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

MINUTES

83rd 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

16-17 May 2019

1. Adoption of the agenda	For adoption *CA-May19-Doc.1.rev2*	

The following items were added to the agenda under AOB: biocidal products used in the manufacturing process of medical devices; report from AISE-CEPE workshop on preservatives in paints and detergents of 15 May; workshop on 19-21 June on fact-finding missions; organisation of CA meetings in 2020. The agenda was then adopted.

2. Adoption of the draft minutes of the previous CA meeting	For adoption *CA-May19-Doc.2*	

The draft minutes of the 82nd CA meting were adopted.

3. Draft delegated acts		
3.1 Draft proposals including certain food and feed active substances into Annex I to the BPR	For discussion *CA-May19-Doc.3.1.a* *CA-May19-Doc.3.1.b* *CA-May19-Doc.3.1.c* *CA-May19-Doc.3.1.d* *CA-May19-Doc.3.1.e* *CA-May19-Doc.3.1.f* *CA-May19-Doc.3.1.g*	

The Commission services presented the revised draft proposals of delegated acts including certain food and feed active substances into Annex I to the BPR. These versions contain various drafting changes compared to the previous versions, following extensive discussions with legal revisers of Commission's Legal Service. However, these changes are mostly editorial and do not change the nature and key aspects of these inclusions. The main change rather concerns the inclusion of vinegar, where no reference is made anymore to the EN standard, as suggested by one Member State during the last CA meeting.

One Member State suggested a different wording in the inclusion conditions with regard to the reference to food and feed definitions, as these substances used in biocidal products are not intended to be ingested by human or animals as food or feed. The Commission noted the comment, but indicated that this has been subject to long internal discussions and indicated that the drafting proposal relates directly to the origin of this whole exercise of amending Annex I where reference was made to food and feed definitions in the previous provisions in Article 6 of Regulation 1451/2007. According to the Commission services, it is clear that biocidal products are not intended to be ingested as food or feed. No changes was therefore considered necessary in the drafting proposals. .

Following the explanations provided by the Commission services, the draft delegated acts were agreed by the expert group as presented. The draft acts will be notified to WTO prior to adoption by the Commission. Considering the procedure for adoption and publication of

delegated acts, these acts could be published at the EU OJ around October 2019. Specific information will be provided to the notifiers of these substances.

4. Biocidal products		

4.1. Report from Coordination Group	For information	

The ECHA representative reported the most relevant topics discussed in the Coordination Group meeting held on 13-14 May.

4.2. Executive report on referrals to the Coordination Group in accordance with Article 35 of the BPR	For information *CA-May19-Doc.4.2*	

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

4.3. Executive report on product authorisations	For information *CA-May19-Doc.4.3*	

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

4.4. Union authorisation		

(a) Executive report on applications for UA	For information *CA-May19-Doc.4.4.a.1 & 2*	

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

(b) Executive report on delays for UA applications	For discussion *CA-May19-Doc.4.4.b*	Closed session

The item was discussed in closed session.

4.5. Transformations of applications for product authorisations and the applicability of provisions in Article 89	For discussion and agreement *CA-May19-Doc.4.5*	

The Commission services indicated that currently the applicability of the provisions in Article 89 are being discussed for three specific situations which are described in the note. At the moment, internal discussions in the Commission services are on-going and it is the intention to provide a way forward in the next CA meeting. Some participants underlined that the cases differ whether an applicant could have prevented the situation that no application had been

submitted before the date of the approval of the last existing active substance in the biocidal product. Participants were invited to submit other cases where further clarification is required on the applicability of the Article 89 provisions by 3 June 2019.

4.6. Management of product authorisations for *in situ* cases	For discussion and agreement *CA-May19-Doc.4.6.a* *CA-May19-Doc.4.6.b*	

The Commission services explained that recent comments from a Member State have triggered new discussions and may have implications on how certain biocidal products generated in situ should be authorised (i.e. as single biocidal product or as a family of biocidal products). The meeting agreed to the Commission proposal to organise a meeting between volunteering Member States, the Commission services and stakeholders in order to find a way forward to finalize the proposal as soon as possible.

A Member State requested the Commission to consider the revision of the footnote 33.

