18 April 2023

BPC-M-45-2022_FINAL

Final non-confidential minutes of the 45th meeting of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC)

22-24 November 2022

Part I - Summary Record of the Proceedings

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC) welcomed the participants to the 45th BPC meeting which took place as a hybrid meeting – both in ECHA premises in Helsinki and via Webex.

The Chair then informed the BPC members of the participation of 26 members, including five alternate members. Apologies were received from 2 members.

21 Advisers and 11 representatives from an accredited stakeholder organisation (ASO) were present at the meeting. Six representatives from the European Commission attended the meeting.

Applicants were invited and present for their specific active substances under agenda item 7, biocidal products under agenda item 8, Article 38 item under agenda point 9 and Article 75 (1)g item under agenda point 10, 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 Chair introduced the draft agenda (BPC-A-45-2022_rev1) and invited any additional items. No additional items were presented and the agenda was adopted. The final version of the agenda will be uploaded to the BPC Interact/Website as part of the meeting minutes.

The Chair informed the meeting participants that the meeting is recorded for the purpose of the minutes and that the recording would be deleted 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 Chair 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-44

The revised draft minutes from BPC-44 (BPC-M-44-2022), incorporating the comments received, were agreed.

The Chair mentioned that all actions from the previous BPC-44 meeting were carried out.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to upload the agreed minutes from BPC-44 to the BPC Interact and to the ECHA website after the meeting.

5. Administrative issues

5.1 Administrative issues

The Chair informed the meeting that the next meeting will be virtual and the meeting in June 2023 face-to-face. The Chair informed the meeting that he will leave ECHA and that the June meeting next year will be his last one.

5.2 Results of survey on using Interact for commenting

Presentation of the survey results was given by the SECR. In 2023 two widely requested changes will be implemented for the Interact Collaborations and Meetings: a notification system and bulk download of documents. Further development of the Interact Portal will be discussed in the Interact user group, member states are encouraged to participate in the group.

Actions:

- **SECR**: to upload the presentation to Interact.

6. Work Programme for BPC

6.1 BPC Work Programmes for active substance approval, Union authorisation, ED assessment and outlook for BPC

The Chair informed members that the Work Programme for active substance approval was revised after the last BPC meeting. Members were invited to contact the SECR on possible changes on the revised programme after which an updated version will be published on the ECHA website.

The Chair stated that for 2022 the planned opinions are listed in the “Outlook” document.

The total number of expected adopted opinions for 2022 will be 57. For UA there is a substantial increase compared to 2021: from 15 to 22. For AS there is a slight decrease in the number of adopted opinions compared to 2021: from 18 to 17 (total) and 14 to 12 (Review Programme).

The Chair informed that several Article 75(1)(g) requests from the Commission have arrived: i) regarding the environmental risk assessment for ADBAC/BKC for PT 2; ii) update of the analysis of alternatives for HPT and MBP; iii) iodine risk assessment and analysis of alternatives. ECHA is consulting with COM on the draft mandates. More information will be provided by ECHA at the next meeting. In addition, one Article 38 request from the Commission has arrived with a foreseen adoption of the opinion at BPC-46.

The Chair asked the evaluating Competent Authorities being rapporteur for active substances or Union authorisations scheduled for discussion at the the first BPC meeting of 2023 (BPC-46) to confirm their planning to the SECR as soon as possible.

The Commission noted an increase of delivery of opinions of the BPC especially on Union authorisation, but similarly to previous meetings, expressed also concerns on the general progress which is still insufficient to conclude the Review Programme by 2024. It reminded that Member States must implement the actions agreed at the CA meeting and in the ECHA Action Plan, in particular to deliver the draft assessment reports and to not postpone discussions on their substances from BPC meeting to meeting. Progress must especially

be made on backlog reports submitted before 1 September 2013 for which decisions must still be based under BPD principles, which is becoming more and more problematic. It noted that there are still 2 years ahead before the deadline of end of 2024 and progress can be made in the meantime. Discussions will start next year in the CA meeting on the review of the 2024 target, but the Commission noted at the same time that the review programme started in 2004 cannot be extended forever and will need to come an end.

Actions:

- **Members**: to send information on any further changes to the Work Programme (WP) for active substance approval to the SECR by **8 December 2022**.

6.2 Update on active substance approval and Union authorisation

An update on Union authorisation (UA) and Active substance approval (AS) was given by the SECR:

i) Workload on AS and UA

SECR presented the current workload of AS and UA dossiers in peer review and the overview of work performed during 2022.

ii) Update from AS and UA processes

The SECR reminded the members to update the planning document provided via the Interact Collaboration tool if there are changes in their planning of submissions. In addition, the SECR informed about the publication of new timelines for the process flows in 2023.

The SECR asked the BPC members to pay particular attention to the quality and complexity of dossiers submitted for PF 48 considering the short timelines between the WG and BPC meetings.

As in relation to the UA process:

- MSs were invited to check carefully the SPC in English before voting in order to ensure a smooth process of the linguistic review of the SPC translations.
- Industry was invited to check the SPC in English provided by COM carefully when preparing the updated translations of the SPC.

The BPC members agreed to apply the approach agreed during the CG-53 in relation to the long-term storage stability studies (CG-53-2022-07 AP 14.1 Shelf-life setting during PA_vf) also for UA applications.

The BPC members agreed on the change in the procedure of the linguistic review of the SPC translations, i.e., to extend the deadline for the applicant to update the translations and the SPC in English after the COM is providing the SPC voted upon in the Standing Committee.

