







OWNERSHIP STATEMENT

A COMPANY OF A COM ° Uly A Constrained of the second of This document, the data contained in it and copyright therein are owned by Bayer CropScience. and any and the second of the and the service of the owner of the service of the

Bayer CropScience (BAŶI

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
		Page
IIIA 10	Ecotoxicological studies on the plant protection product	<u></u>
IIIA 10.1	Effects on birds	8
IIIA 10.1.1	Acute toxicity exposure ratio (TERA) for birds	* 130
IIIA 10.1.2	Short-term toxicity exposure ratio (TERst) for firds	, NA
IIIA 10.1.3	In case of bait, the concentration of active substance in the bait	م ¹ 6 م
IIIA 10.1.4	In case of pellets, granules, pills or treated seed	× 16,0
IIIA 10.1.4.1	Amount of a.s. in or on each pellet, granule, pill or treated seed	16
IIIA 10.1.4.2	Proportion of the LD ₅₀ for the a.s. in 100 particles / gram particles	
IIIA 10.1.5	In the case of pellets, granules and pills, their size and shape	≫ 16
IIIA 10.1.6	Acute oral toxicity of the preparation to the more sensitive species	16
IIIA 10.1.7	Supervised cage or field triats Q Q Q	A
IIIA 10.1.8	Acceptance of bait, granules or treated seed by birds	Ş 17
IIIA 10.1.9	Effects of secondary poisoning	[*] 17
IIIA 10.2	Effect on aquatioorganisms of the second sec	20
IIIA 10.2.1	Toxicity expositive ratios for aquatic species	26
IIIA 10.2.1.1	TERA for fish w w w	28
IIIA 10.2.1.2	TERLT for fish of O	28
IIIA 10.2.1.3	TERA for Daphinia of the transformed and the t	29
IIIA 10.2.1.4	TERL'i for Daphnia & A A A A	29
IIIA 10.2.1.5	TERA for an aquatic insect species of k k	29
IIIA 10.2.1.6	TERLT for an aquatic insect species 0 4	30
IIIA 10.2.1.7	TERA for an aquatic crustacean species	30
IIIA 10.2.1.8	TERAT for an aquatic existance in species	30
IIIA 10.2.1.9	TERA forcan aquatic gastropod molluse species	30
IIIA 10.2.1,10	TERLT for an aquatic gastropod mollusc species	30
IIIA 10.2.1.11	TERE for algae	31
IIIA 16,2.2	Acute toxicity (aquatic) of the preparation	31
IIIA 10.2.2.1	Fish acute toxicity LC 50, freshwater, cold-water species	31
IIIA 10.2.2.2	Acute toxicity (24 & 48 h) for Daphioa preferably Daphnia magna	32
IIIA 10.2.2.3	Effects on algal growth and growth rate	33
IIIA 10.2.2.4	Marine or estuarine organisms acute toxicity LC50/EC50	34
IIIA 10.2.2.5	Marine sediment invertebrates, acute toxicity LC50/EC50	34
IIIA 10.2.3	Mierocosm or mesocosm study	34
IIIA,10.2.4	Residue data in fish (long term)	34
IIIAA0.2.5	Chronie fish toxicity data	34
IIIA 10.2.5.1 @	Chronic toxicity 28 day exposure) to juvenile fish	34
IIIA 10.2.5.2	Fish early life stage toxicity test	34
IIIA 10.2,5.3	Kish life cycle test Q	35
IIIA 10.2.6	Chromic toxicity to aquatic invertebrates	35
111A 10.2.6.1	Chronic toxicity to Daphnia magna (21-day)	35
111A 10.2.6.2	Chronic toxicity for a representative species of aquatic insects	35
IIIA 10.2,6.3	Chronic toxicity for a representative species of aquatic gastropod	a-
Ŭ,	molluscs	35
IIIA 10.2.7	Accumulation in aquatic non-target organisms	35
IIIA 10.3	Effects on terrestrial vertebrates other than birds	36

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.3.1	Toxicity exposure ratios for terrestrial vertebrates other than birds	ℤ37 嶡
IIIA 10.3.1.1	Acute toxicity exposure ratio (TERA)	'40 <i>∕</i> Ş
IIIA 10.3.1.2	Short-term toxicity exposure ratio (TERst)	41
IIIA 10.3.1.3	Long-term toxicity exposure ratio (TER _{LT})	A)
IIIA 10.3.2	Effects on terrestrial vertebrates other than birds	[″] 42
IIIA 10.3.2.1	Acute oral toxicity of the preparation	42
IIIA 10.3.2.2	Acceptance of bait, granules or treated seed	A3 _0
IIIA 10.3.2.3	Effects of secondary poisoning	⁷ 43 🔗
IIIA 10.3.3	Supervised cage or field trials or other appropriate studies	44
IIIA 10.4	Effects on bees	45
IIIA 10.4.1	Hazard Quotients for bees	45
IIIA 10.4.1.1	Oral exposure Q _{HO}	46
IIIA 10.4.1.2	Contact exposure Q _{HC} \sim	46
IIIA 10.4.2	Acute toxicity of the preparation to bees A	246
IIIA 10.4.2.1	Acute oral toxicity	46
IIIA 10.4.2.2	Acute contact to the start of t	48
IIIA 10.4.3	Effects on bees of residues on crops S S S	48
IIIA 10.4.4	Cage tests Q & & & & O & C & Y	48
IIIA 10.4.5	Field tests	49
IIIA 10.4.6	Investigation of special effects	49
IIIA 10.4.6.1	Larval toxicito	49
IIIA 10.4.6.2	Long residual effects	49
IIIA 10.4.6.3	Disprienting effects on bees in the second s	49
IIIA 10.4.7	Turnel tests - effects of feeding on contaminated honey dew or flowers	49
IIIA 10.5	Effection arthropods other than bees	50
IIIA 10.5.1	Effects on sensitive species already tested, artificial substrates	54
IIIA 10.5.2 [©]	Effects on non-target terrestrial arthropods in ext. laboratory tests	57
IIIA 10.5.39	Effects on non-target terrestrial arthropode in semi-field tests	64
IIIA 10.5.4	Field tests on arthropods species	69
IIIA 10.6	Effects on earthworms and other soil macro-organisms	70
IIIA 10.6.1	Foxicity exposure ratios for earthworms, TERA and TERLT	72
IIIA 10.6.2	Acute toxicity to cartheorms &	72
IIIA 10.6.3	Sublethal effects on earthworms	73
IIIA 10.6.4 🎽	Field tests (effects on earthworms)	74
IIIA 10.65	Residue content of earthworms	74
IIIA 10.6.6	Effects on other soil non-target macro-organisms	75
IIIA 40.6.7	Effects on organic matter breakdown	76
IIIA [®] 10.7	Effects on soil microbial activity	77
IIIA 10.7.1 🔏	Laboratory test to investigate impact on soil microbial activity	78
IIIA 10.7.2 [°]	Further resting to investigate impact on soil microbial activity	79
IIIA 10.8	Effects on non-target plants	79
IIIA 1958.1	Effects on non-target terrestrial plants	79
IIIA.40.8.1,9	Seed germination	80
IIKA 10.8.9.2	Vegetative vigour	80
IIIĂ 10 \$.1.3	Seedling emergence	82
IIIA 10.8.1.4	Terrestrial field testing	84
IIIA 10.8.2	Effects on non-target aquatic plants	84
IIIA 10.8.2.1	Aquatic plant growth – Lemna	84



~84

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

- **IIIA 10.8.2.2** Aquatic field testing
- Effects on other non-target organisms believed to be at risk **IIIA 10.9**
- Summary of preliminary data: biological activity & dose range finding 84 **IIIA 10.9.1**
- **IIIA 10.9.2** Assessment of relevance to potential impact on non-target species

- 35 85 88 89 89 8' di skan isks för. diatalities i sary to avoid o of the shift of the shift of the shift of the of the shift of the shift of the shift of the of the shift of the shift of the shift of the shift of the of the shift of the shift



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10 Ecotoxicological studies on the plant protection product

General Remarks

Throughout this dossier, references are made to study reports and statements on a 65.25 Wo formulation of Iprovalicarb and Folpet, in which the composition had been incorrectly assigned. Any reference to this formulation is analogous to Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 6% Iprovalicarb & 56.3% Folpet), the true and accurate product description for this dossier

Recent changes in the production of the WG 63.5 formulation of Provalicarb + Folpet have led to a change in the lignosulfonate component. This is considered only a moor change as explained in a bridging statement and therefore studies carried out with the former formulation are valid for the new one (see Edition No. M-246642-03-1 in confidential Document JIII)

Toxicity data is provided in this dessier on the WG 65.3 product from aquatic organism studies (fish, *Daphnia*, and algae), acute bee studies, non-target atthropod studies, chronic earthworm studies, soil micro-organisms and non-target terrestrial plants. This will be compared in the case of aquatic organisms to a mixture toxicity calculation according to Finney's formula (GFAP, 4990) based on the active substance endpoints. The lower of the two values will be used for risk assessment purposes, to give an added level of protection. Active substance studies are not available for non-target arthropods and non-target terrestrial plants for any more studies are not available for non-target arthropods and non-target terrestrial plants for any methods are not available for non-target arthropods and non-target terrestrial plants are not appropriate for phronic exposures and for the risk assessment for earthworm reproduction; the findings form the WG 65.3 study will be used.