4.7. Disinfectant by-products	For discussion and agreement *CA-May19-Doc.4.7*	

The Commission services referred to the discussion in the March 2019 meeting and the input received from participants. The participants taking the floor agreed that guidance should be applied if it is available. One Member State pointed out that available guidance could be applied to other type of uses.
The CA-meeting agreed that:

1. If guidance is available it should already be applied in the assessment;
2. The Commission asks ECHA to start developing relevant guidance. ECHA will decide, in consultation with the experts, what are the sections with highest priority. It is already indicated to ECHA that the DBP affecting food and drinking water is to be considered as a priority.

Regarding the time frame to be expected for guidance development: ECHA will come back on the point to the September meeting after having consulted the experts.

4.8. Applicability of Coordination Group recommendations regarding BPFs	For discussion and agreement *CA-May19-Doc.4.8*	

The Commission explained that the objective of the new guidance note was to include the new recommendations of the CG Working Parties (CG WPs) on the implementation of the Biocidal Product Family (BPF) concept. The Commission informed that on top of the CG WPs recommendations, the document also includes the content of the Q&A Annex of the current guidance. The Commission also highlighted that certain parts of the text need further clarification. The relevant experts of the CG will be consulted for this.

The Commission indicated that one of the key issues of the CA document is the date of applicability. In the version put forward for the meeting, the recommendations of the CA-July12-Doc.6.2.d document on applicability of guidance were followed. According to this

document, a derogation to the default cut-off date of two-years for the applicability of new guidance could be granted only in cases where there are serious concerns. However, the Commission recalled that the CG recommended an earlier applicability of the guidance. Eight Member States explained that the applicability of this guidance is urgently needed. It should clarify the concept of family of biocidal products for applicants and support Member States in the assessment of BPF applications. According to some Member States some applications already submitted are not manageable and should be split based on the information contained in the guidance. Five Member States were in favour of an applicability of the guidance to existing applications. Three Member States and three industry associations supported an applicability of the guidance to new applications submitted after the endorsement of the guidance by the CA.

The Commission services concluded that the date of applicability of the guidance will be revised to accommodate the needs of Member States to correctly assess applications for BPF authorisation.

4.9. French provision on the restriction of use and placing on the market of treated wood	For information	Closed session

The item was discussed in closed session.

5.	**Active substances**

5.1. Progression of the review programme on active substances	For information *CA-May-Doc.5.1*	

The Commission services presented the status report on the review programme and reminded that Member States should organise their work along the priority lists.

One Member State expressed the concerns received from stakeholders that the BPC work plan available on the ECHA website stops in 2019, and does not include further information about the work planned in 2020. ECHA replied that this situation is due to the fact that Member States have not indicated any submission of assessment reports on active substances which would allow making such working plan, and reiterated its concerns on the matter, echoed by the Commission services. The Commission services called therefore Member States to make progress in their evaluation work so that ECHA activities can continue.

5.2. Progression of the renewal process of approval of active substances	For information *CA-May19-Doc.5.2*	

The Commission services presented the status report on the applications for renewal of approval.

5.3. Management of in situ generated chlorine dioxide and related substances in the Review Programme	For discussion and agreement *CA-May19-Doc.5.3*	

ECHA presented its revised proposal concerning the management of in situ generated chlorine dioxide and related substances in the review programme. It proposed to maintain the approach agreed in 2015, meaning that the second precursors would be assessed as part of the product authorisation applications.

One Member State indicated it could support the proposal, but asked that ECHA coordinates the product authorisation stage to avoid that several Member States would assess the same second precursors at that stage. It also requested to limit the number of second precursor allowed at product authorisation in an application for a biocidal product family, in order to avoid having unmanageable applications.

Another Member State requested that it is recognised in the document that the approach proposed by ECHA will potentially generate delays in the assessment of applications for product authorisation. Another Member State noted that the same debate and arguments were raised in 2015, that there are no new elements, so the approach should be maintained. It therefore agreed with the ECHA proposal. It also supported the previous remarks and noted the need for further guidance from ECHA for product authorisation.

The proposal presented in the document was agreed. As proposed by Member States, ECHA will add a sentence on the possible induced delays during product authorisation, and a revised version will be posted in the 83rd CA meeting folder for this meeting.

It was also requested to industry and the participants in the review programme for in situ chlorine dioxide entries to provide information to ECHA on the technologies present on the market and the second precursors being used, so that ECHA can consider this information in the possible recommendations and guidance for product authorisation. ECHA agreed to coordinate the assessment of the second precursor if several authorities are involved. The coordination group will be asked whether there is a need to develop guidance on the number and type of precursors included in a product.