Actions:

- **SECR**: to upload the presentation to Interact.

7. Applications for approval of active substances

7.1 Working procedure for active substance approval

The SECR presented the revision of the working procedures to take account of new practices and new agreements within the active substance approval process. The main changes proposed were described:

- use of Interact meetings and Interact collaboration is included, replacing the use of S-CIRCABC;
- the involvement of the applicant in the opinion-forming phase is aligned with the agreement reached at BPC-44 meeting;
- section 7 on how to handle CARs coming directly from Technical Meetings has been removed, as it had become obsolete;
- section 8 on the finalisation and dissemination steps has been reworded to improve clarity and to include a link to the guidelines for the assessment of confidentiality claims;
- a table with document mapping has been included to identify the location of the documents;
- the criteria included in the accordance checks have been updated according to recent practices.

Some clarifications were requested during the meeting. Also some suggestions for alignment with the UA process were made and agreed by the SECR. A link to the new CAR/CLH template will be included. It was also suggested to use the 30d-RCOM template for harmonisation across all processes.

During the discussion ASOs repeatedly expressed their concerns in relation to the BPC agreement on the applicant's involvement in the opinion forming process. SECR explained that the new approach intends to streamline the process and it would become more structured in relation to the applicant's comments, i.e., during the 30 days commenting at the end of the evaluation. In addition, the 30 day commenting period becomes more transparent and other MSs can see the discussion between the eCA and the applicant.

The BPC agreed with the revised working procedure.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to publish the revised working procedure on the ECHA web-site.

7.2 Introducing new information during the peer review process of active substance approval and Union authorisation

The SECR presented the revised procedure for accepting new data during the opinion-forming phase, both for AS and UA.

Besides the implementation of the proposal agreed at BPC-44 to no longer require that new data is readily available but only require that new data is submitted within 10 working days after the WG, other revisions were presented in the document.

The procedures have been harmonised for AS and UA, leading to one combined document for the two processes. This is intended to achieve equal treatment of applicants.

The document keeps the current approach that the submission of data during the opinion-forming is exceptional, and the data package should be complete when the assessment report is submitted for the accordance check. Therefore, new information can be submitted only when specific conditions indicated in the document are met.

Besides the existing conditions, SECR proposed to include a new condition that the information should not have been formally requested previous by the eCA to be provided by the applicant during the validation or evaluation phase. This proposal intends to provide certainty to eCAs and applicants and to confirm the exceptionality of data requests during opinion-forming.

Finally, the specific considerations of AS have been grouped in a separate chapter, while its content has remained unchanged compared to the current procedure.

The BPC agreed on the SECR proposal and the alignment and harmonisation of the procedures. The SECR will finalise the document and publish it on the ECHA web-site.

7.3 Procedure for the submission, evaluation and dissemination of data generated after active substance approval

The SECR briefly informed about the discussion at Coordination Group level on this document and asked for common views from BPC and CG side during the upcoming commenting phase of the documents.

Actions:

- **SECR**: to upload the presentation to Interact.

7.4 Draft BPC opinion on reaction mass of N,N-didecyl-N-(2-hydroxyethyl)-N-methylammonium propionate and N,N-didecyl-N-(2-(2-hydroxyethoxy)ethyl)-N-methylammonium propionate and N,N-didecyl-N-(2-(2-(2-hydroxyethoxy)ethoxy)ethyl)-N-methylammonium propionate (Formerly: Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-[2-(didecylmethylammonio)ethyl]- .omega.- hydroxy-, propanoate (salt) for PT 2 and 4 (Bardap 26))

The Chair welcomed the applicant for this item. The ASOs were allowed to be present during the discussion. The rapporteur briefly introduced the cases. Both are backlog dossiers in the review programme.

The active substance was redefined, due to the reason that the old name did not match the composition of the active substance as measured in the five batch analysis. Consequently, the “old” CAS and EC numbers are no longer valid and were removed from the documents. The applicant was asked whether a CAS number would be requested for the redefined substance. The applicant replied that no CAS number had been requested yet. The eCA replied on a question from COM about the assessment of coarse spraying that the in use concentration of the biocidal active substance is much lower than the level of corrosiveness and the droblet size so large that no concern about the use of spraying is identified. The applicant suggested to specify the DT50 determined in the water sediment test (whole system, water and sediment). This was agreed by the meeting. Some members

suggested to request in section 2.5 of the opinion additional information at renewal on the metabolites in groundwater and soil compartments as the assessment was on modelling only. In line with other opinions it was decided to include this request for additional data in the assessment report but not add this to the opinion.

All items in the open issues table were addressed and conclusions reached were recorded in the open issues table. The opinion was adopted by consensus.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur:** to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **13 January 2023**.
- **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 **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.

7.5 Draft BPC opinion on Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with hydrocarbon solvents for PT 18

The Chair welcomed the applicant for this item. The ASOs were allowed to be present during the discussion. Given the similarity of the two *Chrysanthemum* extracts, obtained with supercritical carbon dioxide and obtained with hydrocarbon solvents, with many comments in common, the agenda items 7.5 and 7.6 were discussed together. The rapporteur briefly introduced the cases.

The cases were already discussed at BPC-41 where the BPC postponed the discussion until the eCA evaluated and incorporated in their assessment the on-going tests on sediment dwelling organisms provided by the applicant. The updated data package on the environmental risk assessment for the sediment allowed reducing the uncertainty leading to a safe use.

