EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Health and Food Safety Directorate General

Standing Committee on Biocidal Products

17 March 2023
10:30 – 17:30
Hybrid meeting

CIRCABC Link: *https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/8b6b0199-c74b-43bd-a9dd-79bdcae3b825/library/7aba4b38-c9fa-47b3-9c6e-884f0e9d2cd9?p=1*

DRAFT MINUTES

Section A Information and/or discussion

A.01 Adoption of the Agenda

On suggestion from one Member State, one point was added to the agenda, related to information on a meeting organised on 30 March 2023 by two Member States concerning decision-making on the renewal of substances meeting exclusion criteria in PT 8. The agenda was then adopted.

A.02 Adoption of the minutes of the 78th SCBP meeting

The minutes of the 78th SCBP meeting were adopted.

A.03 Exchange of views on the renewal of approval of propiconazole for use in biocidal products of product-type 8

The Commission introduced the main issues and asked for the opinion of Member States on specific conditions of a possible renewal of approval of propiconazole, concerning the authorisations of biocidal products and as regards treated articles and possible risk mitigation measures. The position of one Member State as provided in writing prior to the meeting was also highlighted.

Three Member States supported the proposed provisions.

One Member State requested a restriction for treatment of wood in toys and playgrounds (treated articles), highlighting the importance of protecting kids' health. The Commission clarified that in accordance with Article 2(2)(k) of the Biocidal Products Regulation (BPR), toys treated with biocides are not in the scope of the BPR. Two additional Member States agreed with a possible restriction of the use of treated wood on playgrounds since there can be alternatives for such use.

Another Member State mentioned that there are biocidal products containing propiconazole for use by the general public in their national market. They support that such products should be banned. They also inquired for more information about 'permanent installations' for which another Member State proposed a possible restriction.

Two Member States pointed out that there are no products which contain propiconazole in concentration below 0.1% authorised for use by the general public in their national markets. One of them asked for specifying the use of top-coatings as a possible risk mitigation to prevent leaching. ECHA replied that the use of top-coating as a risk mitigation measure was largely discussed in the BPC and there was no concrete conclusion about it. The same Member State proposed to add a similar provision on treated articles as was included in the renewal of creosote: '*The person responsible for the placing on the market of a treated article shall ensure that the label of that treated article includes the statement: 'During storage, treated wood shall not be accessible to the general public. Measures shall be taken to prevent unauthorised access. Treated wood must be stored on impermeable hard standing or on absorptive material to prevent runoff to the environment, and under shelter or covered with a tarpaulin. Any spill or contaminated material must be collected on such sites and disposed as hazardous waste'*. The Commission inquired whether such provision would fit in the case of propiconazole based on its uses in various treated articles compared to the case of creosote where the uses were very limited (railway sleepers and poles).

Another Member State welcomed the Commission's proposal on a restriction related to uses in contact with food and feed. They suggested possible restrictions not only in relation to playgrounds but to other consumer products as well.

The Commission reminded of the limitations for setting specific restrictions for treated articles through the BPR, and it asked whether a Member State would intend to submit a proposal for restriction under REACH. The Commission also announced its intention to open a newsgroup for further written comments by 14 April on provisions / conditions to be included in the renewal of approval.

A.04 Information on some active substances – efficacy assessment of preservatives

The Commission informed that after receipt of several opinions of the BPC on active substances used as preservatives, discussions took place between the Commission and ECHA on the conduct of the efficacy assessment. ECHA had confirmed to the Commission that efficacy had not been assessed by requiring Tier 2 efficacy testing, although the relevant guidance document foresaw this. The Commission informed of its intention to request ECHA to provide revised opinions that will assess efficacy in line with the applicable ECHA efficacy guidance documents.

The Commission also called the attention of Member States to ensure that active substances are assessed in accordance with the applicable guidance documents.

A.05 Exchange of views on the outcome of the BPC discussion for the Union authorisation of GA 24-50 BPF

ECHA informed, after the checking the rules of procedures of the BPC, that the opinion for this product did not receive the necessary majority during the vote in the BPC, and that it will therefore be re-discussed at the next BPC meeting.

