EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY DIRECTORATE GENERAL
Food and feed safety, innovation
Pesticides and Biocides

MINUTES

85th meeting of representatives of Members States Competent Authorities for the implementation of Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 concerning the making available on the market and use of biocidal products

19-20 September 2019

1. Adoption of the agenda	For adoption *CA-Sept19-Doc.1*	

The following AOB points were added to the agenda: the use of biocides in organic farming, a mandate being developed for EFSA and ECHA to assess the risks of disinfection-by-product in drinking water formed from PPP residues, a mandate being developed for ECHA to assess risks for pollinators arising from exposure to biocides, the state of play of fact finding missions overview report, an information point from AISE on the control of vector-borne diseases and one point for the closed session. The agenda was then adopted.

2. Adoption of the draft minutes of the previous CA meeting	For adoption *CA-Sept19-Doc.2*	

The minutes of the previous meeting were adopted.

3. Draft delegated acts
No item for information or discussion

4. Biocidal products

4.1. Use of trivial name of the active substance on the product label	For discussion	

The Commission services introduced the topic referring to the two comments received after the July meeting, which were both in favour of including the trivial name on the products label. One Member State was of the view that this issue is not specific only for biocidal substances and considered that this issue should not be addressed under the BPR but under a more generic legislation (e.g. CLP). ECHA mentioned that the requirement to indicate the scientific name comes from the CLP. When it comes to the indication of the name in the products SPC a pragmatic approach could be adopted. One Member State informed about a case where the scientific name of the substance is very long and the applicant has difficulties in including it on the product label. Another Member State suggested that the provisions of Article 22(e) of the BPR might offer a solution, since it requires the indication in the SPC of the "qualitative and quantitative composition in terms of active substances and non-active substances, knowledge of which is essential for proper use of biocidal products". It might be argued that the knowledge of both trivial and scientific name of the substance is essential for a proper use of the biocidal product.

Participants were invited to provide their comments by 11 October 2019.

4.2. Union authorisation		

(a) Executive report on applications for UA	For information *CA-Sept19-Doc.4.2.a.1 & 2*	

The meeting participants were invited to take note of the report uploaded in CIRCABC.

4.3. Report from Coordination Group	For information	

ECHA provided a short summary of the 37th meeting of the Coordination Group held on 16 and 17 September. In the meeting, six referrals were discussed: consensus was reached for two of them and the discussion will continue for other two. For two referrals no agreement was reached in two points that will be therefore referred to the Commission. The preparation for the next IT user group meeting was also discussed as well as the feedback on ongoing e-consultations.

4.4. Executive report on referrals to the Coordination Group in accordance with Article 35 of the BPR	For information *CA-Sept19-Doc.4.4*	

The meeting participants were invited to take note of the report uploaded in CIRCABC.

4.5. BPF concept: consultation on the Q&A annex	For discussion	

The Commission services indicated that an industry association requested the possibility to carry over some of the items listed in the Q&A Annex of the 2014 BPF guidance to the similar Annex of the Note for Guidance 'Implementing the concept of biocidal product family' agreed at the meeting in July 2019. Industry has identified the items that should be carried over and Member States were invited to provide comments.

Two Member States provided comments in writing before the meeting. Another Member State informed that written comments will be submitted in the coming weeks. The Commission services invited Member States authorities to provide comments via the dedicated newsgroup until 11 October 2019.

5. Active substances	

5.1. The in-situ generation of nitrogen for the preservation of museum objects	For discussion *CA-Sept19-Doc.5.1, 5.1.b, 5.1.c*	

The Commission services introduced the topic by referring to the document developed for the meeting, clarifying two aspects of the application of Article 55(3): i) that the authorisation of products by the Member States following a derogation by the Commission should be based on an application for authorisation and ii) that Member States' request for derogation do not need to refer to a specific product or group of products.