One member raised the concern that information is lacking to assess whether genotoxic photometabolites may be formed as it is the case for other pyrethroids. Another member supported this concern. The ECHA SECR stated that based on a preliminary analysis the concern may be less as similar photometabolites may be formed but probably at a lower rate. The applicant informed about information submitted under the PPP Regulation where no concern was identified for several metabolites. It was concluded that there is a theoretical possibility, but not sufficient information to conclude whether genotoxic metabolites will be formed. However, considering the status as a backlog-dossier, no new information could be requested from the applicant after the evaluation had been finalised. The Commission referred to the possibility of initiating an early review according to Article 15 of the BPR by a Member State. The Chair concluded that the issue will be recorded in the minutes but that the opinion nor Assessment Report will be amended and asked the applicant to submit relevant information to the SECR as this may be useful for the regulatory process following the adoption of the opinion.

The evaluation and conclusions of the outdoor spray application in woodlands and amenity areas was discussed intensively. This use was evaluated applying the agreed scenario by

the Environment Working Group in 2022 laid down in a document entitled "PT 18 – Outdoor large scale spraying scenario" in the Technical Agreement for Biocides (TAB ENV entry 248). The first issue discussed was the statement in the draft opinion that "such uses should be regarded as not safe by definition", which was taken from the document above. First, with respect to this outdoor large scale spraying application it was argued that the text in the TAB is too strict and would need to be modified. It was decided that the SECR will take action. Second it was discussed if the conclusions in the draft opinion need to be amended as it stated in the draft that large scale spraying application should not be allowed. Several members stated that this should be reworded as guidance on how to perform an assessment is under development following a mandate received from the Commission by EFSA and ECHA for bees and so-called non-bee pollinators[1]. It was clarified that a quantitative risk assessment metholdogy will become available for bees – including possible risk mitigation measures – for large scale spraying outdoors while for non-bee pollinators the assessment will probably have to rely on a qualitative method. Subsequently, several members were of the opinion that this use can be allowed but that there the need to define clear preconditions for the outdoor large-scale spray application of relevant products in case of product authorisation and the assignment of necessary precautionary instructions for use and risk mitigation measures in order to reduce the adverse effects on the ecosystem and biodiversity as much as possible. Depending on the specific product and applications, both, a quantitative and a holistic qualitative risk assessment for the environment should carried out including bees as well as non-bee pollinators. Two members still raised concerns over this use. One member expressed the view that this use does not meet the conditions in Article 19(1)(b)(iv) of the BPR, due to its expected impact on biological diversity and the ecosystem and is not compatible with sustainable use of biocides. It was concluded by majority to accept the use provided the preconditions mentioned above are included in the opinion.

One member stated that in principle unacceptable risks are identified for the large scale spray application outdoor as in the scenario applied a 30 meter buffer zone is included to mitigate potential risks to the aquatic environment. The meeting agreed and concluded that this has to be reflected in the approval conditions and the section on elements to be taken into account for product authorisation.

All items in the open issues table were addressed and conclusions reached were recorded in the open issues table. The opinion was adopted by majority with a minority position provided by one member.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur:** to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **13 January 2023**.
- **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.
- **Member's minority (SE):** to submit the minority position by **1 December 2022.**

[1] For non-bee pollinators ECHA has recently published a scientific report entitled: "European arthropods and their role in pollination: scientific report of their biodiversity, ecology and sensitivity to biocides. September 2022.

- **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.

7.6 Draft BPC opinion on Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with supercritical carbon dioxide for PT 18

See agenda item 7.5.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur**: to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by 13 January 2023.
- **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.
- **Member's minority (SE):** to submit the minority position by **1 December 2022**.
- **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.

8. Union authorisation

8.1 Working procedure for Union authorisation applications

The SECR introduced the topic on the working procedure for Union authorisation application. The main changes introduced in the procedure were:

- the applicant involvement during the opinion forming process;
- clarification included about redaction of the PAR provided for dissemination;
- adding the table with the summary of the case relevant documents – mapping of the documents for the MSCAs.

The BPC members agreed with the revised procedure.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to publish the revised working procedure on the ECHA web-site.

8.2 Guiding principles on handling information provided by the applicant during UA process

The SECR introduced the updated document on the guiding principles on handling information provided by the applicant. Several members indicated that they appreciated that the document provides some flexibility for the different ways the member states are organised, for example with respect to the validation stage. Here the Commission stated that a common approach is required with respect to the validation stage. Accredited stakeholder organisation in general found the document too restrictive. The document will be amended to reflect that applicants may ask the evaluating competent authority to give

them the opportunity to submit extra information when for instaInnnce new guidance comes into force. Documents to reflect the same principles for active substance procedures and national authorisations will be developed. Some further amendments were agreed, mainly administrative. The document was agreed with the discussed amendments.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to amend the document in accordance with the discussions at the BPC and publish it on the ECHA web-site. To distribute the comments on the initial document with the explanation by SECR how these comments were taken into consideration.

8.3 Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing Glutaral (Glutaraldehyde) for PT 6, 11, 12

The Chair welcomed the applicant for this item. The ASOs were not allowed to be present during the discussion. The rapporteur introduced the case.

The items in the open issues table were addressed and conclusions reached were recorded in the open issues table.

The opinion was adopted by majority. Two members (DE and SE) informed the BPC that they will file a minority position.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur:** to revise the product assessment report (PAR) and draft SPC in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **9 December 2022.**
- **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.
- **Member (DE):** to submit the derogation to the Commission.
- **Member's minority (DE and SE):** to submit the minority position by **1 December 2022**.
- **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion, minority positions, draft SPC and final PAR to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish them on the ECHA website.