5.4. The in-situ generation of nitrogen for the preservation of museum objects	For discussion *CA-May19-Doc.5.4*	

The Commission services introduced the situation described by the letter sent by ICOM/ICOMOS, where these associations recently informed about their issue related to the in situ generation of nitrogen for the preservation of museum artefacts and monuments.

The representative from ICOM (International Council of Museums), as well as the representative from a company building in-situ generation chambers, considered that nitrogen is acting by removing oxygen and the resulting low level of oxygen is killing organisms, and considered that nitrogen is not as an active substance. The representative from ICOM expressed the technical challenges of the substitution of the technique by using canisters of nitrogen, that he considered not practical, implying the need of storage chambers and the need to use the product from the sole company having an authorisation for the technology. The representative from ICOM questioned why restrictions were set in the current Annex I entry for nitrogen, and enquired about the procedure to be followed in order to get in situ generation of nitrogen into Annex I to the BPR. ICOM underlined that museums are working intensively to use less dangerous chemicals.

Two Member States considered that the present case was not falling under the scope of the BPR.

The Commission services referred to the information already provided in the reply provided to ICOM by letter on 12 April 2019. The Commission services, supported by other Member States, reminded that nitrogen, as well as in-situ generation, are in the scope of the BPR, and that the issue must therefore be solved using the provisions set therein.

One Member State enquired whether it could be possible to modify the current Annex I entry to cover also the in-situ generation of nitrogen, or include it in category 6 as well. The Commission services noted that an inclusion into category 6 of the BPR would mean that the provisions of Article 95 of the BPR may be applicable to the technology (as set in Article 95(6) of the BPR). The relevance of an inclusion into category 6, or another category, can be further investigated in case an application is submitted for Annex I inclusion.

As regards the procedure to be followed in order to get in situ generation of nitrogen into Annex I to the BPR, the Commission services referred to the procedure set by Regulation 88/2014. One Member State called the attention of ICOM on the fact that, in the dossier to be submitted for Annex I inclusion, it will be important to identify clearly the risk mitigations put in place for the use of this technology, noting that the use of nitrogen under the BPD was restricted to trained professionals only, due to the level of precautions required.

ICOM proposed to gather information on the technology, risk mitigation measures, and the current absence of alternatives, and provide this information to Member States authorities. ICOM also noted its interest to prepare an Annex I inclusion application.

The Commission services asked the Member States concerned by the issue to inform by 3rd June 2019 whether they intend to request a derogation pursuant to Article 55(3) of the BPR. The exact process to be followed to effectively request the derogation will be defined afterwards.

5.5. Relevant renewal data under Article 95	For discussion *CA-May 19-Doc.5.5*	

ECHA presented its document to get clarifications on the interpretation of "relevant data" in the context of Article 95(7) of the BPR.

Member States and stakeholders were invited to send comments by 3rd June 2019, for further discussion at a subsequent CA meeting.

6. Treated articles

6.1. Garments treated with permethrin	For discussion *CA-May19-Doc.6.1*	

The Commission services briefly introduced the document prepared by the Estonian competent authority and regarding garments treated with permethrin and marketed with the claim of protecting against stings and bites of insects. Three Member States were of the

opinion that the garment is a treated article due to the fact that its primary function is to clothe the wearer and the other functions are secondary. The Member State having proposed this item for the agenda and other eight Member States were of the opposite view and considered that the garment should be considered a biocidal product, as it is marketed as an insect-resistant garment, highlighting the biocidal claim and its biocidal function. One Member State drew the attention to the fact that nowadays permethrin is found almost everywhere in the environment and that mass production and use of such garments, if they were to be considered treated articles, will only worsen the situation. Other two Member States concurred with this view and also pointed out that the purpose of the regulation should be borne in mind, which is not to encourage an indiscriminate use of biocidal products.

It emerged from the discussion that there are divergent views among Member States on whether those garments should be considered a treated article or a biocidal product. The Estonian competent authority was invited to consider whether to submit an Article 3(3) request to the Commission on this matter.

7. Horizontal matters

7.1. ECHA communications	For information *CA-May19-Doc.7.1*	

ECHA gave two presentations, on the action plan following the Active Substances Workshop held at ECHA in February 2019 and on mapping the BPR-related information on the ECHA website, respectively.