One Member State enquired whether economic factors could be taken into account when justifying that the active substance is essential for the protection of cultural heritage. The Commission services indicated that this is indeed one point under discussion and that the Austrian request for derogation indeed makes reference to economic and proportionality considerations. The representative of the International Council of Museums (ICOM) was of the opinion that such factors should be taken into account, considering that museums are non-profit organisations, often financed by public money, and have limits as to how much they can invest in applying different pest eradication technologies. Another Member State expressed concerns regarding the timing of the process outlined in the document prepared for the meeting and remarked that an application for update of Annex I would be the most efficient way forward. The Commission services pointed out that, following a positive decision of the Commission, the Member State having requested the derogation needs to authorise the product. Inclusion in Annex I implies that products can be authorised by simplified procedure. So, both approaches will require some time to complete the procedures. Most probably the derogation will apply during a specified time limit, as legal advice stresses that a derogation should be an exception and not a general rule. One Member State considered that both processes should take place in parallel. The Commission services asked whether ICOM was considering to apply for an inclusion of in situ nitrogen into Annex I. ICOM confirmed that they were considering this avenue. The Commission services invited ICOM to provide such a commitment in writing as this could then be taken into account when deciding on the request for derogation.

In reply to a question from a Member State, the Commission services referred to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 88/2014 which sets out the procedure for the amendment of Annex I. According to this Regulation the procedure has to be triggered by an application with the relevant data. The Commission services pointed out that most of the required data are probably already available from the former dossiers applying for the approval of nitrogen. The Commission services enquired whether other Member States consider submitting a request for derogation. Two Member State informed they will need such a derogation and will apply for it, while eight other Member States informed that they were having discussions with the museums and will decide later on whether to apply for a derogation or not. One other Member State communicated that the museums consulted in their country showed no interest in using this technology.

One Member State pointed out that alternative treatments are not suitable for all cultural objects. The advantage of nitrogen is that it can be used to treat all objects in museums, including large objects. This Member State underlined that it is for the owner of a cultural object to decide on the best method to treat it for conservation. Moreover, alternatives consisting of toxic gasses are not suited for museums with visitors. This view was supported by another Member State. ICOM stressed that museums intend to move away from the use of toxic substances.

A representative of the Austrian Federal Monuments Authority gave a presentation outlining the functioning of the system of in-situ generation of nitrogen and the advantages and disadvantages of various technologies of pest eradication that may be used for the protection of cultural heritage objects.

The ICOM representative made a statement requesting to have it included in the meeting minutes. This statement is Annexed to these minutes.

The Commission services stressed that it is very important that cultural heritage is preserved but indicated that, based on the information submitted on alternatives, the latest having arrived only a few days before the meeting, it is not obvious to conclude that there are no appropriate alternatives. The Commission services will analyse whether costs and feasibility

for museums to work with different technologies can be considered in the decision-making process. The Commission furthermore mentioned that a time limit should probably be set for a derogation, if granted, because of the uncertainties on appropriate alternatives. Hence, the inclusion of in situ nitrogen into Annex I seemed the only mid to long-term solution. The Commission services, therefore, strongly encouraged ICOM to apply for inclusion of in situ nitrogen into Annex I. The Commission services reiterated that, in case a derogation is granted, the products will need to be authorised in the respective Member States and invited those Member States interested in applying for an Article 55(3) derogation to do so soon.

5.2. Relevant renewal data under Article 95	For discussion *CA-Sept19-Doc.5.2*	

The Commission services informed that ECHA will propose a revised guidance on Article 95 and alternative suppliers when the horizontal discussion on the guidance on renewals of approval of active substances (item 7.2.a) is more advanced.

5.3. Progression of the review programme on active substances	For information *CA-Sept19-Doc.5.3*	

The Commission services presented an overview of the progress of the work on the review programme, noting that almost no progress occurred since the last CA meeting. Only 3 reports were submitted by one Member State. The Commission services encouraged again Member States to work along the priority list, and make progress on the backlog reports submitted before 1st September 2013. The Commission also informed that ECHA is working on a set of additional proposals to improve the progress of the review programme, which should be presented at the next CA meeting.

The status report was noted by the CA meeting.

5.4. Progression of the renewal process of approval of active substances	For information *CA-Sept19-Doc.5.4*	

The Commission services presented the overview of on-going and future renewals.
One Member State asked to have a type of ‘alarm system’ that a dossiers is not submitted for renewal. This will help to better the manage the workload. ECHA pointed out that in November the IT user group meeting will take place and this suggestion can be discussed.
The status report was noted by the CA meeting.