8.4 Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing Hydrochloric acid for PT 2

The Chair welcomed the applicant for this item. The ASOs were allowed to be present during the discussion. The rapporteur briefly introduced the case.

The environmental risk assessment of a substance of concern (SoC) was discussed. The members agreed with the assessment, however some members asked for a more detailed description of the intrinsic properties of this SoC for future biocidal product authorisation applications where the product contains the same non-active substance. It was decided that the rapporteur will in consultation with these members after the BPC, finalise the overview of the intrinsic properties for this SoC and the wording to add in the PAR in relation to the environmental risk assessment of SoC. All other items in the open issues

table were addressed and conclusions reached were recorded in the open issues table. The opinion was adopted by consensus.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur:** to revise the product assessment report (PAR) and draft SPC in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **9 December 2022.**
- **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, draft SPC and final PAR to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish them on the ECHA website.

8.5 Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing L-(+)-lactic acid for PT 3

The Chair welcomed the applicant for this item. The ASOs were allowed to be present during the discussion. The rapporteur briefly introduced the case.

All items in the open issues table were addressed and conclusions reached were recorded in the open issues table. The opinion was adopted by consensus.

Actions:

- **Rapporteur:** to revise the product assessment report (PAR) and draft SPC in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **9 December 2022.**
- **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, draft SPC and final PAR to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish them on the ECHA website.

8.6 Linguistic review procedure for same biocidal product applications for Union authorisation

ECHA presented the document. It was explained that a first draft of the document was presented at BPC-43 for commenting. Based on the comments received, the procedure was significantly revised and was now presented before the BPC for agreement. Following the introduction two members took the floor and expressed their support for the document. The procedure was agreed and will be published on the ECHA web-site.

Actions:

- **SECR**: to publish the procedure on the ECHA web-site.

9. Article 38 opinion requests

9.1. Draft BPC opinion on question on an unresolved objection during a mutual recognition procedure of a PT 18 biocidal product intended for the treatment of wasps and hornets nests

The Chair welcomed the applicant for this item. The ASOs were allowed to be present during the discussion. The rapporteur briefly introduced the case.

There was no concern raised about the scientific content of the opinion, however a member raised the question whether there is a legal basis for the request for further analytical data. Also the matter of consistency with decisions on other, comparable products and the lack of specific guidance for this case was mentioned. There was some support for this from the BPC members. The Chair and the Commission clarified that the legal assessment and the considerations on consistency with comparable products are not part of the mandate given to ECHA and this discussion should take place in a different forum. It was therefore agreed to remove any reference to the legal framework and the potential request for more data from the opinion. A number of technical points raised by the applicant were discussed not resulting in amendments to the opinion text except for some additional clarifications.

All items in the open issues table were addressed and conclusions reached were recorded in the open issues table. The opinion was adopted by consensus with two abstentions.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to revise the draft opinion in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and carry out an editorial check.
- **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish them on the ECHA website.

10. Article 75 (1)g opinion requests

10.1 Draft BPC opinion on questions regarding the comparative assessment of anticoagulant rodenticides

The Chair welcomed the applicant. The rapporteur briefly introduced the dossier.

Three stakeholders' observers (CEPA, CEFIC Biocides for Europe – Rodent Control Group and Futura GmbH) made a presentation on their organisation and their views on rodent control. The open issue table was then addressed point by point.

Regarding the assessment of chemical alternatives, there was a request by a member to add a use against rats in addition to mice for CO_2 products. SECR mentioned that often there is only limited information available on the products and uses to draw a conclusion. There was support by the BPC to add the use against rats although it was acknowledged that the situation – the product is authorised or under evaluation according to the simplified procedure - may be different in different member states. Overall there was agreement to the assessment concluding alphachloralose, cholecalciferol and CO_2 as eligible chemical alternatives for the uses specified in the opinion.

The issue of permanent baiting with AVK rodenticides and with traps was intensively discussed. Several members stated that there are serious concerns with respect to adverse environmental impacts of using AVK rodenticides. In some MS this use is not allowed, in

some MS it is while one member indicated that the use is not allowed today but it is being considered how this would be possible under strict conditions. CEPA indicated that with respect to trained professionals it is not a major use and is in fact an application or technique to reduce the use of rodenticides: permanent baiting is used for monitoring purposes in sensitive situations where there is for example a risk of re-invasion or a risk for livestock due to the possible spread of diseases.

Another issue related to permanent baiting and the use of traps discussed was the lack of efficacy data. It was highlighted that usually no efficacy data is provided in a biocidal product authorisation application for permanent baiting since the target organism is normally not present, therefore a standard efficacy assessment is not feasible. For the same reason no standard efficacy assessment of traps for permanent baiting can be done. However, AVK rodenticides can cause a risk to non-target organisms during the whole period of use in permanent baiting while providing only limited or no benefit for human health. The Committee indicated that comparing the efficacy of AVK rodenticides and traps for permanent baiting is probably not appropriate. An industry stakeholder raised concerns about bans of AVK permanent baiting which could have a big economic impact in some sectors and lead to rodent infestations, while the use of traps in permanent baiting can also be a risk to non-target organisms. No consensus could be reached on the use of AVK rodenticides or traps for permanent baiting: it was decided to reflect the discussion in the opinion with the conclusion that at the moment it cannot be concluded that traps are a suitable alternative for the use of AVK rodenticides for permanent baiting.