Iprovalicarb

Iprovalicarb (chemic du code SZX 0722) is a new fungicidal active substance. In March 1998, an Annex II dossier for this a.s. was submitted to the Irish PSD acting as rapporteur for the EU. In the dossier, the use of the compound was supported in grapes data from studies conducted with the solo product, WG 50) and potatoes (data from studies conducted with a combination product with Mancozeb, WP 69).

Folpet

Folget is manufactured by **The Solution of the Second stage** of the EU review programme with Italy acting as the rapporteur for the EU. The conclusion from the peer review process was published in July 2006. Full details can be obtained from the manufacturers and from the EFSA Scientific Report (2006) 70, 1-78, Conclusion of the Peer Review.

Access to Folpet data 🗟

The representative formulation in the application for Annex I Renewal of iprovalicarb is a combination with folpet, which – from a Bayer perspective - is a 3rd party substance, procured from . (The second secon

files, data, studies, summaries and assessments owned by which were submitted in the EU for

the support of the registration of the active substance folget and the representative formulation Folgan 80 WDG. The right to references of Bayer CropScience AG extends to all EU countries. A separate Letter of Access is included in this supplementary dossier (M-428625-01-1).

Baver CropScience AG is using a risk envelope approach for the risk assessment of the representative formulation. Within the scope of this supplementary dossier, up to 4 applications at 135 kg/hg folget are proposed as a safe use in grapes. This is much below, the critical GAP that currently defends in this crop in the EU, where 10 applications of up to 1.6 kg/ha have been approved, with all other parameters such as interval between applications or pre-harvest interval being identical or very similar Therefore, Bayer CropScience AG considers it instified to refer to polpet data owned by wherever appropriate. A folpet-specific risk assessment is not considered necessary to defend the Annex I listing of iprovalicarb.

The use pattern for this The product is intended for use as a fungreide of g summarised in Table 10- 1. formulation is

		-pp-reaction	- pore		- on peg to e ga		
Crop	Country	Timing of application	Max. number of applications	spplication interval	Maximum Jabekrate	Maximum ap individual	plication rate, treatment s./ha]
		BRCH	Ø. 3		product/ha]	provaliearb	Folpet
Grapes	Germany	\$6-75 ⁶	শ্ব ন্যু	× 10-14 、		Q 216	1.3512
Grapes	Czech Republic		0 1-4	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		© 0.162	1.0134
Grapes	Spaign	15-85	24 Å	1612	© 167	0.150	0.940
D.111.	44	C 1	AD OUT	1			

Table 10- 1: Application partern of provalicarb & Folper WG was as used for the risk assess

Bold letters: artificial wor considered for risk assessment

The risk assessments throughout this dossier are conducted with an artificial GAP that provides a risk 2 kg product/ha with an interval between envelope for the intended uses, i.e. applications of applications of 10 days at BBCH_175+85

Ecotoxicologically significant metabolites

Metabolites, for which analytical methods have to be established for monitoring purposes, have to be addressed as significant metabolites. For these metabolites, significant quantities have been observed in at least one invironmental compartment of either soil, water, plant or air.

However, none of the metabolites can be considered as hazardous or poses a higher risk to terrestrial and aquativ organisms than the parent compound.

Ecotoxicologically relevant metabolites

None of the metabolites, which are addressed within this dossier and the corresponding Annex II for the active ingredients, is considered as ecotoxicologically relevant. None of the metabolites poses a higher risk to terrestrial and aquatic organisms than the parent compound.



IIIA 10.1 Effects on birds

Toxicity of iprovalicarb to birds

Toxicity of iprovalicard to birds The summary of the toxicity profile of the active substance iprovalicarb to birds is provided ny the

Table 10.1- 1:	Avian toxicity	v data of iprovalicarb
Test Species	Test design	Ecotoxicological endpoint Q Reference O
Bobwhite quail	acute, oral	$LD_{50} > 2000 \text{ mg/a.s./kg/bw} \qquad \qquad$
Bobwhite quail	5-day feeding	$ \begin{array}{c} LC_{50} \\ DDD_{50} \\ > 1251 \\ mg a.s./kg bw/d \\ \hline \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ $
Mallard duck	5-day feeding	$\begin{array}{c} LC_{50} & > 5000 \\ DDD_{50} & > 2414 \\ \hline mg a.s./kg bw/d \\ \hline M & 000326201-1 \\ \hline HA & 8.1.2/02 \\ \hline LC_{50} & & \\ \hline S & K/VE & 009 \\ \hline M & 000326201-1 \\ \hline HA & 8.1.2/02 \\ \hline LC_{50} & & \\ \hline S & K/VE & 009 \\ \hline M & 000326201-1 \\ \hline HA & 8.1.2/02 \\ \hline LC_{50} & & \\ \hline S & K/VE & 009 \\ \hline M & 000326201-1 \\ \hline HA & 8.1.2/02 \\ \hline \end{array}$
Bobwhite quail	22-weeks feeding chronic, reproduction	NOEC 2000 mg a.s./kg feed 101
Bold letters end	noin in used in ri	sk Wessmert

Metabolites

Metabolites O The parent compound was the major component found in all resider studies, and the only metabolites of quantitative significance (Thydroxymethyl-SZ 0722 and it glucoside [M01 and M02]) found in any study were determined in very minor absolute quantities and represent a metabolic pathway also seen in animals.

The main metabolite protational crops was p-methyl-phonethylamine (PMPA, M10), but it is highly unlikely that this metabolice poses a risk to birds, even if its toxicity to birds would be in the same range as for the parent compour

The summary of the toxicity profile of the active substance folpet to birds is provided in the following table.

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Table 10.1-2:	Avian toxicity	v data of fo	lpet			aî 🚿
Test Species	Test design	Eco	toxicologi	cal endpoint	Reference	
Bobwhite quail	acute, oral	LD50	> 2510	mg a.s./kg bw	~	
Bobwhite quail	5 day feeding	LC ₅₀	> 5000	mg a.s./kg feed		
Boowinte quan	5-day recurring	DDD ₅₀	> 1127	mg a.s./kg bw/d		
Mallard duck	5-day feeding	LC50	> 5000	mg a.s./kg feed	A Ô	\$\$.\$
Widnard duck	5-day recarding	DDD ₅₀	> 746	mg a.s./kg bw/d		
Bobwhite quail	screening,	NOEC	4640	mg a kg feed		
Boowinte quan	reproduction	HOLE	1010	1115 u.s./ Kg 100u	See list of endpoints	EESA 10
	18-weeks				Scientific Report for Fo	lpet 2006)
Bobwhite quail	feeding	NOEC	1000	Ang a.s./kg feed		-r ())()
Boownite quan	chronic,	NOAEL	78.3 🔏	mg a.s./kg bw/d		¢ _ Q'
	reproduction		L.	<u> </u>		
	18-weeks		Ő			4
Mallard duck	feeding	NOEC	1,000	ng a.s. kg feed		à 4°
Wallalu uuck	chronic,	NOAEL	√9 0.0 ≽	mg as /kg bw/d	A	Ş <u>v</u>
	reproduction		$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$			A V
Bold letters: end	points used in ri	sk assessni	ent 🕵	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		\bigcirc
		,0×	×.			Ò

Metabolites

The main metabolites of folper in plants are phthalimide and phthalic acid (EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet 2006). Bird studies and separate risk assessment were not performed for these metabolites. Initial residues in food items are assumed to be not more than for the parent compound. A risk to birds is unlikely, even if the toxicity to birds would be in the same range as for the parent compound. Further details can be obtained from Machteshim.

Toxicity of the formulated product

The acute, LER values - Lier 1 ev refined - (see overview Table 104 - 7 as well as Point 10.1.1 below) are above the trigger of 10. There is no indication that the formulation is more toxic than expected based on concentration additivity of its active substances (see Point 10.1.6).

For this reason and also considering animal welfare, no acute oral toxicity study with the preparation was deemed necessary. Instead the toxicity of the formulated product was calculated according to Finney's formula.

Table 109-3:	Avian toxic	ity data of the	e formula	d Iprovalica	rb + Folpet WG 65.3
Test species	Test design	🔹 🧏 Čotoxi	cological	endpoint	Reference
Bobwhite quail	acute, oral	QLD ₅₀	37,13	mg/kg bw	calculated according to Finney
			01		

For more details referencess made to Polett 10.1.6 of this dossier.

Selection of endpoints for the risk assessment

(According to the Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & Mammals, EFSA 2009¹)

¹ EFSA (2009): Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & Mammals on request from EFSA. The EFSA Journal (2009), 7(12):1438.

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 *(Submission for Annex I renewal)*

Data are available for more than one species and/or from more than one study

Data on more than one species will cause an increasingly conservative risk assessment if the same size described that allow maintaining the level of protection when more than the required number of species has been tested.