6. Treated articles
No item for information or discussion

7. Horizontal matters

7.1. Amendment of Annexes II and III to the BPR	For discussion *CA-Sept19-Doc.7.1*	

The Commission services briefly presented the main changes to the draft text since the last discussion at the meeting in July. The Commission services also clarified its intention to conclude the discussions and launch the formal interservice consultation on a draft delegated act based on this version shortly after the meeting. If the consultation is closed, the competent authorities and other experts can be consulted in the meeting in November on the draft Delegated Regulation amending Annexes II and III to adapt them to scientific and technical progress. Representatives of the EU Parliament and the Council will be invited to attend the meeting. The Commission services proposed to go through the text item per item to see where Member States or stakeholders would have still concerns.

On point 8.10.2, a representative of a Commission service pointed out that the proposed text would lead to the use of many test animals. According to this Commission service, for reproductive toxicity testing triggering of the second generation in the Extended One Generation Test should be evidence-based like in the REACH Regulation, to have it better aligned with the 3Rs approach. The Commission service having prepared the proposal pointed out that the proposal is aligned with the technical guidance of EFSA and ECHA, the specific advice provided by both agencies on what is necessary for determining ED properties, and with the outcome of the detailed and prolonged discussions during the preparatory work.

A Member State requested the use of rats as the preferred species for the test of pre-natal development toxicity (PNDT). The proposed text specified that rabbits (non-rodents) should be the preferred species. Another Commission service commented that for REACH, where the legal text in the Regulation does not specify the species, registrants usually run the study with rats as a first species in practice (as it provides a better comparison with other endpoints). In some cases, rabbits are the first choice. ECHA is developing different criteria to help applicants to choose between the two species for testing under REACH. One Member State indicated that PNDT should be conducted on rats only and that the second species could be skipped. The Commission services invited the other Member States to indicate whether they would support the proposal of the first Member State or not.

On point 8.13.3.1, a representative of a Commission service requested clarification on the need to include a reference to the mammalian toxicity studies listed under point 8.13.3 (i) concerning ED properties. According to this representative the studies under the first indent of point 8.13.3 are designed for other purposes than ED assessment.

One Member State asked why the waiving conditions of point 2.5 had been removed, considering that these conditions would have been useful to address cases where the description of a chemical formula is not possible. The Commission services explained that they had proposed to remove the wording in column 3 because it was found imprecise and not helpful. The Commission services also recalled that the provisions of Annex IV of the BPR ('General rules for the adaption of the data requirements') also apply.

7.2. ECHA guidance		

(a) Draft guidance on data requirements and assessment of applications for renewal of active substances	For discussion *CA-Sept19-Doc.7.2.a*	

The Commission services introduced the discussion reminding of the requests made by Member States at the last CA meeting to have a general discussion on the objectives of the renewal process and a strategy to manage it. The Commission services further recalled that the renewal process should not end up in a similar situation as the review programme where Member States are seriously delayed in completing evaluations and therefore decisions keep being postponed. The proposed draft guidance seemed counter-intuitive against this background as it proposed to perform a full assessment unless a limited assessment is justified, although the spirit of the provision of the BPR was rather the opposite. The Commission services pointed out that a decision to conduct a full evaluation in the context of a renewal automatically implies having to extend the expiry date of approvals, and some Member States currently disagree on extensions for substances subject to exclusion or substitution. The Commission services reminded Member States of the need to allocate appropriate resources for this process, and emphasised that they have the power to set the level of their fees accordingly.

ECHA presented its revised version of the draft guidance document. It considered that the BPR leaves some margin of manoeuvre on the extent of the work to be done during the renewal process, and that the objectives were not set clearly in the BPR. ECHA noted that assessing ED properties of substances meeting already other exclusion criteria could have limited added value, and that performing a full evaluation as referred in the BPR does not necessarily mean to re-assess every study or aspect of the original assessment if there is no good reason to do so (e.g. no new test methods, guidance etc.). One Member State pointed out that the renewal guidance should be clear whether new guidance developed after the submission of the application should be applied for the evaluation at renewal stage.

One Member State considered that the BPR intended that only limited evaluations are conducted during the renewal, but reality shows that 6 months to deliver an assessment is short even when only a limited amount of new data are submitted. Therefore, it will be necessary to perform a full evaluation as referred to in the BPR in all cases. Another Member State considered that other Member States should have the opportunity to provide data to the evaluating CA, and that the evaluating CA should make an e-consultation before deciding on whether a limited evaluation suffices or a full evaluation is necessary. On the latter, the Commission services remarked that the evaluating CA has to decide within 90 days of acceptance of the application by ECHA whether to conduct a full evaluation, which leaves hardly any time for such consultation.