The Committee discussed if one positive field trial study with a mouse trap for use inside buildings would be sufficient to demonstrate efficacy of mechanical traps in general for this use and concluded it is sufficint, noting though that some members would like to see additional studies. ECHA will consult with the Commission on how additional information from future field trials on the effectiveness of rodent traps can be made available.

Commission indicated that they will issue a decision based on the BPC opinion, responding to the questions listed in the mandate addressed to ECHA on this issue.

All items in the open issues table were addressed and conclusions reached were recorded in the open issues table. The opinion was adopted by majority.

Actions:

- **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.
- **Member's minority (DE):** to submit the minority position by 01 December 2022.
- **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.

11. Any other business

11.1. Guidance on analysis of alternatives

The SECR introduced the topic and updates on Guidance on analysis of alternatives. Some members re-iterated their concerns expressed at BPC-42 in relation with the several challenges of conducting analyses of alternatives at active substance level, indicating that eCAs might not be able to address all the elements indicated in the guidance. Another member and a stakeholder observer however recognised the benefit of having a guidance

despite the recognised challenges. COM reminded about the obligations under the BPR for assessing alternatives, and the importance of having such information in a more systematic way as part of the active substance approval and renewal processes. The SECR suggested to review the guidance in five-years' time once experience with its implementation has been gained. The BPC adopted the guidance by consensus. The SECR indicated that it will be provided to the CA meeting of December 2022 for adoption together with a note describing an implementation timeline and practice. The guidance will be published on ECHA's website in Q1 2023 after editorial corrections and final legal review.

Actions:

- **SECR:** to present the guidance and an implementation timeline note to the CAD meeting and then to publish the guidance on the ECHA web-site after editorial corrections and final legal review.

12. 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

Main conclusions and action points

Agreed at the 45th meeting of BPC

22-24 November 2022

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 Website/Interact as part of the draft meeting minutes after the meeting.
Item 4 - Agreement of the minutes and review of actions from BPC-44	
The revised version of the minutes of BPC-44 was agreed.	**SECR:** to upload the agreed minutes to the BPC Interact and to the ECHA website.
Item 5 – Administrative issues	
The Chair informed that the March meeting will be virtual and the June meeting in 2023 will be organised as a face-to-face meeting.	
5.2. Results of survey on using Interact for commenting	
The BPC took note of the presentation provided by the SECR.	SECR: to upload the presentation on Interact/BPC CIRCABC IG.
Item 6 - Work programme for BPC	
6.1 BPC Work Programmes for active substance approval, Union authorisation, ED assessment and outlook for BPC	
-	**Members:** to send information on any further changes to the Work Programme (WP) for active substance approval to the SECR by **8 December 2022.**
6.2 Update on active substance approval and Union authorisation	
The BPC took note of the presentation provided by the SECR and agreed on some of the questions raised in it.	**SECR:** to upload the presentation on Interact/BPC CIRCABC IG.

Item 7 - Applications for approval of active substances	
7.1 Working procedure for active substance approval	
The BPC discussed and agreed on the document provided by the SECR.	**SECR:** to upload the document on Interact/BPC CIRCABC IG and publish it on the BPC website.
7.2 Introducing new information during the peer review process of active substance approval and Union authorisation	
The BPC discussed and agreed on the document provided by the SECR.	SECR: to finalise the document and publish it on the BPC website.
7.3 Procedure for the submission, evaluation and dissemination of data generated after active substance approval	
The BPC took note of the presentation provided by the SECR.	SECR: to upload the presentation on Interact/BPC CIRCABC IG.
7.4 Draft BPC opinion on Bardap 26 for PT 2 and 4	
The BPC adopted by consensus the opinion on the approval of the active substance for PT 02 and PT 04.	**Rapporteur**: to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **13 January 2023**. **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 opinions to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.
7.5 Draft BPC opinion on Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with hydrocarbon solvents for PT 18	
The BPC adopted by majority the opinion on the approval of the active substance for PT 18	**Rapporteur**: to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **13 January 2023**. **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. **Member (SE):** to submit the minority position by **01 December 2022** **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinions to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.
7.6 Draft BPC opinion on Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with supercritical carbon dioxide for PT 18	
The BPC adopted by majority the opinion on the approval of the active substance for PT 18	**Rapporteur**: to revise the assessment report in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **13 January 2023.**

	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. **Member (SE):** to submit the minority position by **01 December 2022** **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinions to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.
Item 8 – Union authorisation	
8.1 Working procedure for Union authorisation applications	
The BPC discussed and agreed on the document provided by the SECR.	**SECR:** to upload the document on Interact/BPC CIRCABC IG and publish it on the BPC website.
8.2 Guiding principles on handling information provided by the applicant during UA process	
The BPC discussed and agreed on the document provided by the SECR.	**SECR:** to revise the document and upload the document on Interact/BPC CIRCABC IG and publish it on the BPC website.
8.3 Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing Glutaral (Glutaraldehyde) for PT 06, 11, 12	
The BPC adopted by majority the opinion on the authorisation of an application for Union authorisation.	**Rapporteur:** to revise the product assessment report (PAR) and draft SPC in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **9 December 2022.** **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. **Members (DE, SE):** to submit the minority position by **01 December 2022** **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion, draft SPC and final PAR to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish the opinion on the ECHA website.
8.4 Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing Hydrochloric acid for PT 02	
The BPC adopted by consensus the opinion on the authorisation of an application for Union authorisation.	**Rapporteur:** to revise the product assessment report (PAR) and draft SPC in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **9 December 2022.** **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, draft SPC and final PAR to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish the opinion on the ECHA website.

