BPC-M-1-2013 FINAL
Agreed at BPC-2
(29 May 2013)

Minutes of the 1st meeting of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC)

26-27 March 2013

Part I. Summary Record of the Proceedings

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC), welcomed the participants to the first meeting.

The Chair informed the BPC of the participation of 21 members and one alternate. Apologies were received from three members. Four advisers, two representatives of the European Commission and two observers from HR and PL present at the meeting were also introduced. The Chair introduced the ECHA Secretariat and Heike Schimmelpfennig and Antero Airaksinen as the future chairs of the BPC Working Groups 'Environment' and 'Human Health', respectively.

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

The list of attendees is given in Part III of the minutes.

2. Agreement of the Agenda

The Chair introduced the draft agenda (BPC-A-1-2013) and explained that item 6.1 was for discussion and guidance development was to be added under AOB. The agenda was agreed. The list of meeting documents and the final agenda are attached to these minutes as Annexes I and II, respectively.

3. Welcome address by Jukka Malm, Director of Regulatory Affairs

The Chair gave the floor to the ECHA Director of Regulatory Affairs, who welcomed the participants and gave an opening address. In it the Director noted that yet another milestone for ECHA in the implementation of the Biocidal Products Regulation (BPR) had been achieved at this first meeting of the BPC. The Director emphasised the importance of the transparency and the independence of the Committee to ensure its work is of a high scientific quality and open for external scientific scrutiny. The need for greater efficiency and effectiveness was also underlined, both at the assessment report stage (Competent Authorities) and then the opinion-forming stage (BPC). In accordance with Article 75(3) of the BPR, BPC members should receive adequate support and resources from their Member States (MS) in order to carry out their important work for the Committee.

4. Tour de table of BPC members

The Chair invited members and observers to introduce themselves, the country they represent and their background.

5. Administrative issues

5.1. Housekeeping issues

The Secretariat (SECR) informed participants of the housekeeping issues including the safety and security arrangements

5.2. Reimbursement rules

The SECR informed participants of the reimbursement rules.

5.3. ICT and document management

The SECR presented document BPC-1-2013-01 on the proposed approach for document management.

The Chair explained the idea of using newsgroup forums on CIRCABC to comment on any agenda item and to provide input on discussion documents. The advantage of using newsgroups was explained, namely to provide transparency for members and other participants and to avoid unnecessary emails circulating to members.

Actions:

Several members proposed additional elements for the management of BPC documents, namely whenever possible to start the subject line of emails with 'BPC-' for clarity; to include both the document numbering in a document heading; and to include the revision number in the documents. The SECR agreed to action these points.

6. Working approach of the BPC

6.1. BPC vision, work programme and priorities

The Chair and the SECR presented for discussion the vision, work programme 2014-16 and possible priorities for the BPC. The issues below were raised by participants.

- Criteria for priority setting of dossiers: it was argued by one member that renewal for rodenticides and evaluations for active substances meeting the exclusion criteria should be given high priority. Several members questioned the prioritisation proposed by the SECR for evaluations submitted after 1 September 2013. In particular, for submissions for product types (PTs) having a low priority according to the SECR, the evaluating Competent Authority (eCA) would not like to put it on hold for several years and also this would conflict with the 270 day opinion-forming target timeline. The SECR proposed that some capacity can be reserved for immediate handling of evaluations in the BPC. Some members recommended that active substance evaluations for one or more PTs could be combined.

- Backlog dossiers: the SECR recognised the above concerns, stating however that there is a backlog in the Review Programme of around 150 evaluations currently in the Biocidal Products Directive (BPD) peer review process containing many from the first two lists e.g. PT 08, 18 and 19 and also that it may be useful to have several evaluations for the same PT in one meeting. A member proposed that MS should always be allowed to replace a scheduled evaluation by another one for which the MS is also the eCA.

- Request for additional information after submission of the evaluation by the eCA to ECHA: members requested clarity on how to deal with this where additional testing may not be possible, but additional information for clarification could be allowed. The SECR stated there is no stop-the-clock mechanism but that additional information could be considered in the BPC or its Working Groups (WGs). In addition, the SECR stated that evaluations have to be fit-for-purpose, meaning that in principle all issues between the eCA and the applicant have been solved before submission to ECHA, including the need for additional information. One member requested clarification on what will happen if the eCA has not spotted a data gap during its evaluation.