One Member State wanted clearer guidance on what needs to be assessed during a limited evaluation. The Commission services considered that it is difficult to give such general guidance as the assessment depends on the content of the application submitted. In any case, the evaluating CA must conclude on whether the conditions set in the BPR for approval are still met.

Following a question of a Member State, the Commission services confirmed that proposing a harmonised classification is an obligation coming from the CLP Regulation, and should definitely be done in case it did not occur during the process for first approval. The Commission noted that around 130 decisions on active substances (for one or more PTs) had been adopted before the new scientific ED criteria became applicable in June 2018, which means that the new ED criteria will have to be assessed for all the substances concerned during the process for the renewal of approval.

The Commission services informed that they had sent some comments to ECHA on the proposed guidance. In particular a section could be added as regards the assessment of ED properties. Applicants should be reminded that they need to conduct all the necessary studies and submit these with the application for renewal. Applicants should not only start thinking

about generating data after submission of the application. They should take benefit of the pre-submission meeting with their evaluating CA, and should start discussing with the evaluating CA well in advance of submission of the application. As regards section 2.1 on Article 95 data, the Commission services remarked that these data should normally have been reviewed during the assessments in view of the authorisation of biocidal products as it is expected that they should have been part of "a third party dossier". ECHA however referred to some previous agreement in the Coordination Group that that these data are hardly assessed during the assessments in view of authorisations. One Member State considered that Article 95 data have to be assessed at some point.

Two Member States considered that the efficacy of the active substance should be re-assessed during the renewal of the active substance. On the contrary, ECHA considered that it was not necessary considering that many products have been authorised since the original approval which means that their efficacy has been assessed as demonstrated and that the efficacy of these products will be reconsidered for the renewal of their authorisation. A Member State considered that the paragraph related to treated articles needs further consideration as the active substance approval provides the opportunity to set conditions and therefore that Member State would propose a different approach.

One Member State asked clarification on section 1.5 on the 5-batch analysis as there is no need to revisit the 5-batch analysis if the source of the active substance is not changed. Another Member State considered that the renewal document should be part of the assessment report, the renewal guidance should clarify whether a letter of access is required and the guidance should also address the assessment of development of resistance.

ECHA invited Member States to send their comments in writing in the newsgroup by 11 October.

7.3. Disinfectant by-products: relevant guidance development by ECHA	For information	

This item was postponed to the November meeting.

7.4. CA meeting documents commenting: sharing MSs comments with stakeholders	For discussion	

The Commission services informed the participants that, following the discussions in the previous meeting and the comments received after the meeting, they intend to grant access to stakeholder observers to the newsgroups section of the restricted CA interest group in CIRCABC. This will allow them to provide their comments on the topics open for discussion and also to see the comments provided by Member States. In response to questions from Member States, the Commission services clarified that the access to observers will be granted only to the specific newsgroups section of the interest group and underlined that no documents in the library section of the restricted CA interest group will be visible to them. The Commission services invited Member States to pay attention to possible disclosure of confidential information when posting their comments. One Member State asked whether a warning in this sense could be displayed each time a comment is created. The Commission services will check if this is technically feasible.

7.5. ECHA communications	For information *CA-Sept19-Doc.7.5*	

ECHA gave a presentation focusing on IT issues (interaction with users, new SPC functionalities, new R4BP features) and on the forthcoming Biocides Stakeholders Day, scheduled on 29 October 2019. The Commission services enquired on the status of the development by ECHA of a system for authorities allowing an overview on the products and the status of the active/non-active substances under the various chemicals legislations. ECHA indicated that the first step will be the development of a functional inventory of co-formulants used in biocidal products.

7.6. Update on Court cases T337/18, T347/18, T734/18(R)	For information	

The Commission reminded that the applicant for Court Case T-337/18 and T-347/18 on PHMB (1415; 4.7) asked the Court for a hearing. The Commission also informed that ECHA and Belgium sent their interventions to the Court for Case T-734/18 on empenthrin.

7.7. Organisation of a multiple stakeholders event on the control of insects responsible for vector borne diseases	For information	

The Commission services informed the CA meeting about future cooperation between SANTE E.4 and the European Centre for Diseases Prevention and Control (ECDC). Former contacts with ECDC highlighted the importance of sharing information on available insecticides on the market authorised under the BPR but also under transitional regimes. Member States are invited to inform the Commission about the trade names, claims and contact details of the manufacturers of insecticides for mosquitoes and ticks that are placed on the market under national rules via the dedicated newsgroup on CIRCABC.

