



5th Working group meeting on Toxicity of Chemical Mixtures (TCM)

Meeting date: 24 January 2011 starting at 10:00

B232 room 02/17A – Brussels

Minutes

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The chairman welcomed the participants and participants and indicated the apologies.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING.

The minutes were approved.

4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST ON MATTERS ON THE AGENDA

There were no interests declared.

5. DISCUSSION OF THE OPINION AND DISTRIBUTION OF TASKS

- There is a need for this opinion to offer a framework for the assessment of mixtures.

- There are some inconsistencies which need to be clarified.

- To clarify our position vis-à-vis The State of the Art report.

- Definitions of simple and complex mixtures are still missing.

- To distinguish between the levels of risk assessment (EU, national, local).

- There should be a contribution or at least comment on the mixtures in cosmetics and pharmaceuticals by an external expert.

- To provide examples and also to refer to AB's manuscript (circulated earlier) in the text (page 9).

- A decision tree (tiered approach) to be developed to help regulators decide when adverse effects might be expected.
- To link the text on page 11 with the previous section.
- To send some examples of long-term testing (biocides directive).
- A sentence to be added about the cosmetics regulation.
- To write some text about the toxicology approach and a footnote about the environmental ... (the bees).
- The limitations and advantages for each of the approaches are needed.
- To check line 26 (page 16) and to add a text for the effect on the environment of chemicals of low-dose concentrations.
- The epidemiological evidence and the text on uncertainty are to be modified and inserted in the opinion.
- The current risk assessment methodology for evaluation of single chemicals may be used; however, all possible sources of exposure are to be considered.
- The answers of question 1 to be categorized according to the three modes of action.
- In the answers of question 1, it should be clearly indicated that this WG does not agree with the evidence presented in The State of the Art report about the effects of low-dose concentrations because this is the key issue and the focus of attention by the interest groups (NGOs and industry).
- In the answers of question 4 it should be indicated that the margin-of-exposure (MoE) approach is the best for no-known-threshold-effect substances.
- In question 5 – there are no major knowledge gaps in terms of methodology. There is a data gap, i.e. information needed to be able to apply the already developed approaches for risk assessment.
- In question 6 – research is needed to identify a different approach to evaluating large amounts of data.
- The EPA flow chart and the IPCS document may serve as a starting point for the development of better criteria with priorities for risk assessment of mixtures.

6. NEXT MEETING – 29 MARCH 2011

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was none.