8.5 Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing L-(+)-lactic acid for PT 03	
The BPC adopted by consensus the opinion on the authorisation of an application for Union authorisation.	**Rapporteur:** to revise the product assessment report (PAR) and draft SPC in accordance with the discussions in the BPC and submit to the SECR by **9 December 2022.** **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, draft SPC and final PAR to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish the opinion on the ECHA website.
8.6 Linguistic review procedure for same biocidal product applications for Union authorisation	
The BPC discussed the document provided by the SECR.	**SECR:** to upload the document on Interact/BPC CIRCABC IG and publish it on the BPC website.
Item 9 – Article 38 opinion requests	
9.1 Draft BPC opinion on question on an unresolved objection during a mutual recognition procedure of a PT 18 biocidal product intended for the treatment of wasps and hornets nests	
The BPC adopted by consensus the opinion on the authorisation of an application for Union authorisation.	**SECR:** to revise the draft opinion in accordance with the discussions in the BPC. **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.
Item 10 – Article 75(1)(g) opinion requests	
10.1 Draft BPC opinion on questions regarding the comparative assessment of anticoagulant rodenticides	
The BPC adopted by majority the opinion on the authorisation of an application for Union authorisation.	**SECR:** to revise the draft opinion in accordance with the discussions in the BPC. **Member (DE):** to submit the minority position by **01 December 2022** **SECR:** to forward the adopted opinion to COM by **16 December 2022** and publish it on the ECHA website.
Item 11 – Any other business	
11.1 Guidance on analysis of alternatives	
The BPC took note of the documents provided by the SECR and discussed the draft guidance.	**SECR:** to upload the documents on Interact/BPC CIRCABC IG.

oOo

Part III - List of Attendees

Members

AT	JOHN	Nina
BE	JARRETY	Helene
CY	HADJIGEORGIOU	Andreas
CZ	MIKOLAS	Jan
DK	GREGERSEN	Nina Falk
EL	VAGIAS	Vasileios
ES	GONZÁLEZ MÁRQUEZ	Luisa
FI	KOIVISTO	Sanna
HR	VRHOVAC FILIPOVIC	Ivana
HU	SZENTGYORGYI	Timea
IE	PIERCE	Louise
IT	BALDASSARRI	Lucilla
LV	BROVKINA	Julija
NL	LUIJK	Rebekka
NO	ESPEVIK RANDALL	Marit
PL	RZODECZKO	Helena
PT	BORGES	Teresa
RO	DRAGOIU	Simona
SE	HAHLBECK	Edda
SI	ČEBAŠEK	Petra
SK	MIKOLASKOVA	Denisa

Alternate members

CH	PYTHON	Francois
DE	WEINHEIMER	Viola
FR	COLLET	Romy
LT	MAJUS	Saulius
MT	MALLIA	Lothar Paul

Advisors

BE	LEROY	Celine
DE	GEDUHN	Anke
DE	FRIESEN	Anton
DE	SCHMOLZ	Erik
DE	EHNI	Markus
ES	DE RIVAS	Ana
ES	RUIZ LOPEZ	Elena Fuensanta
FR	CHÉZEAU	Aurélie
IT	UBALDI	Alessandro
IT	DEKOVI	Edlira
IT	CATALDI	Lucilla
LV	IGAUNE	Ieva
LV	MEZULE	Linda
NL	MUIJS	Barry
NL	KALKERS	Lucas
NL	LANS	Martine
NL	COX	Nina
NL	VAN DRIEL	Ruud
SE	ASK BJÖRNBERG	Karolin
SK	BILOHUSCIN	Jan
SK	ROMAN	Olga

Commission observers

DG SANTE	CAINZOS GARCIA	Marta
DG SANTE	CHATELIN	Ludovic
DG SANTE	DELVAUX	Vincent
DG SANTE	GRUHN	Lena
DG SANTE	NEGULICI	Ligia
DG SANTE	TSIAMIS	Konstantinos

Stakeholder Observers

AUBRY	Marc
BARBU	Luminita
BATES	Eamonn
CAZELLE	Elodie
COR	Gabrielle
DREVE	Simina
LE LAIDIER	Gabriel
MIHAI	Camelia
SCHRÖER	Daniel
VAN BERLO	Boris
WEIß	Aharon

Applicants

Arrow Regulatory /Quatchem
Jesmond Bioscience GmbH
MC (Netherlands) 1 B.V./Lanxess
Natural Pyrethrum task force/
KPIC/Sumitomo Chemicals
SC Johnson Europe Sàrl
YOU Solutions Germany /Arxada

ECHA staff

BUCHANAN	Camilla
CARLON	Claudio
DAMSTEN	Micaela
DE WOLF	Watze
ESTEVAN MARTINEZ	Carmen
HÄMÄLÄINEN	Eva
HONKA	Anni
LAITINEN	Jaana
LIPKOVA	Adriana
MACKEVICA	Aiga
MARCON	Eva
MATTHES	Jochen
MOTTET	Denis
MUELLER	Gesine
PAPADAKI	Paschalina
RAULIO	Mari
ROCKE	Timo
SAEZ RIBAS	Monica
STASKO	Jolanta
SZYMANKIEWICZ	Katarzyna
UPHOFF	Andreas
VAN DE PLASSCHE	Erik
VAN DER LINDEN	Sander
VAN GALEN	Joost
VASILEVA	Katya

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-45

Annex I

Documents submitted to the members of the Biocidal Products Committee for the BPC-45 meeting