For that reason the endpoints for risk assessment depicted in the table above have been established in accordance with the following criteria:

- If acute tests for more than one species are available the geometric mean should be used for the refined assessment, except when the endpoint for the most sensitive species is more than a factor 10 below the geometric mean of all the tested species. Where this is the case, the most sensitive species will be used for the risk assessment but generally without any assessment factor.
- If more than one acute study on the same species is available, the geometric mean of the endpoints of the same species should be taken. This endpoint is then used in the overall geometric mean for refinement.
- For reproductive studies, the endpoint from the most sensitive tested species should be used.
- If more than one reproductive study has been conducted according to a Similar protocol or guideline on the same species, the two datasets are merged as it were one study Doing so, large spacing between the concentration steps may be diminished and more adequate LO(A)ELs and NO(A)ELs can be identified. This endpoint will be used for refinement

If separate values for males and females are measured, it is proposed that the geometric mean be used unless there is a clear indication of a difference in sensitivity between the series (e.g. > 25%).

Short-term endpoints

According to the risk assessment scheme of EFSA GD birds and mammals (2009) a short-term risk assessment is not required. However, the endpoint from short-term dietary studies, e.g. 5-day dietary study in birds (OECD 205), should be used in an acute risk assessment when indicating a higher toxicity via the dietary exposure route (lower LDD₅₀).

But there is no indication that a day exposure via dictary route might provoke higher toxicity than one application via gavage in active study.

Therefore, in acute risk assessment the neute endpoint will be used.

Reproductive endpoints

The acute oral LD_{50} value used in the acute avan assessment (either the LD_{50} for a single species, or the geometric mean for multiple species) divided by 10 to obtain $LD_{50}/10$ will be compared with the lowest NOAED from the reproduction study (studies) ignoring purely parental effects (e.g. changes in parental body weight and food consumption).

The lower endpoint from the reproduction study will be used in avian reproductive risk assessment.

Conversion of endpoints from ppm to mg a.s./kg bw/d

The TER Figures for long-term exposure of birds are calculated on the basis of a dietary dose or level as recommended by "Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds and Mammals under Council Directive 91/414/EEC" (SANCO/4145/2000-final).

Therefore dietary concentrations have to be converted into a daily dose. For this purpose generally the



mean body weight and the mean food consumption over the exposure period have to be calculated \mathbb{Q}°

Risk assessment for birds

The risk assessment procedure follows the EFSA Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Dirds & Mammals (2009). The risk assessment follows a tiered approach to assess the effects of plant protection products on birds based on current regulatory requirements. The risk is considered acceptable, if the 'Toxicity Exposure Ratio' (TFR) value pass the trigger values of ≥ 10 for acute exposure and ≥ 5 for chronic exposure. If the TER values are below the trigger values in certain areas, a reprined risk assessment based on more relevant and realistic conditions is performed for those particular areas?

Calculation of Toxicity Exposure Ratio

The calculation of acute and long-term voxicity to Exposure Ratio (TER) is defined as follows

The endpoints for acute and long term bisk assessment derive from acute and reproduction studies respectively, and are expressed as dose [mg] per kg body weight per day.

Calculation of Daily Dietary Dose (DDD)

The <u>daily</u> detary <u>dose</u> for a single application is given by the following equation:

DDD single application application rate [kg ha] × shortcut value (SV 90)

In case of multiple applications the $DDD_{single application}$ should be multiplied with an appropriate multiple application factor (MAF₉₀)

DDD applications = DDD apple a

Long-term exposure

For a single application the daily distary dose is given by the following equation:

 $DDD_{successful} = application rate [Rg/ha] \times shortcut value (SV_m) \times TWA$

For multiple applications the DDD_{single application} should be multiplied with an appropriate multiple application factor (MAF_a).

 $DIDD_{multiple applications} = DDD_{single application} \times MAF_m$



Where

DDD Daily dietary dose	;
JDD Daily dietaly dose	

- MAF Multiple application factor
- TWA Time weighted average factor (= f_{twa}) based on a default time window of 21 days and a DT₅₀ of 10 days leading to a value of 0.53
- <u>Shortcut value</u> $SV = FIR/bw \times RUD$: Value for expersure estimate based on species and crop
- RUD Residue per unit dose: residues on feed items normalized on an application rate of a.s./ha.
- 90 90th percentile values for acute exposure, extension for MAF, RUD and SV
- m mean values for reproductive/long-term exposure, extension for MAF, RUD and SV

Standard exposure scenario for risk assessment or screening level

The main potential exposure route for birds is expected to be consumption of contampated feed. Accordingly this will be main part of the risk assessment in the following under Sections 10.1.1 and 10.1.2.

The risk assessment on screening level is well as the Tier 1 risk assessment is based on standard scenarios (combination of indicator species (screening level) or generic focal species (Tier 1) and crop.

Default ("shortcut"-) values for the exposure estimate will be used a provided in Appendix A of the EFSA Guidance Document on kisk Assessment for Birds & Manuals (2009) representing a worst case assessment

It is assumed that

- animals satisfy their entire food demand in the treated area (PT = 1),
- animals feed on a single for type only (PP = 1),
- over an acute time frame flours) the animals feed on personal mean residues over a long-term period (days to weeks),
- the multiple application factor (MAF) for the acute or long-term exposure is based on default values based on a generic DTS value of 10 days, considering the actual (maximum) number of applications and the interval between them,
- long-term predicted environmental concentrations to be compared with chronic endpoints can be calculated as the time weighted average concentration. Default assumptions are a time window of 21 days and DT_{50} of 10 days leading to a time weighted average factor (= f_{twa}) of 0.53.
- This factors equally valid for feed items consisting of vegetation as well as of arthropods. • The 'indicator species used on screening level is not a real species but, by virtue of its size and
- feeding habits is considered to have higher exposure than other species that occur in a particular crop at a particular time and is therefore protective for all other species in that particular crop.



Baver

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 *(Submission for Annex I renewal)*

Avian indicator species for risk assessment on screening level

The product Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 is intended to be used in grapes with four applications of 2.4 kg product/ha corresponding to 0.216 kg iprovalicarb/ha and 1.3512 kg for pet/ha at BBCH 15.85 with a minimum interval of 10 days. This is an artificial GAP that provides a risk envelope for the intended uses.

Folpet is a 3rd party substance procured from

CropScience AG is using a risk envelope approach for the risk essessment of the representative formulation. Within the scope of this supplementary dossier, up to 4 application at 1.35 kg/h folger are proposed as a safe use in grapes. This is much below the critical GAR that down currently defends in this crop in the EU, where 10 applications of up to 1.6 kg/ha have been approved, with all other parameters such as interval between applications of pre-havest interval being identical or very similar. Therefore, Bayer CropScience AG considers it justified to refer to tolpet data oxned by wherever appropriate. A folpet-specific risk assessment us not considered necessary to defend the Annex I listing of iprovalicarb.

According to the EFSA Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & Manimals (2009) the following indicator species have to be addressed in risk assessment on screening level.

		Q Q A	Shorter	it value
Crop	Intreator	species 🖉 📈	For longeterm RA	by For acute RA
			🔬 Based On RUD 📶 🦼	based on RUD 90
Grapes	Small omniv	orous bird 👋 🔬	کّ ر∂ 38.9	95.3
	ž oʻ xvi	V A V	O A O	

Table 10.1-4: Relevant avian indicator species for risk assessment on screening levels

Summary of calculated TER values for birds

Table 10.1 5:	Summary	of all acute FER	calculations as	given uno	ler point 10.1.1

Crop	Active substance	SV90	TERA	Result needs refinement?
Grapes	Small omnigorous bird O Iprovalicarb	95.3	> 65	no

Table 10.1- 6:	Summary of all reproductive (long-term) TER calculations	s as given	under p	oint 10.1.2
Crop	Indicator species A Active substance	SVm	TERLT	Result needs refinement?
Grapes	Stnall omnivorous bird	38.9	19	no
1				

Conclusion: According to the presented risk assessment, the risk to birds from the use of the product in grapes is acceptable.

IIIA 10 9.1 Acute toxicity exposure ratio (TERA) for birds

Acute toxicity exposure ratio on screening level for birds

The risk assessment at the screening level has been performed for grapes for an application rate of 4×0.206 kg iprovalicarb/ha at a minimum application interval of 10 days.

Table 10.1	Table 10.1.1- 1: Acute DDD and TER calculation on screening level for birds							
		ID	DDD				AN AN	nex S
Сгор	Indicator species	[mg/kg bw]	Appl. rate [kg/ha]	SV90	MAF ₉₀	DDD		
	Iprovalicarb A A A A							
Grapes	Small omnivorous bird	> 2000	0.216	95.3	₹.₹	30.9	°≫ 65 ≈ 1	0 2
					a, ^v	Ĩ		

Table 10.1.1- 1:	Acute DDD and TER calculation on	screening level for birds

All TER values are above the Annex VI trigger of 10 for acute exposite. Accordingly an macceptable acute risk to birds from the use of the product according to the proposed use pattern can be exclude

Acute risk assessment for birds drinking contaminated water

An assessment of the risk potentially posed by consomption of contaminated dinking water is required according to the EFSA Guidance Document for Birds and Mammals (2009). For details see point 10.1.2 of this dossier. As Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 is applied in grapes, no pools in leadaxils where an acut@exposure

possibly might occur are to be expected Therefore the assessment is not relevant The acute risk from water in pudgles formed on the soil surface of a field, when a (heavy) rainfall

event follows the application of a pesticide to a crop or bare soil is covered by the long-term risk assessment under point 10.1.2 of this dossier

IIIA 10.1.2 Shortderm toxicity exposure ratio (PERs) for birds

According to the risk assessment scheme of EFSA GD birds and mammals (2009) a short-term risk assessment is not required. However, the endpoint from short-term dietary studies, e.g. 5-day dietary study in birds (OECD 205) should be used in an acute tisk assessment when indicating a higher toxicity via the dietar exposure route (lower LDD₅₀). But there is no indication that 5-day exposure via dietary route with bispyribae sodium might provoke higher toxicity than one application via gavage in acute study

Long-term toxicity exposure ratio on screening lever for birds

The risk assessment at the sceening level has been performed for grapes for an application rate of 4×0.216 kg iproval carb/ha at a minimum application interval of 10 days.