- Alignment with CLH process and assessment of substances which are persistent, bio-accumulative and toxic (PBTs) by the PBT Expert Group: members requested clarity on the possibilities to align these processes and on the priority setting mechanism within ECHA for submissions coming from different regulatory frameworks such as REACH, Harmonised Classification and Labelling (CLH), Plant Protection Products (PPPs) and the BPR. The SECR referred to experience on alignment between PPP and CLH, where one of the main issues is the public consultation for evaluations based on the same information. The SECR stated the

relatively long timeline for the CLH process may offer possibilities for alignment and welcomed any proposals from members. The SECR proposed to discuss this further, once the dates for meetings for the coming years are set.

- Target period for finalising BPC opinions in the Review Programme: the SECR indicated that the BPR does not indicate a deadline for finalising the opinions related to the Review Programme and that a 270 day period will be the aim for finalising the BPC opinion on active substances in the Review Programme, the starting point of this period having to be agreed. .

- Substitution and exclusion criteria and the application of Article 5(2) BPR: a member raised the application of Article 5(2), especially the last paragraph. The member questioned if a MS can assess at the approval stage if one of the conditions of Article 5(2) is met. COM clarified that according to Article 90(2) evaluations submitted by the eCA to ECHA before 1 September 2013 have to be evaluated under the criteria from the BPD. This means that the eCA does not need to address exclusion and substitution criteria. However, as decisions for these evaluations will be taken under the BPR, these criteria may still need to be addressed in the BPC. This requires further discussion, also at CA level.

Actions:

Members were invited to provide their own work programmes (proposed submission of dossiers in 2013-16 under the Review Programme) in a BPC CIRCABC IG newsgroup and to the Commission by 19 April 2013. The SECR was to refine the work programme in the light of discussion and any further comments before the next meeting.

6.2. Establishing BPC Working Groups

The SECR presented document BPC-1-2013-02 on the establishment of BPC Working Groups (WGs). The issues below were discussed.

- Resources allocated by MS to support WG members: several members sought clarification of the requirements for MS to support WG members. The SECR agreed to highlight this aspect for the next meeting.

- The structure of the General Working group (WG I): it was agreed to further consider splitting WG I into two working groups, one for efficacy issues and the other focused on analytical methods and physico-chemical properties.

- Term of office term for core members (CCAs): several members were concerned with the proposed fixed term of office of 3 years for core members. One member proposed that membership of the WGs should be comprised solely of those who had commented on the dossiers that are on the agenda. The SECR clarified that those members commenting on a document would be invited to be flexible members or non-core members (nCCAs) of WGs, if they were not already core members.

- The possibility of virtual meetings: the SECR explained that physical meetings will be held at the initial stages for all WGs; however virtual meetings are foreseen as one of the tools that may be used by WGs in the medium and longer term.

- Nomination of WG members and advisers: the SECR clarified that the nominations would be for CCA and not for nCCAs. In response to the question of numbers of advisers, the SECR confirmed that more than one adviser will be allowed for CCAs, if this is necessary to provide the appropriate expertise but that advisers are not reimbursed by the Agency. It was also confirmed that nCCAs may be accompanied by non reimbursed advisers.

- The workload of WGs: several members were concerned about the expected work load for the members of the WGs. The SECR agreed to provide further clarification on this point at the next meeting.

- Reimbursement of nCCAs: the SECR explained the the legislative financial statement foresaw only a limited number of WG participants. The available budget established in line with the legislative financial statement would probably preclude the reimbursement of nCCAs.

The Chair concluded that the proposed approach was agreed subject to the clarifications above.

Actions:

Members were invited to provide any further written comments by Friday 19 April in the dedicated BPC CIRCABC newsgroup. The SECR was to draw up mandates and objectives for the WGs by the next meeting.

6.3. Collaboration with the Member States

The SECR presented proposals for the effective and efficient collaboration with the MS. The approach proposed was supported subject to the clarifications below.

