-2018-16E		European technical guidance - legionella

20 April 2018
BPC-A-25-2018_rev2

Draft agenda

25th meeting of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC)

25-26 April 2018

ECHA Conference Centre, Annankatu 18, Helsinki

Starts on 25 April at 09:30, ends on 26 April at 16:00

1. – Welcome and apologies

2. – Agreement of the agenda

BPC-A-25-2018

For agreement

3. – Declarations of potential conflicts of interest to agenda items

4. – Agreement of the minutes and review of actions from BPC-24

BPC-M-24-2017

For agreement

5. – Administrative issues

5.1. Housekeeping issues

For information

5.2. Other administrative issues and report from other Committees

BPC-25-2018-01

For information

6. – Work programme for BPC

6.1. Revised BPC Work Programme 2018-2019

BPC-25-2018-02

For information

6.2. Outlook for BPC

BPC-25-2018-03

For information

7. – Applications for approval of active substances*

7.1. Draft BPC opinion on active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and for active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

Previous discussion(s): WG-IV-2017, WG-I-2018 (APCP only)

Active chlorine generated from sodium chloride by electrolysis:

PT1: BPC-25-2018-04A, B, C

PT2: BPC-25-2018-05A, B, C

PT3: BPC-25-2018-06A, B, C

PT4: BPC-25-2018-07A, B, C

PT5: BPC-25-2018-08A, B, C

Active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid:

PT1: BPC-25-2018-09A, B, C

PT2: BPC-25-2018-10A, B, C

PT3: BPC-25-2018-11A, B, C

PT4: BPC-25-2018-12A, B, C

PT5: BPC-25-2018-13A, B, C

For adoption

7.2. Draft BPC opinion on carbendazim for PT 7 and 10

Previous discussion(s): WG-II-2015

PT7: BPC-25-2018-14A, B, C

PT10: BPC-25-2018-15A, B, C

For adoption

7.3. Draft BPC opinion on *Willaertia Magna C2c Maky* for PT 11

Previous discussion(s): WGMO-2, WGMO-3

---

* For the discussions of the draft BPC opinions at least the following documents will be distributed: a draft BPC opinion (denoted by A), a draft assessment report (AR) which may cover more than one PT (denoted by B) and a document containing open issues covering all the PTs to be discussed for that substance (denoted by C).

BPC-25-2018-16A, B, C

For adoption

7.4. Assessment of endocrine disrupting properties in active substance approval

Previous discussion(s): BPC-24

BPC-25-2018-17

For agreement

Item 8 – Union authorisation

8.1 Update on Union authorisation

8.2 Proposal on the "fast-track procedure" on Union authorisation

BPC-25-2018-18

For agreement

Item 9 – Any other business

Item 10 – Action points and conclusions

For agreement

Provisional time schedule for the

25th meeting of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC)

ECHA Conference Centre, Annankatu 18, Helsinki

25 April 2018: starts at 09:30; 26 March ends at 16:00

Please note that the time schedule indicated below are provisional and subject to possible change. The schedule is distributed to participants on a preliminary basis. If needed, follow-up discussions may take place on the following day for BPC opinions.

Wednesday 25 April: morning session

Items 1-5	Opening items and administrative issues
Item 6	Work programme of the BPC 2018-19
Item 7.1	Draft BPC opinion on active chlorine generated from sodium chlorite by electrolysis for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and for active chlorine released from hypochlorous acid for PT 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

Wednesday 25 April: afternoon session

Item 7.1	(cont'd)
Item 7.2	Draft BPC opinion on carbendazim for PT 7 and 10

Thursday 26 April: morning session

Item 7.3	Draft BPC opinion on Willaertia Magna C2c Maky for PT 11

Thursday 26 April: afternoon session

Item 8.1	Update on Union authorisation
Item 8.2	Proposal on the "fast-track procedure" on Union authorisation
Item 7.4	Assessment of endocrine disrupting properties in active substance approval
Item 9	AOB
Item 10	Action points and conclusions

End of meeting

o0o