A.06 Exchange of views on a request for derogation in accordance with Article 44 (5) for the Union authorisation of 'AWPF Calcium Hypochlorite BPF'

The Commission introduced a document summarising the justification provided by a Member State for a request for derogation from Union authorisation in accordance with Article 44 (5) of the BPR with regards to the use for the disinfection of water in public swimming pools. That Member State explained, that due to their national norms which are widely applied to operate public pools in their territory, a lower application rate for the product is required. As with lower application rates the formation of disinfection-by-products (DBPs) would be lower, this could be justified on the ground of the protection of human health and the environment. The Member State provided information on the efficacy of the lower application rates proposed.

The Commission asked the other Member States if they agreed that this situation is unique to that Member State or if similar requirements apply for their territories. If it were not unique they were asked if they consider to aim for lower application rates to minimise as much as possible the formation of DBPs as during the assessment there was no conclusion on the risk from DBPs as the work on the relevant guidance is not finalised.

Most Member States explained that they have similar and comparable norms and rules for public swimming pool water as the requesting Member State, while some explained to have other limit values. Several Member States indicated that they would favour to minimise the application rates in view of the formation of DBPs. ECHA explained that an overview of standards was available during the assessment but no relevant data. The eCA explained that during the efficacy assessment there was some discussion if available field data could be used but the BPC working group considered that the mandatory laboratory tests require a certain level of contamination which resulted in higher application rates.

It was agreed that the Commission will mandate ECHA to analyse further these issues and to determine an application rate and potentially ranges to reflect the values applicable in different Member State. In its analysis, ECHA should consider whether the efficacy data provided by the requesting Member State and the available field data should be taken into account, and the applicant should be involved.

A.07 Information on the application for Union authorisation for the biocidal products ‘EuLA hydra-lime 23’ and ‘EuLA oxi-lime 23’

ECHA introduced a document explaining the approach followed in the assessment of the risks from inhalation for some uses of these two biocidal products and a minority opinion raising concerns that the risk identified in the quantitative assessment using the agreed reference value was overruled by a qualitative assessment and that in the qualitative risk assessment the efficacy of personal protective equipment was overestimated. The member state explained its minority opinion.

No comments were made by the other Member States. It was concluded that proposals for authorisation recommended by the BPC was supported by the other Member States. The Commission will continue to prepare the drafts decisions for those two applications.

A.08 Information on a draft Decision addressing questions regarding the second comparative assessment of anticoagulant rodenticide biocidal products

The Commission explained that following the recent adoption of a BPC opinion on the second comparative assessment of anticoagulant rodenticides, a draft Commission Decision under Article 23(5) of the BPR is under preparation. The Commission intends to present a draft proposal at the meeting of the Standing Committee of June and will invite the Committee to provide written comments over the summer. The draft decision will be completed once the second opinion of the BPC will be provided on the remaining question related to a comparison

of active coagulant rodenticides active substances. The draft decision is planned to be prepared for the September meeting.

One Member State strongly disagreed with the views that mechanical traps could be an alternative to AVKs rodenticides in the case of important mice infestations. The Commission asked that Member State to provide its comments in writing.

A.09 Information on a draft Article 36 Decision concerning the biocidal product BOMBEX® PEBBYS® CS

The Commission provided information on the preparation of an Article 36 Decision concerning an insecticide manufactured by encapsulation. An ECHA opinion concerning the possible presence in the product of residual isocyanates and free aromatic amines as a result of the encapsulation process was delivered by the BPC in December 2022. While it excluded the presence of residual isocyanates, the opinion did not exclude the presence of free aromatic amines and an associated risk for human health.

After the reception of the BPC opinion, the Commission requested the applicant whether they can generate additional analytical data concerning the presence of free aromatic amines (if they are able to do so by end-May), after which it will proceed with adopting a decision. Replying to a question from a Member State why the applicant had been given the possibility to generate further data, the Commission explained that this is the first case addressing concerns related to the manufacturing process of an encapsulated product, while other products similarly manufactured have been authorised and are present on the market.

Section B Draft(s) presented for an opinion

B.01 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision not approving cyanamide as an active substance for use in biocidal products of product types 3 and 18

The Commission confirmed that, following the last meeting, the few Member States that had voiced reservations on the draft decision confirmed that they support the non-approval of the active substance, except one. It informed that there was also no support from Member States on a proposal from one Member State to defer the applicability of the non-approval decision in order to give more time to operators to find alternatives, and that this was in fact not possible as the phase out-periods are already established in the BPR. It also noted that provisions of Article 55(1) allowing provisional authorisations may be used by Member States in case the conditions set in that Article are met on their territory (e.g. danger to public health or animal health which cannot be controlled by other means).