		DDD						Annex
Crop Crop	[mg/kg bw]	Appl. rate [kg/ha]	SVm	MAF _m	f _{twa}	DDD	TER _{LT}	VI Trigger
	Ipro	ovalicarb						
Grapes Small omniverous bird	161	0.216	38.9	1.9	0.53	8.5	19	5

Table 10.1.2- 1: [®]Long-term **D**D and **TER** calculation on screening level for birds

The TER value is above the Annex VI trigger of 5 for reproductive/long-term exposure. Accordingly, safe use of the product in grapes can be concluded.

A

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 *(Submission for Annex I renewal)*

Long-term risk assessment for birds drinking contaminated water

An assessment of the risk potentially posed by consumption of contaminated drinking required according to the EFSA Guidance Document for Birds and Mammals (2009).

Due to the incidental nature of occurrence of drinking water reservoirs on agriculture fields (as compared to the contamination of food items growing or dwelling on those fields) a separate assessment of this exposure route is considered appropriate at least on the first-ther level.

Two scenarios were identified as relevant for assessing the fisk of pesticides reading water to birds and mammals:

- Leaf scenario, only relevant for birds possibly drinking vater from peridles in leaf whorls after application of a pesticide to a crop and subsequent rainfall or prigation. This scenario is only relevant for acrie exposure.
 As Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 is applied in grapes no pools in leaf axils where an acute exposure possibly might occur are to be expected.
- Puddle scenario. Birds and mammal@taking water from puddles formed on the soil surface of a field when a (heavy) mainfall event follows the application of a pesticide to a crop or base soil. This scenario is only relevant for acute and long term exposure.

An "escape clause" recommended in the EESA Guidance Document for Birds and Mammals (2009) allows for screening the need for a quantitative rist assessment by a comparison between the application rate and the toxicity of the respective substance. This escape clause specifies that "due to the characteristics of the exposure scenario in connection with the standard assumptions for water uptake by animals ..., no specific calculations of exposure and TER are necessary when the ratio of effective application rate (# application rate $\stackrel{\circ}{\to}$ MAFD (in g/ha) to relevant endpoint (in mg/kg bw/d) does not exceed \$0 in the case of less sorptive substances (Koc < 500 L/kg) or 3000 in the case of more sorptive substances (Koc \geq 500 L/kg)."²

Table 10, 102- 2:	Evaluation of potentia	concern for exposure	of birds drinking water	(escape clause)
			0	· • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Compound	Koc [L/kg]	Application rate × MAR _m (g a.s.@a]	NÔ(A)EL Əng a.s./ Ag bw/d]	Ratio (Application rate × MAF) / NO(A)EL	"Escape clause" No concern if ratio	Conclusion
Iprovalicarb	143.9	216 × 1.90	161	2.5	\leq 50	No concern
		Ĵ,				

This evaluation confirms that the risk for birds from drinking water that may contain residues from the use of the product is acceptable.

² EFSA (2009): Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & Mammals on request from EFSA, p. 69

IIIA 10.1.3 In case of bait, the concentration of active substance in the bait

Not applicable for spray application.

IIIA 10.1.4 In case of pellets, granules, pills or treated seed

Not applicable for spray application.

IIIA 10.1.4.1 Amount of a.s. in or on each pellet, granule, pill or treated se

Not applicable for spray application.

IIIA 10.1.4.2 Proportion of the LD50 for the a.s. in 100 particles / gram particles

Not applicable for spray application.

IIIA 10.1.5 In the case of pellets, granules and pills, their size and shape

Not applicable for spray application

IIIA 10.1.6 Acute or al toxicity of the preparation to the more sensitive species

The risk assessment base on the active substances revealed TER values well above the respective triggers indicating acceptable abute and long-term fisk to birds (see Points 100).1 and 10.1.2 of this dossier).

A comparison of the acute endpoints of the formulation Iprovalicate + Folpet WG 65.3 derived from a study on rats with calculated theoretical endpoints (calculated according to Finney's formula GIFAP, 1990) is shown in Table 10.1.6-19

1 abic 10.1.0- 1. Compariso	in or acute solution, active angle calcins var	
	ippovalicarty 9% Tolpet 36.3%	Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3
Species Q	Calcutated [mg product/kg]	Study results [mg product/kg]
Bird (Bobwhete quail		not available
Mammal (Rat)	Q3339	$LD_{50} > 2500$
1 1 1	$D \rightarrow 0000$	10

Table 10.1.6- 1: Comparison of acute toxicity active ingredients vs. formulation

¹ based on provalicarb – $LD_{50} \gtrsim 2000$ mg/kg by folget – $LD_{50} > 2510$ mg/kg bw ² based on: iprovalicarb – $LD_{50} \approx 5000$ mg/kg bw; folget – $LD_{50} > 2000$ mg/kg bw

The comparison of results of this testing with the results of mixed toxicity calculation according to Finney showed that the preparation can be expected to be not more toxic than on its active ingredient content base

Thus a risk assessment based on the product would not change the conclusion derived from the risk assessment based on the individual active substances and is therefore omitted.

IIIĂ 10.7.7

Supervised cage or field trials

The risk assessment based on the active substance indicates acceptable acute, short-term and long-term risks to birds (see Points 10.1.1 and 10.1.2 of this dossier). For this reason and also considering animal



welfare, no supervised cage or field study with the preparation was deemed necessary.

IIIA 10.1.8 Acceptance of bait, granules or treated seed by birds

Not applicable for spray application.

IIIA 10.1.9 Effects of secondary poisoning

Substances with a high bioaccumulation potential could theoretically bear $\overset{\circ}{o}$ risk of secondary poisoning for birds if feeding on contaminated prec like fish or earthworms. For organic chemicals, a log K_{OW} > 3 is used to trigger an in-depth evaluation of the potential for bioaccumulation. The octanol/water partition coefficients (Log/P_{ow}) for introvalicate have been determined as 3.18 (Diastereomer A) and 3.20 (Diastereomer B). Therefore a risk assessment for a generic earthworm-eating bird and a generic fish-eating bird for the iprovalicate component has been performed.

Risk assessment for bioaccumulation and food chain behaviour for birds

The risk assessment according to EFSA 2009 follows a tiered approach to assess the effects of plant protection products on birds and manimals. The risk is considered acceptable, if the 'Cong-term Toxicity Exposure Ratio' (TER_{LT}) value pass the trigger values of ≥ 5 for horg-term exposure. If the TER values are below the trigger values, a refined fisk assessment based on more relevant and realistic conditions is performed for those particular areas.

Calculation of Foxicity Exposure Ratio (FER)

The long-term Toxicity to Exposure Ratio (TER) depends on the selection of the suitable endpoint and is defined as follows (EFSA 2009):

Long-term risk: TER NOGA)EL [bng a s./kg by d] / DDD

Calculation of Daily Pictary Dose (PDD) for earthworp -eating birds

Residues in earthwords are calculated according of the following equation:

The bioconcentration factor BCF C_{word} C_{soil} is calculated according to the following equation:

BCF $= (0.84 \oplus 0.012)$ Pow) $(\mathcal{F}_{oc} \times K_{oc})$

coil

= PF

DDDearthworm

PECworm

 $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ = $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ ganic carbon adsorption coefficient

= Organic carbon content of soil (take 0.02 as a default value)



Calculation of Daily Dietary Dose (DDD) for fish-eating birds

 $DDD_{fish} = PEC_{fish} \times FIR \ / \ bw$

Residues in fish are calculated according to the following equation:

 $PEC_{fish} = PEC_{sw} \times BCF_{fish}$

Avian generic focal species for Tier 1 risk assessment

According to the EFSA Guidance Document on Kisk Assessment for Birds and Manmals 2009 the following generic focal species have to be addressed in the Tick 1 risk assessment and the session of the sessi

Table 10.1.9- 1:	Avian generic focal s	necies/for the	Aier 1 risk	assessment of	secondary	noisonin	18
1 4010 10.11/ 11	Trian Scherie local s	pecies upi the		assessmenter	secondary	poisoning	<u>۲</u>

		AL A	\sim	¥ 69	a n	×	
Generic avian indicator species	Body	l weight	ĺg] "Ø	Example	ؔF	TR/bw	ŝ,
Earthworm eater	ő	100	, Q	Bhackbird		1,95 2	, j
Fish eater	Å	1000	N N	Heron	Ĉ	ک 159 ک	, S
	\sim	ês û	n Ĉ		ر م	. Õ	Ö

Long-term TER calculation for earthworm-eating birds

Table 10.1.9- 2: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation for earthworm-eating birds

Compound) Iprovalicarb	Origin of Value
BCF worm calcul	ation: a S S	
Pow & L	<u>)</u> <u>~</u>	AII 2.8
K _{oc} [mL/g]	11329	S IIA 7.4 / ANA 9.3
foc	\$ 02 J	default
BCFworm	8.5346	
Ø PECworm calcul	ation: A &	
PEC _{soil} (twa 21 d)[mg/kg]	0.359	> / IIIA 9.4
PECworn [mg/kg]	3.064 O'	
ODDD & alculat	ion: O V V	Â
FIR/bw		Default
DDD [mg/kg bw/d] 🔍 🖉	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
TERLT Calcula	itign: 🔨 🚴 💊	
NO(A)EL [m̥g/kɡ bw/d] 🛛 🖉 🔬		IIIA 10.1
TER _{LT}	0° 39° . ~	
Trigger 🖏 🕺	A. 185 A	
Refined risk assessment required?	No Y	

¹ mean of both diastereoments \sim

² Worst case PEG toil (twa, 21 d) for the ase in vines, early, 4×216 g a.s./ha, $4 \times 60\%$ interception, 10 days interval

The TER value & above the togger of 5. Accordingly the risk to earthworm eating birds from the use of the productor of the proposed use pattern is acceptable.