- Responsibility for drawing up the opinion: one member requested clarification on who draws up the BPC opinion making reference to a possible inconsistency between Articles 8(4) and 44(3) of the BPR where it is stated that the Agency shall prepare the opinion whereas in Article 75(1) it is stated that the BPC is responsible for the opinion. The SECR confirmed that it is the BPC that agrees the opinion and the rapporteur is responsible for 'holding the pen'. It is the role of the SECR to provide technical and scientific support to the rapporteur and the BPC in coming to its conclusion. COM stated that there may be a difference between REACH and the BPR, where in REACH it is stated that the Committee prepares the opinion. According to COM the meaning of Article 75(1) is that the intellectual content of the opinion is the responsibility of the BPC and who drafts the opinion or holds the pen is a matter of interpretation. The SECR stated that there is no contradiction between Articles 8(4) and 44(3) as Article 75(1) states that the BPC is part of the Agency. In addition, the SECR highlighted that Article 76, which describes the tasks of the SECR, does not mention the preparation of the opinions.

- The opinion of the Agency referred to in Article 8(4) and 44(3): COM clarified that they expect that all relevant issues are addressed in the peer review process in the BPC and reflected in the opinion. COM foresees that the implementing regulations or decisions can be adopted in the majority of cases by the Standing Committee (SC) via a written procedure, where almost all elements can be taken directly (for example approval conditions and some recitals) from the opinion. Only in specific cases an in depth discussion at the SC was foreseen, for example when there are issues of policy relevance. The SECR indicated that for the approval of active substances it was foreseen that the opinion template will consist of a summary of the assessment, a proposal for the approval including the conditions (similar to the current sections 3 of the Assessment Report under the BPD) and a summary of the considerations of the BPC. The minority positions were to be published separately. A template for the approval of active substances was to be provided for the next BPC meeting.

- Mechanism for collaboration between the eCAs and ECHA: i) one member suggested to include the facilitating role of the SECR in aligning the BPR process with CLH and the PBT assessment by the PBT Expert Group; ii) the SECR confirmed, following a question from another member, that ECHA will implement the pre-submission process for Union authorisation as discussed at the CA meeting in February; iii) the SECR was requested by several members to be more specific on its role and resources including the timing of the intervention by the ECHA dossier manager. On the latter it was suggested that this can take place after the completeness check is finalised by the eCA. The SECR stated the objective of the upstream communication before the evaluation is submitted to

the Agency by the eCA is to improve the quality of the evaluations and ensure their consistency and that they are fit-for-the purpose of opinion-forming by the BPC. The extent and timing of the intervention by the ECHA dossier manager depends on the case.

Actions:

It was agreed that SECR would consider the issues raised and report back to the next meeting. Members were invited to provide any further comments in a BPC CIRCABC IG newsgroup by Friday 19 April.

6.4. Member declarations of interest and ECHA policy

The SECR presented the ECHA policy on the prevention of conflicts of interest. In particular the points below were noted.

- A conflict of interest arises when the impartiality and objectivity of a decision, opinion or recommendation of the Agency and the BPC is or might be in the public perception compromised by an interest held by an individual. It was explained that independence is a core value of the Agency and avoiding conflicts of interest is one element to preserve this.
- The annual declarations of interest made by all members and alternates must be updated whenever private interests change.
- If the private interests of participants interfere with specific agenda points, a declaration must be made at the start of each BPC meeting and the actions specified in the rules of procedure will be followed.
- The Secretariat also drew to the attention of members the need to follow the provisions of document 'General Principles and Guidance for Committee Members of the Agency' which is available on the BPC CIRCABC IG.

6.5. Participation of observers in the BPC

The SECR introduced paper BPC-1-2013-03. The issues below were discussed.

- Participation of applicants in type I and II processes: several members expressed concern that applicants may not be allowed to participate in these processes at the BPC level on the grounds of efficiency and transparency. Reference was made to the experience under the BPD where applicants were able to clarify issues during a meeting. One member stated their participation was especially relevant for assessing the viability of proposed risk management measures or for assessing the relevance of an identified risk in light of the use of the biocidal product(s) in practice. Several other members supported the proposal by the SECR which emphasised that clarification would not normally be needed at this late stage, since the views of the applicant should be clear by the BPC meeting. One of the members proposed that applicants could be on stand-by during the BPC meeting to clarify questions where considered necessary by the BPC. COM stated the importance of the views of the applicant being heard during the process and would recommend that applicants are permitted in BPC meetings for type II processes. The SECR explained that the process may lose transparency if additional information is brought in by an applicant during the BPC stage and therefore input should come as early as possible and preferably in writing. The SECR also asked members to consider the consequences for confidential business information (CBI) following a public consultation under Article 10 of the BPR as described in the proposal.