One Member State mentioned that the national procedure under Article 39 of the BPR is not a guarantee that the product will reach the market in each MS, although the the control of insects responsible for vector borne diseases is presumably a problem affecting all MSs.. The decision to selectively market a product will still lie with the authorisation holder. An UA for such products would therefore be more appropriate.

An industry association presented briefly its policy on insects controls which is available here.

7.8. Article 65(3) reporting: web-based tool for 2020 reporting	For information	

The Commission services informed that the template agreed for the first round of reporting was transposed into a survey format and the last details are being finalised. Some features of the format used (EU Survey) were presented and it was mentioned this format is also used by the Commission when running public consultations. The link to the specific reporting survey will be circulated to the competent authorities in the coming weeks. One Member State enquired whether, in cases where more than one authorities are responsible for biocides, more reports should be submitted. The Commission services clarified that a single report per

Member State, compiling data provided by all competent authorities, should be submitted (by one of the competent authorities) for each Member State.

8. Scope matters		
8.1 Disinfection of garden tools	For information	

The Commission services informed that the Standing Committee on Biocidal Products in its meeting of 19 September 2019 gave a favourable opinion on the proposal of Union authorisation for the single biocidal product with the claim "Disinfection of gardening equipment for human hygiene purpose only". As regards the discussion on the borderline of the use of products for the general hygiene purposes, the Commission services clarified that the disinfection for human hygiene purposes is a biocidal use and this was confirmed by the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed, section phytopharmaceuticals. The Commission is open to discuss further this matter in a future competent authorities meeting. One Member State proposed to develop a reflection paper on this issue.

8.2 Scope issues identified during the drafting of PT 11-12 efficacy guidance	For discussion *CA-Sept19-Doc.8.2*	

The Commission services introduced the topic reminding that this point was put forward by CEFIC, which prepared the document distributed for the meeting. CEFIC mentioned that the document is the result of discussions that took place during the development of efficacy guidance for PT 11 and 12, when several borderline cases were identified. Three Member States indicated that there is a need for clarity on this issue. CEFIC invited the participants to check the document and provide their views on the interpretation of the uses described. The CA meeting was invited to send their comments in writing in the newsgroup by 11 October.

9. Enforcement issues
No item for information or discussion

10. International Matters		
10.1 OECD Working Group on Biocides meeting on 25-26 September 2019	For information	

11. AOB		
(a) List of Competent Authorities and other Contact Points	For information *CA-Sept19-Doc.11.a*	

(b) Use of biocides in organic farming		

The Commission services informed that authorities in charge of the Organic Farming Regulation are currently reviewing their current lists of allowed biocides, and that some inconsistences with the BPR were noted. The Commission services invited biocides Competent Authorities to discuss this issue with their national contacts points on organic farming. The Commission will send the organic contacts points to biocides CAs to facilitate the national communications.

(c) Mandate to EFSA/ECHA to assess the risks of DBP in drinking water formed from PPP residues		

The Commission services informed that EFSA and ECHA will be soon mandated to assess the risks of the presence of residues of plant protection products in drinking water and their possible interaction with disinfection systems (chlorination or ozonisation). The Commission services will give a regular update on the development of this mandate.

(d) Mandate to ECHA to assess risks for pollinators arising from exposure to biocides		

The meeting was informed that the Commission has recently requested EFSA a review to the Guidance Document on the Risk Assessment of Plant Protection Products on Bees. In this mandate, EFSA has been requested to closely cooperate with ECHA, as some active substances have a dual use in plant protection products and in biocidal products and consistency on the implementation of the regulatory frameworks for plant protection and biocidal products is necessary.

The Commission services presented the state of play of the EFSA review to inform the CAs in charge of the BPR on the latest developments on this issue.
The Commission services informed the CA-meeting on its intention to send a mandate to ECHA to evaluate the need to develop a specific guidance, in addition to EFSA guidance, to assess risks for pollinators arising from exposure to biocides.

(e) State of play of fact finding missions		

The CA meeting was informed that the summary report of the fact finding missions is finalised and the conclusions of the workshop are being prepared.

(f) One point for the closed session		Closed session

The item was discussed in closed session.