Page 19 of 91

2012-05-02

Bayer CropScience

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Long-term TER calculation for fish-eating birds

Long-term TER calculation for	r fish-eating birds		Q D
Table 10.1.9- 3: Tier 1 long-tern	n TER calculation for fish-ea	ting birds	
Compound	Iprovalicarb	Origin of value	
	PEC _{fish} calculation:	10,	
BCF _{fish}	1.4	IIA 8.2.64 02	
PEC_{SW} (twa, 21 d)[mg/L] ¹⁾	0.01993	AIII.9.7	
PEC _{fish} [mg/kg]	0.028	<u> </u>	
	DDD calculation:	.0 ⁴ «,	
FIR/bw	0.159 ₄ 🖉 "	Default	
DDD [mg/kg bw/d]	0.004		
	TERLT calculation:		
NO(A)EL [mg/kg bw/d]	16 4		NY W
TER _{LT}	40250		L A co
Trigger	A5.0 20		P' Q' A
Refined risk assessment required?	No No		

g O./ha, 4 × 50% interception, 30 days ¹ Worst case PEC_{sw} (twa, 21 d) for the use in yings, early, 4 × 246

The TER value is above the trigger of 3 Accordingly the risk to the early birds from the use of the product according to the proposed use pattern is acceptable

U

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.2 Effect on aquatic organisms

Toxicity of iprovalicarb to aquatic organisms

IIIA 10.2 E	Effect on aquati	ic organis	sms	
Toxicity of iproval	icarb to aquatic	organism	S	
A summary of the a	quatic toxicity pr	ofile is pro	ovided below for iprovalicarb.	g 4 a
Table 10.2- 1: Toxicit	ty of iprovalicarb	to aquatic o	organisms of the second s	
Test species	Test system	Test duration	Endpoint [mg as/L]	Reference 3 5
Iprovalicarb			\mathcal{A} \mathcal{C} \mathcal{S}	
<i>Oncorhynchus</i> <i>mykiss</i> (rainbow trout)	Static acute	96 h 🖉	C Sone 22.7 (form)	(\$995) DOM 95060 M 000056-01-1 ITA 8.27/.1/01 (EU point IIA, 8.2.10/1)
<i>Lepomis</i> macrochirus (Bluegill sunfish)	Static acute	5 96 Ky	LCS > 20.70(mm)	(1995) 5 DOM 59059 M-00050-0121 IIA \$2.1.2/64 (EQ point IIA, 8.2.1/02)
<i>Oncorhynchus</i> <i>mykiss</i> (rainbow trout)	Chronic semi viatic		$ \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \\ \end{array} \\$	(1997) DOM 96053 M-000032-01-1 UA 8.2.3/01 OU point IIA, 8.2.2.1/01)
Oncorhynchus mykiss (rainbow trout)	EDS Dow-through		Soec 5(mm)	(2000) 443A-105 M-030681-01-1 IIA 8.2.4/01
Daphnia magna (water flea)	Static acute	248 h	$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i$	(1996) HBF/DM 157 M-000039-01-1 IIA 8.3.1.1/01 (EU point IIA, 8.2.4/01)
Daphnia mogna (water flog)	Reproduction test		NOEC 1.89 (mm)	(1996) HBF/RDM 57 M-000036-01-1 IIA 8.3.2.1/01 (EU point IIA, 8.2.5/01)
Chironomus riportus (chironomid)	Static, spited	28 dv	EC _{15 emerg} . 128 (nom) EC _{15 develop} . > 250 (nom)	EBSZL026 M-398870-01-1 IIA 8.5.2/01
Pseudokir chnertella subcapitata (green alga)	Crowth inhibition test	72 h	ErC ₅₀ > 10 (nom) E _b C ₅₀ > 10 (nom)	(1996) AJO/141195 M-000034-01-1 IIA 8.4/01 (EU point IIA, 8.2.6/01)



Test species	Test system	Test duration	Endpoint [mg as/L]	Reference
M03 (Iprovalicarb-c	arboxylic acid)			
Oncorhynchus mykiss (rainbow trout)	Static acute	96 h	LC ₅₀ > 10 mg p.m./L (nom)	(2011) EBSZX156 M-409113591-1 IIA 8.2,13/03
Daphnia magna (water flea)	Static acute	48 h	ECstop 10 mg p.m.(D(nom)	2011) EBSZX1575 Mo409052-01-1 AFA 8.3Q.1/04
Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata (green alga)	Static acute	72 h 🐇	$E_bC_{50} > 10 \text{ mg p.m./L} (nom)^{\circ}$ $E_cC_{50} > 10 \text{ song p.m./L} (nom)^{\circ}$	2011) EBSZX 158 MA11009-01-1 IIA 8.494
M10 (PMPA)	[
Oncorhynchus mykiss (rainbow trout)	Static acute	0 96 g 1	AcC ₅₀ p.m./L (nom)	(1997) & DOM 96963 M-000014-0103 IIA. S.2.1.3/04 (FC point IIA, 8.2.1/03)
Daphnia magna (water flea)	Static acute	48°h	C50 & 36.5 mg.p.m./L (nom) & y (nom) & y (nom) & y	(1997) HBF/DM 170 M_000119-01-1 HQ 8.3.1.1/02 (EU point IIA, 8.2.4/02)
Chironomus riparius (chironomid)	Static spiked	*28 d ~	EC ₁₆ merg. > 000 mg p.m./kg	EBSZL022 M-368933-01-1 IIA 8.5.2/02
Pseudokirchhæriella subcapitata (green æga)	Growth indibition est	72 h	ErC ₅₀ F rC ₅₀ Chom) TDS mg p.m./L Chom) TDS mg p.m./L Chom) TDS mg p.m./L Chom) TDS mg p.m./L	(1997) AJO/151796 M-000079-01-1 IIA 8.4/02 (EU point IIA, 8.2.6/02)
M15 (N-acetyl-PMP			<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
Oncorhynchus mykiss (rainbow trout)	Station Cute		ر کلال دوری 100 mg p.m./L (nom)	(1997) DOM 97048 M-000751-01-1 IIA 8.2.1.3/02 (EU point IIA, 8.2.1/04)
Daphhia magna (water flea)	Static acute		EC50≥100 mg p.m./L (nom)	(1997) HBF/DM 185 M-000601-01-1 IIA 8.3.1.1/03 (EU point IIA, 8.2.4/03)
Pseudokirchnerie subcapitalia (green algae)	Growth Thibition test	72 h	E _r C ₅₀ > 100 mg p.m./L (nom) E _b C ₅₀ > 100 mg p.m./L (nom)	AJO/167297 M-000624-01-1 IIA 8.4/03 (EU point IIA, 8.2.6/03)





 Mietabolites

 M10 (= PMPA) and M15 (=N-acetyl-PMPA) are aquatic metabolites of iprovalicarb of brajor, importance that could be detected in the water/sediment study. In addition, the toxicity of the metabolite iprovalicarb-carboxylic acid (M03) was also tested.