- One member proposed that the process be evaluated after one year, rather than three and asked whether ECHA accredited stakeholder organisations (ASOs) have speaking rights or not.

- Another member questioned why Article 37 was not considered in type II processes.

- The SECR clarified that the ECHA Code of conduct for ASOs indicates that one representative per ASO is allowed who may be accompanied by an expert with the agreement of the SECR.

Actions:

It was agreed the SECR will invite ASOs that have expressed an interest to observe the work of the BPC to the next meeting. In addition, the SECR was to report back to the next meeting on the issues raised and in particular regarding the involvement of applicants in BPC meetings for type I and type II processes.

7. Rules of procedure

The SECR presented document BPC-1-2013-04, a first draft of the BPC rules of procedure (RoPs) that it had prepared on behalf of members. It was explained that the RoPs are a framework by which all of the activities of the BPC are governed and assist the Committee to have a consistent approach to decision-making and on other procedural matters. SECR also explained that much of the content of the draft RoPs are relatively fixed because they originate from either legislative requirements or from ECHA policy provisions.

The principal discussion points were in relation to the provisions concerning rapporteurs and co-rapporteurs. The issues raised were as follows: the necessity of appointing rapporteurs for all BPC opinions; the mechanism for appointing co-rapporteurs and replacing rapporteurs; the affiliation of rapporteurs for cases covered by Article 75(1)(g); and the possibility of a flexible involvement of rapporteurs in BPC WGs. In addition, several members sought clarification on the frequency with which written procedures would be used to adopt BPC opinions.

The SECR agreed on the need for further reflection on these issues and undertook to provide further clarification in the next revision of the RoPs. Several members also suggested editorial revisions which were accepted and will be included in the next version of the document.

Actions:

Members were invited to provide any further comments in the BPC CIRCABC IG newsgroup by Friday 19 April. The SECR was to amend the draft RoPs as indicated above for the next meeting and seek agreement. This would then enable the RoPs to be presented for their approval to the ECHA Management Board scheduled for 18-19 June.

8. Working procedures and templates

8.1. Overview of priority working procedures

The SECR gave an overview of the use of working procedures as a tool to assist the BPC members to meet the legal timelines and to be clear about their roles. The priority working procedures to be discussed for 2013 were for delivering BPC opinions in the following areas: applications for approval of active substances; applications for Union authorisation; and scientific and technical matters concerning mutual recognition.

8.2. Approval of active substances

The SECR proposed an approach for the working procedure for the approval of active substances. The issues below were discussed.

- Submission windows: members and COM supported the introduction of submission windows for Competent Authority Reports (CARs) to be submitted by the eCAs. This will enable the 270-day period to be started effectively and to optimise the efficiency of the processing of dossiers. It was also agreed to consider further mechanisms to avoid simultaneous commenting periods for a large number of CARs following a submission window.

- Timing of the public consultation for potential candidates for substitution: several members queried the timing of the public consultation to be carried out for those

active substances that are potential candidates for substitution. The SECR indicated its preference to initiate the public consultation immediately following an accordance check performed by the SECR on the eCA proposal within the CAR.

- One WG discussion per substance: the SECR proposed the general approach of one discussion at each of the standing WGs per substance. This was welcomed by members as a means to improve the efficiency of the process. The SECR also introduced the possibility of ad hoc discussions or a 'task force' following a WG meeting, as a tool which may be used to finalise a WG discussion on specific open issues. Such task forces would be tasked by the WG to work within a short timeframe to finalise open issues.

- Timeline for the final steps of BPC opinion-forming: several members expressed concern that there might not be sufficient time allocated for the last stages of the BPC opinion forming process. The SECR clarified that time would be saved by general having only one WG discussion per substance.

- CAR structure: a structure for the CAR was presented by the SECR on which there was general agreement. The SECR proposed this should form the basis for the CAR template to be prepared for the next meeting for CARs for which an application is submitted under Article 7 of the BPR after 1 September 2013. In addition, members were invited to start using the structure of levels I and II (the conclusions and the assessment report) for the CARs under evaluation for the Review Programme when appropriate. Where document III has been provided in the old Word format, this would not need to be converted into a IUCLID dossier.

- Updating the CAR: the SECR noted it will be necessary for the eCA to update assessment reports before BPC discussions and the entire CAR after BPC opinions have been adopted. COM pointed out that it would be useful for companies if assessment reports could be published before the COM decision, to enable their use for applications for product authorisations.