Annex: **Statement of ICOM representative in relation to point 5.1 of the agenda**

"*[A response to the position of Thermo Lignum]*
It is obvious, that Thermo Lignum is "muddying the waters" in this case and that they only take an interest in the matter in order to protect their market position and eliminate competition.

For ICOM and ICOMOS there is more at stake. This is partly a matter of being able to freely choose the best method for eradicating pests in our collections all over Europe and partly a scientific discussion about what is the best solution.

Thermo Lignum is trying to convince you that there are other alternatives to the anoxia method and the use of nitrogen because they equal their own warm air method with that of anoxia or controlled air. In their letter to the Commission (annexed at the former CA meeting) numerous scientific articles were mentioned to support this position.

However, museums and conservators worldwide do not share this view. The heat applying methods (like Thermo Lignum) as well as the frost applying methods **do** have some limitations when it comes to which materials that can be treated and which not - even if you maintain a stable relative humidity of about 50 % in and around the cultural heritage objects during treatment. And there is a negative list for these two methods. Whereas for anoxia there is none.

In their position letter, Thermo Lignum "forgets" to mention an article by Marieanne Ball et al. from 2013 "Assessment of the Thermo Lignum Oven Pest eradication treatment" where a specific range of natural and synthetic polymers and resins from an ethnographical collection was submitted to TL treatment in order to investigate whether these materials were fit for the treatment or not. And it appeared that several of these materials showed a variety of changes due to the heating treatment. The same year, Querner and Kjerulf made an overview article on the available eradication methods used on cultural heritage objects and raised reasonable doubts on several kinds of materials with reference to warm air treatment.

This is why the anoxia method has been included and promoted in the standard EN 16790:2016 Integrated Pest Management for protection of cultural heritage.

All these observations and the related literature in favor of the anoxia method is listed in a letter of sept 4th from Mr. Thomas Jakl, Federal Ministry of Austria for sustainability and Tourism to Mr. Klaus Berend, DG SANTE.

ICOM/ICOMOS fully supports the statements mentioned in that letter**.**

Finally, I wish to say that we don't think more time should be spent on the claims of Thermo Lignum. Their method/product is good for a great number of cultural heritage materials, but the Thermo Lignum treatment does not equal with the anoxia or controlled atmosphere treatment. Anoxia is the most comprehensive method, since it covers by far the most materials and, in many ways, it is the least risky method when considering the risk of damage during treatment of our cultural heritage.

[On the differences between the needs for resp. nitrogen in cannisters and insitu generated nitrogen]
Another reason to support a derogation is that museums all over Europe need time to solve the matter properly. We need to file an application in order to have insitu generated nitrogen adopted in the BPR.

The reason why only nitrogen in canisters have been adopted so far, is that this was the method preferred by the applicant – namely Rentokil. I have been working on projects with this company in Denmark and know the method very well. It follows the procedure described in the original report (part of the dossier) leading to the adoption of nitrogen in the BPR. The reason why a company like Rentokil uses this method is that they perform disinfection tasks in various places all over – the business is based on mobility.

What we are doing in the museums, is the opposite. We use our anoxia facilities in fixed places in connection with huge museum stores where the anoxia facility is part of the infrastructure and part of a continuous routine. Therefore, it makes sense to use in situ generated nitrogen – it is a cheap and environmentally friendly method. We do not transport batteries of canisters to and from suppliers making a huge CO2 imprint and wasting a lot of time." (End of statement of ICOM representative)

Next meetings:

2019 (provisional)

CG	CA and SCBP	BPR Subgroup Forum	BPC	BPC's WG
-	-	-	26 Feb-1 March	
12-13 March	13-15 March	21-22 March	-	
-	-	-	-	
13-14 May	16-17 May	-	-	
-	-	20-21 June	24-28 June	
3 July	4-5 July	-	-	
-	-	-	-	
16-17 September	19-20 September	-	-	
-	-	-	7-11 Oct	
19-20 November	20-22 November	7-8 November	-	
-	-	-	9-13 Dec	

2020 (provisional)

CG	CA and SCBP	BPR Subgroup Forum	BPC	BPC's WG
-	3-7 Feb	-		
		26-27 March	2-6 March	
-	-	-	-	
	12-15 May	-	-	
-	-	25-26 June	15-18 June	
		-	-	
-	-	-	-	
	22-25 Sept	-	-	
-	-	29-30 Oct-	5-9 Oct	
			-	
-	8-11 Dec-	-	30 Nov - 4 Dec	