 Toxicity of folpet to aquatic organisms

 A summary of the aquatic toxicity profile is provided below for folpet

 Table 10.2- 2: Toxicity of folpet to aquatic organisms

Test systemTest durationTest (Endpoint [mg/s/L])Reference ReferenceSolpetDiscorhynchus mykiss Rainbow trout)Static acute96 h $LC_{50}=0.233$ Discorhynchus mykiss Brown trout)Static acute96 h $LC_{50}=0.098$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report icFolpet, 2006Discorhynchus mykiss Rainbow trout)Chronic semi-static28 d $24 h LC_{50}=0.193$ $96 h LC_{50}=0.103$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report icFolpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Semi-static acute28 d $26 c s_{50} = 0.110^3$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report icFolpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Growth onhibition test $72 h$ $ECS_{50} = 30 mg p.m./L$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 h $LC_{50} = 100 mg p.m./L$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 h $LC_{50} > 100 mg p.m./L$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 h $LC_{50} > 100 mg p.m./L$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 h $LC_{50} > 100 mg p.m./L$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 h $LC_{50} > 100 mg p.m./L$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 h $LC_{50} > 100 mg p.m./L$ $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	1 able 10.2- 2: 1 0x101	ly of forpet to aqua		Ŭ 1
iii <th< th=""><th>Test species</th><th>Test system</th><th>Test Endpoint [mg ns/L] / / Reference</th><th></th></th<>	Test species	Test system	Test Endpoint [mg ns/L] / / Reference	
olpetDincorhynchus mykissStatic acute96 hLCs = 0.233Rainbow trout)Static acute96 hLCs = 0.985Brown trout)Static acute96 hLCs = 0.985Dincorhynchus mykissChronic semi-static28 d24 h LCs > 0.156 				k
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	rolpet	1		<u>"</u>
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Incorhynchus	Statia aguta		
Kalmov trout)Static acute96 hLCss \neq 0.098Dicorhynchus mykiss Rainbow trout)Chronic semi-static24 h LCss \neq 0.156 96 h LCso $=$ 0.163 96 h LCso $=$ 0.163 96 h LCso $=$ 0.163 96 h LCso $=$ 0.163 96 h LCso $=$ 0.1103 96 h LCso $=$ 0.100 hibition testDaphnia magna water flea)Semi-static acute38 h56 so96804 96 hDaphnia magna water flea)Growth pinhibition test72 hECso $=$ 39 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 h14 so $=$ 39 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hLCso $=$ 39 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hLCso $=$ 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hLCso $=$ 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hLCso $=$ 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute72 hEsCso $=$ 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	<i>nykiss</i> (Painbow trout)	Static acute		
admb Huld Brown trout)Static acute96 h $LC_{50} \neq 0.098$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Semi-static 	(Kallioow trout)	, L		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(Brown trout)	Static acute	26 h	
Discortights Nexiss Rainbow trout)Chronic semi-static28 d24 h LCs - 0.156 	(Biowin doud)	Ŵ		
Disconfunctius mykiss Rainbow trout)Chronic semi-static semi-static acutoChronic semi-static acuto24, 11, 12, 64, 0, 153, 96, 110	~	Â.		
mykss Rainbow trout)semi-static acutoward acuto90-h LC so = 0.1103 28-day LC so = 0.1103 28-day LC so = 0.1103 26-day LC so = 0.100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Phthalic active machine magna water flea)Static active 26-day LC so > 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Paphnia magna water flea)Static active 26-day LC so > 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Paphnia magna water flea)Static active 26-day LC so > 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 <td>Oncorhynchus</td> <td>Chronic</td> <td>24-h LC₅₆>0.136 EFSØ Scientific Repo</td> <td>ort</td>	Oncorhynchus	Chronic	24-h LC ₅₆ >0.136 EFSØ Scientific Repo	ort
Rainbow front) Daphnia magna water flea) Semi-static icenedesmus ubspicatus green alga) Phthalimide Lepomis machrochirus Bluegill sunfish) Daphnia magna water flea) Daphnia magna Magn	mykiss (Daimhann tuant)	semi static	$96-n LC_{50} = 0.133$ [for folget, 2006]	
Daphnia magna water flea)Semi-static acuto38 hEC so9,6804 (acuto)Scenedesmus ubspicatus green alga)Growth inhibition test72 hEr so> 10 EC soPhthalimide epomis machrochirus Bluegill sunfish)Static acute96 hEC so> 40Phthalimide epomis machrochirus Bluegill sunfish)Static acute96 hEC so> 40Phthalimide epomis machrochirus Bluegill sunfish)Static acute96 hEC so> 10 EC soEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hEC so> 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hEC so> 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hEC so> 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hEC so> 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Static acute48 hEC so> 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Static acute48 hEC so> 100 mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	(Kallibow trout)		$a^{28} - \frac{100}{2} = 0.110^{-8}$	
Daphnia magna water flea)Semi-static acutoAB hEC 50 $9,680^4$ (mission test)Scenedesmus ubspicatus green alga)Fröwth mibition test72 hEr 50> 10 Er 50> 10 Er 50Phthalinide reponity nachrochirus Bluegill sunfish)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 10 Er 50Er 50> 240Phthalinide machrochirus Bluegill sunfish)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 10 EC 50EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 100 mg p.m./LPhthalic acid makiss rainbow trout)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 100 mg p.m./LDaphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 100 mg p.m./LDaphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 100 mg p.m./LDaphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 100 mg p.m./LDaphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 100 mg p.m./LDaphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hIf C 50> 100 mg p.m./LDaphnia magna water flea)Static acute72 hE _b C 50100 mg p.m./L		à à ×		
water flea) acue 3 acue 3 acue 3 acue 5 acue 48 5 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Daphnia magna 🛛 🔏	Semi-static	\mathcal{A} h \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} h A	
Scenedesmus ubspicatus green alga)Growth phibition test72 hEreso Ereso Scenedesmus Ereso Ereso Foreso Foreso> 10 Ereso Fore	(water flea)	acut		
ubspicatus T24 Effects 40 green alga) minibition test 724 Effects 40 Phthalimide	Scenedesmus	Geowth _	$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F} = $	
green alga)printerior decisionPhthalimideLeponismachrochirusBluegill sunfish)Daphnia magna water flea)Phthalic acidDincorhynemus mykiss mainbow trout)Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hLC $_{50} = 39 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Phthalic acidDincorhynemus mykiss mainbow trout)Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hLC $_{50} > 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Phthalic acid mocorhynemus mykiss mykiss mainbow trout)Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute48 fbEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Phthalic acid mainbow trout)Complexity papenia magna water flea)Phthalic acid magna water flea)Phthalic acid papenia magna water flea)Phthalic acid papenia magna water flea)Phthalic acid papenia magna water flea)Phthalic acid papenia magna water flea)Phthalic acid papenia magna water flea)Phthalic acid papenia magna water flea)Phthalic acid papenia papeniaPhthalic acid papeniaPhthalic acid papeniaPhthalic acid papeniaPhthalic acid papeniaPhthalic acid papenia	subspicatus 👸	whibition test	724 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	
Phthalimide Static actite 96 h LC $_{50} = 38$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 Daphnia magna water flea) Static actite 96 h EC $_{50} = 39$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 Phthalic actite 48 h EC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 Phthalic actite 96 h EC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 Phthalic actite 96 h EC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 Daphnia magna water flea) Static actite 96 h EC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 Daphnia magna water flea) Static actite 48 h EC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 Pathalic actite 48 h EC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006 Pathalic actite 72 h E_bC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./L EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	(green alga)			
Leponix machrochirus Bluegill sunfish)Static acute96 hLC $_{50} = 38$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute48 hEC $_{50} = 39$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Phthalic acit Discorbytenus nykiss water flea)Static acute96 hLC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hLC $_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hEC $_{50} \ge 100$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 hEC $_{50} \ge 100$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	Phthalimiete			
Machrochirus Bluegill sunfish)Static acute90 h $12 s_0 = 30$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute 480 6 $EC_{50} = 39$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Phthalic acid Dicorhynchus nykiss, rainbow trout)Static acute 96 h $LC_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute 96 h $LC_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute 96 h $EC_{50} \ge 100$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	Lepomi 🛠 🖻			
Bidegin sumsityErsa scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute48 fb $FC_{50} = 39 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ Ersa scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Phthalic acitDiscorrhynehus mykiss rainbow trout)Static acute96 ft $LC_{50} > 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 ft $LC_{50} > 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute96 ft $EC_{50} \ge 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute72 h $E_bC_{50} > 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	(Bluegill supfish)		90 n $10050 = 30$ mg p.m./L	
Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute 486 $EC_{0} = 39 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ Ior Folpet, 2000Phthalic acid Dincorhynchus nykiss rainbow trout)Static acute 96 h $LC_{50} > 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acute 4840 $EC_{50} \ge 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006		A	EFSA Scientific Repo	ort
water flea) $(1000000000000000000000000000000000000$	Daphnia magna 🚬	Static agente	10° 1	
Phthalic acidOncorhynehus nykissStatic acute96 hLC50 > 100 mg p.m./LCaphnia magnaWater flea)Static acuteGrowthOr Seudokirchueriella ubcapitateGrowthT2 hEbC50 > 100 mg p.m./L	(water flea)		4800 DC30 39 mg p.m./L	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Phthalic activ			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Oncorhytomus			
rainbow trout)Static acce48 fc $EC_{50} \ge 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Daphnia magna water flea)Static acce48 fc $EC_{50} \ge 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Pseudokirchueriella ubcapitade green atgae)Growth inhibition test72 h $E_bC_{50} > 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	mvkiss	Static acute	96% LC ₅₀ > 100 mg p.m./L	
Daphnia magnaStatic acce 48 Å $EC_{50} \ge 100$ mg p.m./LEFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Static acce 72 h $E_bC_{50} \ge 100$ mg p.m./L $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Static acce 72 h $E_bC_{50} > 100$ mg p.m./L $EFSA$ Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	(rainbow trout)			
Daphnia magna water flea)Static acore 4842 $EC_{50} \ge 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006Pseudokirchueriella ubcapitada green algae)Growth inhibition test 72 h $E_bC_{50} > 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006	>	10, 0 ¹		
water flea) <i>Pseudokirchueriella</i> <i>ubcapitad</i> green algae) <i>Growth</i> <i>ahibition test</i> <i>T2 h</i> <i>EbC₅₀ > 100 mg p.m./L</i> <i>for Folpet, 2006</i>	Daphnia magna 🖉	Static acate	48@ EC ₅₀ $\geq 100 \text{mg p.m./L}$ EFSA Scientific Repo	ort
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(water flea)		for Folpet, 2006	
<i>ubcapitade</i> green algae) 72 h E _b C ₅₀ > 100 mg p.m./L	Pseudokirchnerielle			
green algae) & Annibition test	subcapitata .	Grówth ~	72 h $E_b C_{50} > 100 \text{ mg p.m./L}$	
	(green algae)	inhibition test		
$c_{I}^{O^{\prime}}$	E Q	L'AL		
	C ^O ^v			