- Work programme: members noted the difficulty of combining the need to have CARs discussed at the WGs and BPC as soon as they are finalised and organising the work programme to discuss and finalise the 150 CARs that have already been submitted to COM. The SECR agreed it will be necessary to clarify the planning of the Member State Competent Authorities with respect to the timelines for finalisation of CARs and to include these plans in the work programme.

Actions:

Members invited the SECR to prepare the first draft working procedure for active substance approval for the next meeting, taking into the above discussion. Members were invited to provide any further comments in a BPC CIRCABC IG newsgroup by Friday 19 April.

9. Conclusions and action points

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

10. AOB

Guidance development

The Chair invited one member to explain the problems they have encountered recently in the course of the development of the guidance in support of the BPR. The member expressed concern about the late delivery of draft documents, short deadlines for comments and lack of transparency in the process. The SECR explained that the need for consultation of the Technical Meeting experts may not be the same for all guidance documents but agreed that it will try to improve communication. The SECR also

recognised the challenge posed during the transitional period where two organisations are sharing the same communication channel.

o0o

Part II. Main conclusions and action points

MAIN CONCLUSIONS & ACTION POINTS

(Adopted at the 1st meeting of BPC)

(26-27 March 2013)

Agenda point	
Conclusions / decisions / minority opinions	**Action requested after the meeting (by whom/by when)**
2. Adoption of the agenda	
The agenda was adopted.	**SECR** to upload the adopted agenda to BPC CIRCABC IG as part of the meeting minutes.
5. Administrative issues	
5.3. ICT and document management	
	SECR to include BPC in title of emails and if possible CIRCA notifications. **SECR** to indicate revision on revised documents. **SECR** to ensure document number appears on documents.
6. Working approach of the BPC	
6.1. BPC vision, work programme and priorities	
The following was agreed: • Draft BPC Work programme will be revised in the light of the discussion and any further comments made in writing; • Important to deal with the backlog dossiers; • Where possible dossiers should be dealt with in batches at the same BPC meeting e.g. one active substance for more than one PT or more than one active substance for the same PT; • A 270 day period for finalising the BPC opinion will be the aim for actives from the Review Programme; • Further reflection needed on the application of substitution and exclusion criteria to the 'backlog dossiers'; • Consideration of reserving a capacity for immediate handling by the BPC of Review Programme submissions in 2013.	**Members** are invited to provide their own work programmes (proposed submission of dossiers in 2013-16 under Review Programme) in the CIRCA IG newsgroup entitled 'Other items from BPC-1' and to the Commission **by Friday 19 April**. **SECR** to refine work programme before the next meeting.
6.2. Establishing Working Groups	
The proposed approach in paper BPC-1-2013-02 was agreed subject to the following clarifications: • Highlight support needed by CAs to BPC and WG members; • Consider splitting General WG e.g. into efficacy and physico-chemical & analytical; • WGs to consider the use of virtual pre-discussions for difficult issues; • More than one adviser to be permitted to WGs when necessary.	**Members** are invited to provide any further comments in the dedicated CIRCA IG newsgroup **by Friday 19 April.** **SECR** to draw up mandates and objectives for the the WGs by the next meeting.

6.3. Collaboration with the Member States	
The approach proposed was supported subject to the following clarifications: • The responsibility for drawing up the BPC opinion; • Consider further the alignment of the PBT/CLH processes with the biocides processes; • The most appropriate mechanism for eCA/dossier manager coordination during the evaluation phase.	**Members** are invited to provide further comments in the CIRCA IG newsgroup entitled 'Other items from BPC-1' **by Friday 19 April**. **SECR** to consider the issues further and report back to the next meeting.
6.5. Participation of observers in the BPC	
The proposed approach in paper BPC-1-2013-03 was to be refined including further consideration of involvement of applicants in BPC meetings for type I & II processes.	**SECR** to: • Invite the accredited stakeholders that have expressed an interest to observe the work of the BPC to BPC-2; • Report back to the next meeting regarding the involvement of applicants in BPC meetings for type I & II processes.
7. Rules of procedure	
It was agreed that the draft RoPs would be amended in the light of the discussion. The following principal issues needed further reflection: • Mechanism for appointing co-rapporteurs; • Do we appoint rapporteurs in all cases; • Replacing (co-) rapporteurs; • Consider alternates as rapporteurs; • Rapporteurs for cases specified in 75(1)(g) for the BPR; • Flexibility for the involvement of rapporteurs in working groups; • The use of written procedures for adopting BPC opinions.	**Members** are invited to provide any further comments in the dedicated CIRCA IG newsgroup **by Friday 19 April**. **SECR** to amend the draft RoPs before the next meeting.
8. Working procedures and templates	
8.2. Approval of active substances	
It was agreed that the first draft working procedure (WP) for the approval of active substances will be drawn up based upon the initial proposal by ECHA and the discussion at BPC-1.	**Members** are invited to provide any further comments in the CIRCA IG newsgroup entitled 'Other items from BPC-1' **by Friday 19 April**. **SECR** to prepare the first draft WP for the approval of active substances before the next meeting.
9. Conclusions and action points	
BPC members agreed these main conclusions and action points of BPC-1.	**SECR** to upload the conclusions and action points to the BPC CIRCABC IG after the meeting.