With regard to the first presentation, on the actions agreed after the Active Substance Workshop, the Commission services supported by Member States thanked ECHA for these actions. One Member State asked for additional training on the assessment of ED properties. It was confirmed that such additional training will be organised under the scope of BTSF. Another Member State also asked for more trainings from ECHA, and not only on ED assessment. Another Member States requested that BPC members (and not only BPC Working group members) are informed when guidance documents are updated.

Another Member State further indicated that it is not satisfied with the current level of requirement of ECHA and RAC on the format of CLP dossiers on biocidal active substances. Referring to the discussions that took place during the ECHA workshop organised on 12-13 February, the Commission informed that it well noted this point, and that further discussions on the matter need to take place between the different Commission services involved in this topic (SANTE, GROW, ENV).

7.2. ECHA guidance		

(a) State of play ECHA guidance (on-going consultation, finalised guidance)	For information *CA-May19-Doc.7.2.a*	

This item was not discussed.

(b) Priority setting for developing ECHA guidance	For discussion *CA-May19-Doc.7.2.b*	

The Commission services introduced the topic mentioning that it was already discussed in several previous meetings.

ECHA informed that based on the input received they revised the document, which is an inventory of the main needs and of the ongoing work, and wanted to know whether the current document addresses the needs of Member States in terms of transparency and clarity and whether there are other needs that have to be addressed. In reply to one industry association, who enquired whether guidance on in-situ generating systems will be developed, ECHA replied that the existing Working Group recommendations (developed with a focus on in-situ active substances) will be updated to include elements specific to in-situ generated products. One Member State expressed appreciation for having the overview provided in the document but was of the opinion that having the overview of guidance under development is not necessarily needed and the focus of the discussion should be on guidance that needs to developed and on how to prioritise those needs. ECHA mentioned that the document covers not only the guidance under development but also the identified needs and that the additional needs flagged by Member States in previous commenting rounds will be included in the next update of the document. ECHA invited Member States to indicate further needs and express their views on prioritisation bearing in mind that resources will have to be allocated for the development of the prioritised needs.

With regard to the development of guidance for bees that had been flagged as a need in the comments of one Member State, the Commission services mentioned that they will probably provide in the near future a mandate to ECHA to work on it.

Stakeholders were also invited to express their views on the priorities for guidance. One industry association enquired whether there are specific criteria to be considered when expressing the views on priorities (e.g. impact of not having the needed guidance) and whether focus is needed on missing guidance (which hinders the evaluation work of competent authorities) or on guidance which would significantly contribute to the risk assessment conclusions. In Commission services' view, developing specific criteria for the prioritisation is challenging, since both the scientific and political dimension need to be considered. ECHA stated that the input from Member States and stakeholders is extremely important, in terms of specific needs, reasons why a specific topic should be prioritised and timelines.

Member States and stakeholders were requested to send further comments by 3rd June 2019.

(c) Draft guidance on data requirements and assessment of applications for renewal of active substances	For discussion *CA-May19-Doc.7.2.c*	

ECHA presented its revised document. The Commission services noted that they had not the possibility to fully check the revised document and the comments received after the last CA meeting yet. In particular, it considers that a full re-evaluation of every data should normally not take place systematically as this was not foreseen by the Co-Legislators who rather foresaw limited re-evaluations as a baseline. The Commission services stressed that the

renewal of approval process should not end-up as the current review programme where it takes 10 years to get an assessment done by an evaluating CA.

One Member State considered it necessary to re-assess every endpoint in the light of new guidance. Supported by other Member States, it questioned also the benefit of using IUCLID for the renewal process taking into account the difficulties associated with using this tool. ECHA pointed out that IUCLID may be improved based on the feedback from the users and underlined that the benefit of IUCLID is in relation to dissemination of the reports and the check of confidentiality.

Member States and stakeholders were requested to send further comments by 3rd June 2019.

7.3. The notification of the United Kingdom pursuant to Article 50 of the Treaty	For information	

The Commission services reported that during the Standing Committee meeting Member States were informed on the status of the applications for active substances that were transferred to a new evaluating competent authority and of the applications for product authorisations where the United Kingdom is the reference Member State.
One industry association thanked Member States and the Commission for their efforts in identifying a potential new reference Member State for the 'orphan' product authorisation cases.