Agenda Point	Number	Title		
2.	BPC-A-45-2022_rev1	Draft agenda		
4.	BPC-M-44-2022	Draft minutes from BPC-43		
5.1		Administrative issues and report from the other Committees		
5.2	presentation	Results of survey on using Interact for commenting		
6.1	BPC-45-2022-01	BPC Work Programme for active substance approval		
	BPC-45-2022-02	BPC Work Programme Union authorisation		
	BPC-45-2022-03	outlook for BPC		
	BPC-45-2022-04	outlook for BPC and ED assessment		
6.2	Presentation	Update on active substance approval and Union authorisation		
7.1	BPC-45-2022-05 BPC-45-2022-13	Working procedure for active substance approval Working procedure for UA_AS_RCOM_template		
7.2	BPC-45-2022-06	Introducing new information during the peer review process of active substance approval and Union authorisation		
7.3	Presentation	Procedure for the submission, evaluation and dissemination		
8.1	BPC-45-2022-12	Working procedure for UA		
	BPC-45-2022-13	Working procedure for UA_AS_RCOM_template		
8.2	BPC-45-2022-14	Guiding principles on handling information provided by the applicant during UA process		
8.6	BPC-45-2022-18	Linguistic review procedure for UA		
11.1	BPC-45-2022-21A	Guidance on analysis of alternatives	AoA guidance doc	
	BPC-45-2022-21B		BRP flow chart	
	BPC-45-2022-21C		Open issues	
	BPC-45-2022-21D		AoA format with instructions	
	BPC-45-2022-21E		BPC-42 open issues	
Agenda Point	**Number**	**Substance-PT**	**eCA**	**Title**
7.4	BPC-45-2022-08A	Bardap 26 for PT 02	IT	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-08B			Assessment report

	BPC-45-2022-08C			Open issues
	BPC-45-2022-08_09D			Doc IIA_PT2-PT4_Oct 2022
	BPC-45-2022-08_09E			PT2-PT4_Cover note_Redefinition
	BPC-45-2022_Room docs_1			ZIP_IIB_IIC_PT2_ZIP file
	BPC-45-2022_Room docs_2			Confidential Annex_PT2-PT4_ZIP file
	BPC-45-2022_Room docs_3			ZIP_IIB_IIC_PT4_ZIP file
	BPC-45-2022-09A	Bardap 26 for PT 4		Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-09B			Assessment report
	BPC-45-2022-09C			Open issues
7.5	BPC-45-2022-10A	Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with hydrocarbon solvents for PT 18	ES	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-10B			Assessment report
	BPC-45-2022-10C			Open issues
	BPC-45-2022-10D_11D			Hyalella Study
	BPC-45-2022-10E_11E			Oligochaete sediment study
	BPC-45-2022-10F_11F			Sediment riparius
	BPC-45-2022-10G_11G			Final minutes
7.6	BPC-45-2022-11A	Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with supercritical carbon dioxide for PT 18	ES	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-11B			Assessment report
	BPC-45-2022-11C			Open issues
8.3	BPC-45-2022-15A	Glutaral (Glutaraldehyde) PT 06,11,12	NL	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-15B			SPC
	BPC-45-2022-15C			PAR
	BPC-45-2022-15D			PAR Conf Annex
	BPC-45-2022-15E			Open issues
	BPC-45-2022-15F			NL position paper
	BPC-45-2022-15G			Tonnage based
	Room document			Position paper_app
8.4	BPC-45-2022-16A	Hydrochloric acid for PT 02	NL	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-16B			SPC
	BPC-45-2022-16C			PAR

	BPC-45-2022-16D			PAR Conf Annex
	BPC-45-2022-16D1			PAR **MS ONLY Conf** Annex
	BPC-45-2022-16E			Open issues
8.5	BPC-45-2022-17A	L-(+)-lactic acid for PT 03	LV	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-17B			SPC
	BPC-45-2022-17C			PAR
	BPC-45-2022-17D			PAR Conf Annex
	BPC-45-2022-17E			Open issues
9.1	BPC-45-2022-19A	Art.38 Request for ECHA opinion pursuant to Articles 36(2) and 38 of the BPR - biocidal product containing permethrin (PT 18)	ECHA	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-19B			Open issues
	BPC-45-2022-19C			Mandate
10.1	BPC-45-2022-20A	Art. 75(1)(g) comparative assessment of anticoagulant rodenticides	ECHA	Draft BPC opinion
	BPC-45-2022-20B			Open issues
	BPC-45-2022_Roomdocs_4			Anticoagulant_rodenticides_comparative_Information received post BPC-44_ZIP file
	BPC-45-2022_Roodoc_5			Summary data field trial
	BPC-45-2022_Roomdoc_6			CEPA Remarks Industry Consensus
	BPC-45-2022_Roomdoc_7			CEPA position statement
	Presentation			CEPA presentation
	Presentation			CEFIC presentation
	Presentation			SWISSINNO presentation
	BPC-45-2022_Roomdoc_8			Field study background

10 November 2022
BPC-A-45-2022_rev1

Draft agenda

45th meeting of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC)

22-24 November 2022

Meeting is held as hybrid

Meeting room Urho in ECHA / WebEx

Starts on 22 November at 09:30,
ends on 24 November at 16:00
The time is indicated in Helsinki time.