The Member State having requested the deferred application indicated to be in position to support the non-approval of the substance considering that it has not been demonstrated that biocidal products of product-types 3 and 18 containing cyanamide meet the approval criteria of Directive 98/8/EC, and that the provisions of Article 55(1) of the BPR may be used by Member States when conditions are met on their territory. It emphasised that the BPR contains also the possibility for a reasoned request for an extension of that period not exceeding 550 days, on which the Commission shall decide without delay. The Commission noted this statement, remarking that it has so far accepted in all cases to grant extension to Member States for permits under Article 55(1) when reasoned requests were submitted.

The Commission indicated that the draft would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023 2023: favourable opinion.

B.02 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision approving (13Z)-Hexadec-13-en-11-yn-1-yl acetate as an active substance for use in biocidal products of product-type 19

The Commission presented the draft decision. Following the previous discussion, the recitals explaining the rationale for the decision had been further elaborated, but the essence of the draft proposal had not changed. No comments were made by Member States.

The Commission indicated that the draft would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023 2023: favourable opinion.

B.03 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision approving ozone generated from oxygen as an active substance for use in biocidal products of product type 2, 4, 5 and 11

The Commission presented the draft Decision. One Member State indicated having had a number of poisoning incidents at national level with ozone generators, that they consider banning ozone generators for the general public on their market, and they do not have a position yet whether they will support the approval. The Commission remarked that the BPC opinion concluded that the use by the general public was considered safe, and a condition in the approval foresees that the product assessment shall give particular attention to non-professional users and the secondary exposure of the general public.

The Commission indicated that the draft would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023 2023: favourable opinion.

B.04 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision (EU) postponing the expiry date of the approval of deltamethrin for use in biocidal products of product-type 18

B.05 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision (EU) postponing the expiry date of the approval of lambda-cyhalothrin for use in biocidal products of product-type 18

B.06 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision (EU) postponing the expiry date of the approval of metofluthrin for use in biocidal products of product-type 18

The Commission introduced agenda items B.04, B.05 and B.06 in group. One Member State mentioned that is it crucial to assess whether the metabolite trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) is formed from the active substance lambda-cyhalothrin, since the active substance belongs to the group of PFAS substancesThe Commission indicated that the draft would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023 2023: favourable opinion on all acts.

B.07 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'WESSOCLEAN GOLD LINE' in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council

The Commission introduced the draft Regulation and recalled that the BPC opinion was adopted by unanimity, no post authorisation requirement was found necessary and that no request for derogation under Article 44(5) had been submitted.

Following a recent agreement in the Efficacy Working Group, the Standing Committee agreed to introduce a new wording in point 1 of section 4.1.1 of the SPC regarding the way to express the necessary contact time for airborne disinfection of hard surfaces.

Two Member States indicated concerns about the presence of the word 'Green' in one of the trade names of the product. The Commission announced that it would contact the applicant and request a modification of the trade name to replace the word with another term to which the applicant agreed.

The Commission indicated that the draft Regulation would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023 2023: favourable opinion

B.08 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the biocidal product family 'HCl Disinfecting Toilet Bowl Cleaner' in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council

The Commission introduced the draft Regulation and recalled that the BPC had agreed its opinion by unanimity, no post authorisation conditions were found necessary and that no Member State requested a derogation under Article 44(5).

The Committee agreed to remove the references to 'a tactile warning of danger' in the SPC as this is regulated under the CLP Regulation. However, the Committee agreed to keep the sentence 'comply with the instructions for use' in section 5.1 of the SPC as this is triggered by the outcomes of the risk assessment and applies to consumer products according to a Coordination Group agreement of December 2020.

The Commission indicated that the draft Regulation would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023: favourable opinion.

B.09 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the biocidal product family 'Lactic acid Family - Quatchem' in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council

The Commission introduced the draft Regulation and informed that the BPC opinion had been adopted by unanimity with no post authorisation condition and no Member State had submitted a request for derogation under Article 44(5).

The Committee agreed to align the expression of the application rates and frequency in the SPC to a wording used in the past for similar applications. In section 5.1, the end of the sentence

'always read the label or leaflet before use and follow all the instructions' was modified to read 'always read the label or leaflet before use' as the use is for professionals only and it is expected that professionals always follow the instructions.