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Test species	Test system	Test duration	Endpoint [mg as/L]	Reference
Phthalamic acid	1			
Oncorhynchus mykiss (rainbow trout)	Static acute	96 h	LC ₅₀ > 100 mg p.m./L	
<i>Daphnia magna</i> (water flea)	Static acute	48 h	EC 100 mg p.m.	EFSA Scientific Report for Forpet, 2006
Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata (green algae)	Growth inhibition test	72 h	$E_bC_{50} > 100 \text{ mg/p.m./} $	
Benzamide		ý		
<i>Oncorhynchus</i> <i>mykiss</i> (rainbow trout)	Static acute	96 h	LC ₅₀ 100 rg p.m./P	
Daphnia magna (water flea)	Static acute	Q48 kg	EC ₅₀ 702 mg p.m./IC	For Forpet, 2006
Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata (green algae)	Growth inhibition tost	√72 h	$\mathcal{L}_{50} \geq 0.00 \text{ mgp} \text{ m}/L^{\circ}$	
2-cyanobenzoic acid		, _s		, Q
Oncorhynchus mykiss (rainbow trout)	Static acute	00 96 h	C ₅₀ 2000 mg p.m/L	
Daphnia magna (water flea)	Statioacute	×48 h ~	$C_{50} > 00 \text{ mg/m./L}$	EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, 2006
Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata (%) (green algae)	Growth inhibition test	22 h ~	\mathcal{F}	

Bold values: Endpoints considered relevant for risk assessment

¹ value to be used for the Tiert risk assessment 2 Six species of fish were tested (see Table 10.2 3). Brown troug (Salmo trutta) was the most sensitive species tested and this LC_{50} should be used of the brigher for risk assessment. Uncertainty regarding interspecies variation in sensitivity has been reduced. Hence, a TER trigger of 10 should be used.

Ň

variation in sensitivity has been reduced. Hence, a TER trigger of 10 should be used. ³ Test conducted with the product Folpan 500 SC ⁴ Test conducted with the product Folpan 80 WPG A multiple single species acute fish study has also been conducted for folpet and is summarised in the following table

Table 10.2- 3: Multip	ole single-species a	acute toxicity tests v	vith fish	
Species	Exposure time	LC50 (mg a.s./L)	Reference	
Brown trout	24 h	0.098		
(Salmo trutta)	96 h	0.098		
Bream	24 h	0.155		Or a star
(Abramis brama)	96 h	0.114	1	
Roach	24 h	0.211		
(Rutilus rutilus)	96 h	0.211	Data provided by	E S O
3- Spined stickleback	24 h	0.229	Makhteshim	
(Gasterosteus aculeatus)	96 h	0.229	A .	
Rainbow trout	24 h	0.233	Q' p°	
(Oncorhynchus mykiss)	96 h	0.239	N O	
Carp	24 h	1.471 0		
(Cyprinus carpio)	96 h	¥.012	N A A	S a w

Metabolites

In the sediment water fate study five metabolites, of Folget were formed, which were then selves transient. These were (with highest @applied radioactivity for whole system) withalighte up to 26.0% in water phase, phthalic acid up to 37.5% in water, phthalamio acid op to 19.3% in water, benzamide up to 10.2% in water and 2-cyapobenzoic acid up to 39.7% in water (see EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, Appendix 1 list of rendpoints). They have a low to reity to aquatic organisms and are significantly less toxic than Folper (see Table 192-2). In addition, these compounds would have been present in the static toxicity tests on Folpet The low metholite toxicity explains how hydrolysis is such an effective detexification mechanism. In terms of exposure, metabolite PEC values will be lower than Folpet. Therefore, the osk to aquatic organisms from these metabolites will be significantly lower than for Forpet itself, and no risk assessment is conducted with them?

Summary of data derived from studies with the formulated product

A summary of the aquatic toxicity profile of Iprovalicarb Folget WG 65.3 is provided in Table 10.2-4. For more details on the respective studies reference is made to Point 10.2.2 of this dossier.

Table 10.2-4: Toxicity of Iprovalicarb + F	olpet WG 65.3 to aquat	ic organisms	
Test organism Test system	Endpoint Omg product/	L]	Reference
Ad	te toxicity to fish		
Oncorhynchus mykiss (rainbow tout)	LC ₅₀ 0	.088	(2003) DOM 22067 M-079959-01-1 KIIIA 10.2.2.1/01
Acute Oxici	ity to aquatic invertebrat	es	
Bophnia Hagna (water flea) Static 48 h	EC ₅₀ 1	60	(2003) DOM 22055 M-078438-01-1 KIIIA 10.2.2.2/01
č ^O ^v			

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Test organism	Test system	Endp [mg proc	oint luct/L]	Reference
	Effe	ects on algal growth		
Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata (green alga)	Static 72 h	EbC50 ErC50	16.0 > 100	(2002) 844911 M-065958-0121 KIII@ 10.2@3/01
In addition, the acute mi	xture toxicity of	the formulated p	roduçt was ca	lculated according to the
formula of Finney (Finney	r, GIFAP, 1990):			
c	1 / LC t _{as} = w/w fraction ctive substances \neq i	50 expecter → ∑ ct w/ f active substance i iprovalicarb folpet		
Table 10.2- 5: Calculati	on of the seute mb	ted toxicity of the fo	mulation acco	ang to Finnex?
	Iproval	licand of	Folger &	Iprovalicarb Folpet
Content within the product [<u>%k) 2</u>		<u>56.3</u>	<u> </u>
I C [mg ag/L]	Effects on fi	sh (<i>Uncorhynehus n</i>	iykiss) ~ ~ ~	
LC_{50} – mixed toxicity [mg product/L]		$\bigcirc Expected LQ_0$ $\bigcirc = 0.443$		$\begin{array}{c} & & \\$
	C O Effects	s on Daphnia magne	U <u>s a</u> ,	
EC ₅₀ [mg as/L]		$\frac{28}{6} = 1.20$		$Measured EC_{50} = 1.60$

Based on Finney's formula, the maximum deviation of the expected toxicity of the formulated product from the measured toxicity is a factor of 47 for fish and a factor of 1.3 for *Daphnia* from the measured toxicity values. This variation is within the experimental variability of biological systems and below the factor of 10 used in the Aquatic Guidance Forcument as indication for significant differences. Thus, the risk assessment for the formulated product can be safely based on the data generated on its active ingredients.

Selection of algae endpoints for pisk assessment

Processes in ecosystems are dominantly rate driven and therefore, the unit development per time (growth rate) appears more suitable to measure effects in algae. Also, growth rates and their inhibition can easily be compared between species; test durations and test conditions, which is not the case for biomass. After numerous discussions, the current test guidelines OECD TG 201, the EU-Method C3, the EC tegulation for Classification and Labeling (EC regulation 1272/2008) and the PPR Opinion (EFSA Journal 461 1 - 44; 2007) list growth rate as the most suitable endpoint of the algae inhibition test. Only the current Guidance Document on Aquatic Toxicology (SANCO/3268/2001 rev. 4) still states that "As there is no clear evidence available to indicate which is the most relevant endpoint for the field situation the lower figure should be used in the risk assessment". In order to avoid unnecessary delays in dossier reviews, toxicity-exposure-ratios in this assessment are built on the



lower of the two values, the E_bC_{50} or the E_rC_{50} in case both values are available, unless justification is available.

IIIA 10.2.1 Toxicity exposure ratios for aquaic speces Aquatic organisms may be exposed to a plant protection product to some extent by spray drift run-off or drainage from treated fields. The provided studies and data permit a risk assessment following

Predicted Environmental Concentrations in surface water bodies

Predicted environmental concentrations for the active substances and their relevant metabolites were calculated in surface water (PECsw) and in sediment (PECsed Caccording to FOC S surface water scenarios as described in detail in Point 9.7 (active substances) and 9.8 (metabolites).

Concentrations in groundwater are also sonsidered, as groundwater might become surface water, leading to exposure of aquatic organisms. However, the PEC values for the active substance and the soil metabolites are $< 0.1 \,\mu g/L$ in groundwater for all relevant FQCUS scenarios and application rates (for details see Point 9.6), and thus not relevant for the risk assessment ?