1. – Welcome and apologies

2. – Agreement of the agenda

BPC-A-45-2022_rev1

For agreement

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

4. – Agreement of the minutes and review of actions from BPC-44

BPC-M-44-2022

For agreement

5. – Administrative issues

5.1. Administrative issues

For information

5.2. Results of survey on using Interact for commenting

For information

6. – Work programme for BPC

6.1. BPC Work Programmes for active substance approval, Union authorisation, ED assessment and outlook for BPC

BPC-45-2022-01; BPC-45-2022-02; BPC-45-2022-03; BPC-45-2022-04

For information

6.2. Update on active substance approval and Union authorisation

For information

7. – Applications for approval of active substances[†]

7.1. Working procedure for active substance approval

BPC-45-2022-05; BPC-45-2022-13

For agreement

7.2. Introducing new information during the peer review process of active substance approval and Union authorisation

BPC-45-2022-06

For agreement

7.3. Procedure for the submission, evaluation and dissemination of data generated after active substance approval

For information

7.4. Draft BPC opinion on Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-[2-(dide-cylmethylammonio)ethyl]- .omega.- hydroxy-, propanoate (salt) for PT 2 and 4 (Bardap 26)

Previous discussion: WG-III-2022

BPC-45-2022-08 A, B, C, D, E

BPC-45-2022-09 A, B, C, D, E

For adoption

7.5. Draft BPC opinion on Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with hydrocarbon solvents for PT 18

Previous discussion: BPC-41

BPC-45-2022-10 A, B, C, D, E, F, G

For adoption

7.6. Draft BPC opinion on Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with supercritical carbon dioxide for PT 18

Previous discussion: BPC-41

BPC-45-2022-11 A, B, C, D, E, F, G

For adoption

[†] 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).

8. – Union authorisation**

8.1. Working procedure for Union authorisation applications

BPC-45-2022-12; BPC-45-2022-13

For agreement

8.2. Guiding principles on handling information provided by the applicant during UA process

BPC-45-2022-14

For agreement

8.3. Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing Glutaral (Glutaraldehyde) for PT 6, 11, 12

Previous discussion: WG-III-2022

BPC-45-2022-15 A, B, C, D, E, F, G

For adoption

8.4. Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing Hydrochloric acid for PT 2

Previous discussion: WG-III-2022

BPC-45-2022-16 A, B, C, D, D1, E

For adoption

8.5. Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing L-(+)-lactic acid for PT 3

Previous discussion: WG-III-2022

BPC-45-2022-17 A, B, C, D, E

For adoption

8.6. Linguistic review procedure for same biocidal product applications for Union authorisation

BPC-45-2022-18

For information

9. – Article 38 opinion requests

9.1. Draft BPC opinion on question on an unresolved objection during a mutual recognition procedure of a PT 18 biocidal product intended for the treatment of wasps and hornets nests

Previous discussion: WG-III-2022

BPC-45-2022-19 A, B, C

For adoption

10.– Article 75(1)(g) opinion requests

** 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 Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC) (denoted by B), a draft product assessment report (PAR) (denoted by C) and a document containing open issues to be discussed for the biocidal product or biocidal product familiy (denoted by D).

10.1. Draft BPC opinion on questions regarding the comparative assessment of anticoagulant rodenticides

BPC-45-2022-20 A, B

For adoption

11. - Any other business

11.1. Guidance on analysis of alternatives

BPC-45-2022-21 A, B, C, D, E

For agreement

12.– Action points and conclusions

Provisional time schedule for the

45th meeting of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC)

Hybrid meeting (Meeting room Urho in ECHA / WebEx)

22 November 2022: starts at 9:30; 24 November 2022 ends at 16:00

Please note that the time schedule indicated below is 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.

Tuesday 22 November: (starts at 09:30 EET / 08:30 CET, ends at 18:00 EET / 17:00 CET)

Items 1-5	Opening items and administrative issues
Item 6.1	BPC Work Programmes for active substance approval, Union authorisation, ED assessment and outlook for BPC
Item 6.2	Update on active substance approval and Union authorisation
Item 7.1	Working procedure for active substance approval
Item 7.2	Introducing new information during the peer review process of active substance approval and Union authorisation
Item 7.3	Procedure for the submission, evaluation and dissemination of data generated after active substance approval
Item 8.1	Working procedure for Union authorisation applications
Item 8.2	Guiding principles on handling information provided by the applicant during UA process
Item 7.4	Draft BPC opinion on Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-[2-(didecylmethylammonio)ethyl]- .omega.- hydroxy-, propanoate (salt) for PT 2 and 4 (Bardap 26)
Item 7.5	Draft BPC opinion on Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with hydrocarbon solvents for PT 18
Item 7.6	Draft BPC opinion on Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium, extract from open and mature flowers of Tanacetum cinerariifolium obtained with supercritical carbon dioxide for PT 18

Wednesday 23 November: (starts at 09:30 EET / 08:30 CET, ends at 17:00 EET / 16:00 CET)

Item 9.1	Draft BPC opinion on question on an unresolved objection during a mutual recognition procedure of a PT 18 biocidal product intended for the treatment of wasps and hornets nests
Item 10.1	Draft BPC opinion on questions regarding the comparative assessment of anticoagulant rodenticides
Item 11.1	Guidance on analysis of alternatives

Thursday 24 November: (starts at 09:30 EET/08:30 CET, ends at 16:00 EET/15:00 CET)

Item 8.3	Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing Glutaral (Glutaraldehyde) for PT 6, 11, 12
Item 8.4	Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing Hydrochloric acid for PT 2
Item 8.5	Draft BPC opinion on an Union authorisation application for a biocidal product family containing L-(+)-lactic acid for PT 3
Item 8.6	Linguistic review procedure for same biocidal product applications for Union authorisation
Item 12	Action points and conclusions

End of meeting

o0o