7.4. EU-wide forecasting of applications	For discussion	

The Commission services proposed not to discuss this item and to bring it again for discussion at the September meeting, also in consideration the ongoing project commissioned by ECHA with a view to improving the fee estimation (under REACH and BPR), which could provide useful input for the discussion.

7.5. Amendment of Annexes II and III to the BPR	For discussion *CA-May19-Doc.7.5*	

The Commission services explained the new proposal for the Extended One Generation Test (EOGRTS), Developmental Neurotoxicity Test (DNT) and Developmental Immuntoxicity Test (DIT) data requirements. The draft has been proposed by ECHA, EFSA and JRC which were involved in the preparation of the ED assessment guidance for biocidal and plant protection products. The Commission services underlined that the two agencies and JRC fully agree on the proposal and recalled that the EU Parliament recently requested coherence in the evaluation of ED properties of chemical substances under various EU chemical legislation. The Commission services, responding to a comment of a Member State, indicated to use it's available means to ensure that data requirements for plant protection products and biocidal products for these tests will be aligned.

Three Members supported the proposal except the DNT data requirement which should not be considered as core data set but should rather be triggered based on available information. One EEA country was satisfied with the proposal. One Member State proposed that DIT be also

considered as Core Data set. Finally, one Member State rejected the proposal on the ground that it does not sufficiently strike the balance between animal welfare and the need to assess EDs properties. According to that Member State, a EOGRTS study with all cohorts is the only option that could adequately address this issue.

Before the meeting, one Member State also expressed the view that the proposed 10 weeks pre-mating exposure is contrary to the standard two weeks exposure of the EOGRTS in OECD guideline. Three Members States disagreed and supported the inclusion of the 10 weeks exposure. The Commission services explained that the two weeks period was the compromise found for the wording of the EOGRTS data requirement under REACH. A 10 weeks period is necessary to allow differentiating between effects on brain development and after sexual maturation that are important information to conclude on substance properties. However, another option is that the pre-mating exposure duration should be 2 weeks and the treatment should continue for an additional 8 weeks so that effects on fertility will not be missed. The Commission services pointed out the experiences with triggering the cohorts of EOGRTS under REACH. One Member State indicated that under the BPR it will be a different situation as an evaluating competent authority can ask additional information without needing the agreement of other Member States.

The Commission services and ECHA explained that the DNT cohorts in EOGRTS may provide indications but will not bring enough information to conclude whether the substance under investigation has ED properties or not. In many cases, the specific TG 426 DNT study will have to be triggered in order to be able to conclude. ECHA was invited to clarify whether a negative outcome of the DNT cohort in EOGRTS is sufficient to conclude that there is no further need for triggering TG 426. One Member State pointed out that DNT cohort in EOGRTS provide no information on learning and memory.

Two Member States requested the organisation of a new WebEx meeting similarly to the one that was organised in January 2019 to discuss the latest divergences between Member States. The Commission services answered that such consultation could be organised in order to help to overcome the current divergences. However, such an event should be organised rapidly in order to allow the Commission to propose a final draft for the July meeting. The Commission services recalled the urgency to conclude on the matter, as this item has been discussed for more than a year in CA meetings, and asked ECHA to organise the WebEx meeting as soon as possible and requested the Member States and observers of the expert group to nominate their experts. The Commission services will inform as soon as possible the nominated experts about the date of the meeting. The Commission services will also inform the PAFF committee on the state of play of the discussion.

The following topics should be on the agenda of this technical meeting:

- How to assess reproductive effects? DNT cohorts of TG 443 or separate study on developmental neurotoxicity (TG 426)?
- Shall TG 426 be a core data set or could it be triggered based on available information? What should be the information to trigger a TG426?
- Should a 10 weeks pre-mating exposure take place in EOGRTS? Is this approach in line with the EFSA-ECHA ED guidance?

Regarding the assessment of ED properties of products, the Commission services explained that the proposal has been revised in the light of the feedback received during and after the last meeting. The Commission services explained that the assessment of non-active

substances will be limited to substances of concerns and therefore not all non-active substances contained in biocidal products would have to be addressed during the evaluation. The data requirements in relation to ED properties for human health and the environment of the non-active substances have also been aligned. No Member States or observers commented the proposal.

Member States and observers were invited to involve colleagues in other regulatory areas in the preparation of their written comments regarding the EOGRTS, DNT and DIT data requirements and the proposal for the ED assessment of products. The deadline for commenting was 31 May.