The Commission indicated that the draft Regulation would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023: favourable opinion

B.10 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the biocidal product family 'Oxy'Pharm H_2O_2'

The Commission introduced the draft Regulation that proposes to grant an authorisation to a family of products of product-types 2 and 4 intended for use by professionals by fogging. The Commission referred to a revised version of the SPC, where, on request of one Member State some changes were made in all sections where the concentration value allowing re-entry in the treated room (0.9 ppm or 1.25 mg/m^3) is mentioned. Since in some Member States the occupational exposure limit for hydrogen peroxide is lower than that value, the reference to that value was complemented by "or a lower relevant national reference value". The Commission mentioned that other changes in the SPC concern the removal of a reference to the confidential annex of the product assessment report and also the clarification that medical devices are excluded from the material indicated in the field of use of the first use in meta-SPC 3.

The Commission indicated that the draft Regulation would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 5 and 28 April 2023: favourable opinion.

B.11 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'Spray On wipes'

B.12 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'Spray On'

B.13 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'OP Plus'

B.14 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'APESIN Spray'

B.15 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'APESIN alcogel'

B.16 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'APESIN Handaktiv'

B.17 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'Manorapid express'

B.18 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'Manorapid express GEL'

B.19 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'Superficid express WIPES'

B.20 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'Superficid express'

B.21 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'Chemisept IPA-N'

B.22 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation granting a Union authorisation for the single biocidal product 'Bacticid IPA-N'

The Commission introduced agenda points B.11 – B.22 jointly as the draft Regulations all concern Union authorisation of same biocidal products all referring to different meta-SPCs of the same reference Union authorisation. No comments were made.

The Commission indicated that the draft Regulations would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023 2023: favourable opinion on all acts.

B.23 Exchange of views of the Committee on a Draft Commission Implementing Decision on the unresolved objections regarding the conditions for granting an authorisation for the biocidal product Virazan in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council

The two draft Decisions of agenda points B.23 (Virazan) and B.25 (Rapid pro) were presented together. The draft Decisions intend to resolve disagreements in the Coordination Group, on how to address the risk of primary and secondary poisoning of companion animals for two PT14 biocidal products containing alphachloralose. Both products are already restricted to professional use. The Commission informed that the draft Decisions have been substantially redrafted after the consultation of the Commission services concerned, and the comments received from the authorisation holders.

Despite the substantial changes in the text of the draft Decisions, the conclusion stays the same as in the other three already adopted Decisions on the same disagreement (Commission Implementing Decisions (EU) 2022/1005, (EU) 2022/1006 and (EU) 2022/1388). The Commission therefore considered that, due to the risk of primary and secondary poisoning of dogs in one Member State and of cats in several Member States, the biocidal product does not fully meet the conditions laid down in Article 19(1), point (b)(iii), of Regulation (EU) No 528/2012. Therefore, in accordance with Article 19(5) of Regulation (EU) No 528/2012, the biocidal product may only be authorised in Member States who consider that not authorising it would result in disproportionate negative impacts for society when compared to the risks to human health, animal health or the environment arising from the use of the biocidal product under the conditions laid down in the authorisation. Furthermore, in accordance with Article 19(5) of Regulation (EU) No 528/2012, the use of the biocidal product is to be subject to appropriate risk mitigation measures to ensure that exposure of humans and the environment to that biocidal product is minimised.

The Commission indicated that the draft acts (B23 and B25) would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023 2023: favourable opinion on both acts.

B.24 Exchange of views of the Committee on a Draft Commission Implementing Decision on the unresolved objections regarding the conditions for granting an authorisation for the biocidal product Aquasan in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council

The Commission introduced the draft Decision that intends to resolve the disagreement on the mutual recognition of the product A-Quasan, which had been discussed in the 77th and 78th meeting of the Committee in October and December 2022, respectively, where Member States had been invited to provide comments on the draft decision. The text of the draft decision had been amended after internal discussions but the conclusion remains the same: the Commission concurs with the views of the Member State having raised objections that the use of the biocidal product can be assigned to product-type 3 as described in Annex V to Regulation (EU) No 528/2012, as the product is to be used for disinfection in the veterinary health care area, including veterinary clinics and operating rooms, surfaces, equipment and objects for companion animals. Product-type 3 includes products used for veterinary hygiene purposes such as disinfectants, disinfecting soaps, oral or corporal hygiene products or with anti-microbial function, products used to disinfect the materials and surfaces associated with the housing or transportation of animals, therefore, as the biocidal product is intended to be used for disinfection in the veterinary health care area, the Commission is of the opinion that the correct product type allocation is Products-type 3 which covers products used for veterinary hygiene including disinfectants.