Part III. List of Attendees

Members
CAMILLERI Tristan (MT)
CZAKÓ Klára Mária (HU)
DONS Christian (NO)
DRAGOIU Simona (RO)
GONZÁLEZ MÁRRQUEZ María Luisa (ES)
GREGG Nicola (UK)
HARRISON John (IE)
HEESCHE-WAGNER Kerstin (DE)
IAKOVIDOU Mary (SE)
JANTONE Anta (LV)
LARSEN Jørgen (DK)
MAJUS Saulius (LT)
MERISTE Anu (EE)
NELEMANS Maartje (NL)
PAIRAULT Oliver (FR)
PLATTNER Edmund (AT)
RUBBIANI Maristella (IT)
TERNIFI Vesna (SI)
TUUSA Tiina (FI)
VAN BERLO Boris (BE)
ZOUNOS Athanassios (EL)

Advisors
AZAD Karima (BE)
CHEZEAU Aurelie (FR)
KOMEN Corine (NL)
RAMOS SCHLEGEL Carmen (ES)

ECHA Staff
AIRAKSINEN Antero
BALDUYCK Bo
BUCHANAN Camilla
HOLLINS Steve
KENIGSWALD Hugues
MALM Jukka
RODRIGUEZ UNAMUNO Virginia
SAEZ RIBAS Monica
VAN DE PLASSCHE Erik

Alternates
GAVRIEL Alexandros (CY)

Representatives of the European Commission
CHORAINE Pierre (DG ENV)
CHATELIN Ludovic (DG ENV)

Observers
BUCHMIET Elżbieta (PL)
TURK Rajka (HR)

Part IV. List of Annexes

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

ANNEX II Final agenda

ANNEX I

Documents submitted to the members of the Biocidal Products Committee

BPC-A-1-2013	Final draft agenda
BPC-1-2013-01	Document management
BPC-1-2013-02	Establishing working groups
BPC-1-2013-03	Participation of observers in the BPC
BPC-1-2013-04	Draft BPC rules of Procedure

ANNEX II

BPC-A-1-2013 FINAL
Agreed at BPC-1
(26 March 2013)

Final agenda
1st meeting of the Biocidal Products Committee (BPC)

26-27 March 2013
ECHA Conference Centre (Annankatu 18, Helsinki)
26 March: starts at 9:30
27 March: ends at 16:00

Item 1 – Welcome and Apologies

Item 2 – Adoption of the Agenda

Document: BPC-A-1-2013
For agreement

Item 3 – Welcome address by Jukka Malm, Director of Regulatory Affairs

Item 4 – Tour de table of BPC members

Item 5 – Administrative issues

5.1 Housekeeping issues
For information

5.2 Reimbursement rules
For information

5.3 ICT and document management
Document: BPC-1-2013-01
For information

Item 6 – Working approach of the BPC

6.1 BPC vision, work programme and priorities
For discussion

6.2 Establishing Working Groups
Document: BPC-1-2013-02
For discussion

6.3 Collaboration with the Member States
For discussion

6.4 Member declarations of interest and ECHA policy
For information

6.5 Participation of observers in the BPC
Document: BPC-1-2013-03

For discussion

Item 7 – Rules of procedure

Document: BPC-1-2013-04

For discussion

Item 8 – Working procedures and templates

8.1 Overview of priority working procedures

For discussion

8.2 Approval of active substances

For discussion

Item 9 – Conclusions and action points

Item 10 – AOB

Guidance development

o0o