7.6. Application of Unique Formula Identifier (UFI) for biocidal products	For information	

A representative of DG GROW gave a presentation on the Annex VIII of the CLP Regulation, related to the obligation for industry to submit information on hazardous mixtures to national poison centres or appointed bodies, and to the Unique Formula Identifier (UFI) (unique code linking a product on the market and the information on the specific mixture), which was introduced by Regulation 2017/542 on information relating to emergency health response, that amended the CLP Regulation. The presentation is available on CIRCABC.

7.7. Concerns related to invalid studies	For information	

The Commission services informed about a recent case where an applicant submitted an invalid study coming from a laboratory that was involved in misconduct behaviours, and forgery of studies. The Commission services urged Industry stakeholders to be vigilant when they submit data and ensure a high quality of the studies submitted in the their applications.

7.8. Updates on Court cases T337/18, T347/18, T734/18(R)	For information	

The Commission services informed the meeting participants about the latest developments on Court cases T337/18, T347/18 and T734/18(R). The Court has dismissed the interim procedure T734/18R for suspension of the Commission decision, on the ground that there is no urgency for either of the two applicants.

7.9. Overview of fees for BPR procedures in Member States	For information	

The Commission services informed that, as a follow-up of the previous CA meeting, an email was sent to Member States competent authorities inviting them to provide information on the fees currently in place for the BPR procedures. Member States were invited to provide their input by 14 June, following which an overview document will be prepared by the Commission services and made available on CIRCABC.

7.10. Notification in accordance with Article 56(3) of the BPR	For information	

The Commission services informed that for the first time they received information pursuant to Article 56(3), concerning a test or experiment[1] for which the Competent Authority, after the assessment of the application, could not fully exclude harmful effects, immediate or delayed, on the health of humans or animals, or any unacceptable adverse effect on humans, animals or the environment. The test or experiment was approved but subject to preventive protective measures.

8. Scope matters
No item for information or discussion

9. Enforcement issues
No item for information or discussion

10. International Matters
No item for information or discussion

11. AOB		
(a) List of Competent Authorities and other Contact Points	For information *CA-March19-Doc.11.a*	

(b) Biocidal products used in the manufacturing of medical devices	For information	

The Commission services informed that they received an Article 55(1) notification from a Member State regarding a preservative used in the manufacturing of medical devices, which in Commission's view is not needed. The Commission services clarified that preservatives in raw materials used exclusively for the manufacturing of medical devices are not in the scope of the BPR, but in the scope of the medical devices legislation.

On a more general note, one Member State enquired whether it is possible to submit Article 55(1) notifications via R4BP. The Commission services replied that at the moment there is no case type in R4BP for these notification and reminded that Member States are invited to use the notification template agreed at the CA meeting in November 2017[2].

[1] The R4BP3 identifiers of the specific case were indicated to the Competent Authorities via email after the meeting.

[2] The agreed template is the Annex I of the document available at https://circabc.europa.eu/w/browse/989135eb-59dc-4591-ba67-2edee1991747

(c) AISE-CEPE workshop of 15 May	For information	

AISE presented the main conclusions of the workshop on preservation of paints and detergents held on 15 May 2019: it was acknowledged that there are issues regarding PT 6 and 7 preservatives; that preservatives are indispensable and a strategy is needed for the short-medium term; there is the intention to bring the topic for discussion in the competent authorities forum.

(d) Workshop on fact finding missions (19-21 June 2019)	For information	

The Commission services informed the participants that the invitations to the workshop to be held in Grange on 19-21 June were circulated to the Member States via the BTSF contact points and that the draft programme will be made available in CIRCABC. It was also mentioned that the participation of stakeholders in this event is not foreseen.

(e) Organisation of CA meetings in 2020	For information	

The Commission services informed the participants that, following the request from one Member State in a communication to the Commission, the schedule of the CA meetings in 2020 will be changed as it is the intention to have four meetings instead of five. This should also allow the timely preparation and distribution of documents, and enabling Member States and observers to prepare better for the meetings. One Member State highlighted that having the documents on time is crucial, to allow participants to be prepared and have fruitful discussions at the meeting rather than providing comments after the meeting.

In reply to a question from another Member State it was clarified that this change will not influence the number of Coordination Group meetings, that will be the same as before.

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	