The Commission informed that the CA document CA-May15-Doc8.3 that was the origin of the disagreement in the Coordination Group, had been amended to clarify that is possible to assign, to product-type 3, biocidal products for general surface disinfection in veterinary clinics when the products are also used in veterinary area.

Outcome of the vote by written procedure that took place between 05 April and 28 April 2023 2023: favourable opinion.

B.25 Exchange of views of the Committee on a Draft Commission Implementing Decision on the unresolved objections regarding the conditions for granting an authorisation for the biocidal product Rapid Pro in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council

See agenda point B.23.

Section C <u>Drafts presented for discussion</u>

C.01 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation approving sulfur dioxide released from sodium metabisulfite as an active substance for use in biocidal products of product type 9

The Commission introduced the draft Regulation. One Member State inquired about product-type 4 (PT4). The Commission replied that this is under internal discussions, due to the interactions with the use of the substance as a food additive, and informed that the draft

approval for PT4 is expected to be presented in the next meeting of the Committee. No other comments were raised.

The Commission indicated that the draft act would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible.

C.02 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation approving *Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium*, extract from open and mature flowers of *Tanacetum cinerariifolium* obtained with supercritical carbon dioxide as an active substance for use in biocidal products of product type 18

C.03 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation approving *Chrysanthemum cinerariaefolium*, extract from open and mature flowers of *Tanacetum cinerariifolium* obtained with hydrocarbon solvents as an active substance for use in biocidal products of product type 18

The Commission introduced the draft Regulations jointly, both following the recommendations in the BPC opinions. One Member State mentioned that it will not support the Commission's proposal due to the environmental risk related with the large scale outdoor use of the biocidal products, and that Member States should only approve the associated biocidal products if Article 19(5) of the BPR applies. No other comments were raised.

The Commission indicated that the draft Regulations would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible.

C.04 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision not renewing the approval of acrolein as an active substance for use in biocidal products of product type 12

C.05 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision repealing the postponement of the expiry date of the approval of acrolein as an active substance for use in biocidal products of product type 12

The Commission introduced the draft Decisions jointly, and explained that they have to be adopted at the same time. No comments were raised.

The Commission indicated that the draft Regulations would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible.

C.06 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) approving 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 ('DMPAP') as an existing active substance for use in biocidal products of product types 2 and 4

C.07 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) amending Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1093 as regards the redefinition of the approved active substance didecylmethylpoly(oxyethyl)ammonium propionate for use in biocidal products of product-type 8

The Commission introduced the draft Regulations jointly and explained that they concern in fact the same active substance. One Member State asked if there is also a need to amend the name of the substance in product authorisations already granted for product-type 8. The Commission replied that, for the sake of pragmatism, there is no need for such amendments.

The Commission indicated that the draft Regulations would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible.

C.08 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision (EU) postponing the expiry date of the approval of *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *israelensis* Serotype H14, Strain AM65-52 for use in biocidal products of product-type 18

The Commission introduced the draft Decision. No comments were raised.

The Commission indicated that the draft Decision would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible.

C.09 Exchange of views of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Decision granting a Union authorisation for the biocidal product family 'SALVECO SALVESAFE PRODUCTS' in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council

The Commission introduced the draft Decision and recalled the minority opinion of one BPC Member. The Committee agreed to the solution proposed by the Commission service to solve the issue raised by the minority opinion.

The Committee also agreed to remove the co-formulants from the composition tables of meta-SPC8 and 9. As their concentration does not trigger any classification of the products, these co-formulants should not be considered as substances of concern for those meta-SPCs and should therefore not be labelled. One Member State indicated that the applicant should have had the choice to publish the composition with the co-formulants or not. The Commission informed that the applicant's choice is to not publish the names of the co-formulants.

The Commission service indicated that the draft Decision would be submitted to the vote of the Committee by written procedure as early as possible after the meeting.