	Â			D.		0″	Iprovalicarb	
Crop	N' A	Step 🔊			KECsw, ng	X	PECsw, 21 d TWA	PECsed, max
	<u>\$</u> , 0	N.		Ĩ,	/[µg/La		_∞ µg/L]	[µg/kg]
Vine, early		1 🕅		Ś	273.1	Ŕ	≪ [▼] 220.7	284.8
4 × 0.216 kg/ha	Ş.	,₽(N-EU	Multi	2	\$ 8.54	J.	<i>Q</i> 14.72	20.11
50% interception	100	2 (S-E	Multi) 🔊	ì a	24.92	4	J 19.93	27.23
°.⊳×*	×.	2 (N=EU	Single)	Š	8,999	\sim	7.182	9.809
L &		205-EU	Single)	Õ.	1S215	, O	10.57	14.45

Maximum PEC, and PEC set values for iprovalicarb at FOCUS Steps 1 and 2 Table 10.2.1-1:

Bold letters: values used in risk assessment

Table 10.2.1- 2:	Maximum PEC	w and PECsed v	alues for iprovalica	rb metabolites at F	OCUS Steps 1 and 2
		sti esta			0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 u u u u u

~~~~(	Ũ		× × 103	M10	)	M15
Crop 🔬		Step ~ Step	<b>PEC</b> sw, Max	PEC _{sw, max}	PEC _{sed} , max	PEC _{sw, max}
<i>b</i>	(		ل <b>∯/ي</b> وµ] ```	[µg/L]	[µg/kg]	[µg/L]
Vine, early	2,1	1 4 ~	© <u></u> 3Q.78	46.34	128.9	45.43
$4 \times 0.216$ kg/ha, $\ll$	Ĭ	2 (S EU Mailti)	0.561	4.835	13.61	1.131
50% interception		🔊 (S-EU) Multi)	[©] 0.561	8.629	24.50	1.155
ÇO N		2 (N-EU Single)	0.329	1.440	4.036	0.362
	4	2 (SEU Single)	♥ 0.352	2.513	7.119	0.386

Bold letters Salues used in Sk assessment

Risk assessment

party substance procured from Folget is a st

). Bayer

CropScience AG is using a risk envelope approach for the risk assessment of the representative formulation. Within the scope of this supplementary dossier, up to 4 applications at 1.35 kg/ha folpet are proposed as a safe use in grapes. This is much below the critical GAP that currently

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

defends in this crop in the EU, where 10 applications of up to 1.6 kg/ha have been approved, with all other parameters such as interval between applications or pre-harvest interval being identical afvery similar. Therefore, Bayer CropScience AG considers it justified to refer to folder data owned by wherever appropriate. A folpet-specific risk assessment is not considered necessary to defend the Annex I listing of iprovalicarb.

Based on the representative most sensitive endpoint values (Table 0.2-1) and the PD (Table 10.2.1-1 and Table 10.2.1-2; highest values selected as worst case), the TR-values have be calculated, based on the following equations:

 $TER_a = LC_{50}$  or  $EC_{50}$  / initial PEC_{water}  $TER_{lt} = E_r C_{50} / initial PEC_{water}$ 

fish and invertebrates are >100 and the TER_{lt}  $TER_{lt} = chronic NOEC / long-term PEC$ The risk is considered acceptable, if the values >10.

### Summary of calculated TER galues for aquatic organism

Table 10.2.1- 3:	Summary of all TER carci	ulations as giv	en under points	10.29.1 to 19	2.1.11 (based on
	most relevant endpoints)		. O ^V &		,

	<u> </u>					
Appl. rate	<b>Organism</b>	Time-scale	Distance	∕ ŤER ⊘′	≪Trigger	Assessment
[g as/ha]		0	[m]		,	level
Iprovalicar	b 🖉 🔪 🎸			5° 0° 55		
	Figh	acute 6		831	100	
	🖉 🖓 Tish 🗸	long-term	S - S		10	
~	👂 Invertebrates ĸ	actito	ð -		100	
4 x 21 0 1	Invertebrates 🚿	long-term		36 Z	10	Step 2
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	Sediment dweller (spiked sediment)	Aong-teon	2- 4	Å ⁴⁷⁰¹	10	
	Green algae	long term *		> 401	10	
M03		, Č Å	Ö ^r (ð		
	Ý Élsh	acute	× - ×	> 17825	100	
- 4	Invertebrates	acute	\$ - U	> 17825	100	Step 2
	Green 🏟 gae 🖉	longeterm	2,7 	> 17825	10	
M10		N N	<u>`</u>			
	Fish S	acute	- Z	> 11589	100	
Ĭ	Invertebrates C	acute "	0 ″ -	> 4230	100	
-	Sediment dweller (spiked sediment)	fong-term	-	> 4082	10	Step 2
Å	🖗 Gtæen algae 🐇	∫ long√@rm	-	832	10	
M15 🖉		9				
	Eish S	acute	-	> 86580	100	
S.	Invertebrates	acute	-	\geq 86580	100	Step 2
	Green algae	long-term	-	> 86580	10	

Conclusion: According to the presented risk assessment, a risk to aquatic organisms from exposure after the use of the product as described in this dossier is unlikely.

IIIA 10.2.1.1 TERA for fish

Table 10.2.1.1- 1: TERA calculations for fish based on maximum PEC_{sw} values according to FOCUS

Species	Endpoint [µg/L]	PEC _{sw,max} [µg/L]	TER A	Annex VI
		Iprovalicarb	Ô Ì	
L. macrochirus	$LC_{50} > 20700$	24.92	≥ 831 <u>v</u>	3 100 0
		MQ®		
O. mykiss	$LC_{50} > 10000$	0.561	Q > 17925	5 6 100 °
	,	M10, °	in the sh	
O. mykiss	$LC_{50} > 100000$) <u> </u>	× 11589	100
	Ą	, Nor15 , O , Q		
O. mykiss	$LC_{50} > 10000$	× × 1.155°	\$ \$6580	100
				<u>A</u> O

The TERA values for the active substance provation and its metabolities meet the required trigger as set in Annex VI of Council Directive @1/4149EEC, Ordicating an acceptable acute risk to fish for application of the product.

TERL for fish **IIIA 10.2.1.2**

Ś Table 10.2.1.2- 1: TERLT calculation for fish based on maximum PECsw values according to FOCUS Step 2 Ændpoint PEC Ø Annex VI **W**TER_{LT} Species [ng/L] $[\mu g/L]$ Trigger Iprovalicarb <u>5000</u> O. mykiss NOÉĆ 24 201 10

The TERLT value for the active substance provalicarb meets the required trigger as set in Annex VI of

The TER_{LT} value for the acrive substance iprovalicarb meets the required trigger as set in Annex VI of Council Directive 91/414/EEC sindicating an acceptable long-term risk to fish for application of the product.



IIIA 10.2.1.3 TERA for Daphnia

Table 10.2.1.3- 1: TERA	calculation for Da	<i>phnia</i> based on max.	PEC _{sw} values acco	rding to FO	CUS Step 2 A
TROLETING IT I BIG			I Besw indes deed		

Species	End [µ	lpoint g/L]	PEC _{sw,max} [µg/L]	TERA	Annex XI
		Ipr	ovalicarb	Å.	
D. magna	EC50	> 19800	24.92	> 795	0 2 100 x
			M03	4	
D. magna	EC50	> 10000	0.561	♀	MOO K
		la da	M10		
D. magna	EC50	> 36500	8.629 ⁵⁵	4230	100
		1	XXY5 0 Q	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	of the second
D. magna	EC50	≥ 100000 ~	× ×1.155	≥ 86580	× 100gr
		O UN			

The TERA values for the active substance iprovalicarb and its merabolities meet the required trigger as set in Annex VI of Council Directore 91/414/EEC, indicating an acceptable acute risk to Daphnia for application of the product.

TERL'ivfor Daphnia **IIIA 10.2.1.4**

Table 10.2.1.4- 1: TERLT calculation for Drephnia based on max. PECsw values according to FOCUS Step 2 NO. **Endpoint** \forall PEC max a, \sim Annex VI ~

Species	0	Ô		μg/L]		J.	Jug/L			Trigger
	J	Ð.	K K	. 4	hat	Bvaliç	arb	0.	S.	
D. magna 🥎		R.	′ NQE€	1890	0°	Ž	24 \$, ∕_	° 76	10
		. 0	. 63		~ .	Ő	J.	, O		

The TER_{LT} value for the active substance provalicarb meets the required trigger as set in Annex VI of Endicating an acceptable long-term risk to Daphnia for application of Council Directive 91/414/EE the product.

TERA for an aquatic insect species IIIA 102.1.5

No specific studies on the acute poxicity of ippovalicarb to aquatic insect species were conducted. However, chronic studies addressing long-teen effects on the sediment dwelling insect Chironomus riparius were performed with the acove substance iprovalicarb and the metabolite M10 (please refer to \sim Point 10.2.1 of this dossier).



IIIA 10.2.1.6 TERLT for an aquatic insect species

IIIA 10.2.1.6	TERLT for an aquatic insect species	¢° č
Table 10.2.1.6- 1:	TER _{LT} calculations for <i>C. riparius</i> based on max. PEC _{sed} Step 2	values according to FQCUS

51	cp 2		"0"	Sec. V
Species Endpoint [µg/kg]		PECsed,max [µg/kg]	THERLT	Annes VI Trigger
	Ipi	rovalicart	<u> </u>	
C. riparius	EC ₁₅ 128000	27.23 🔍	ړن 4701 ≰	
		M10	9° 6° 69	
C. riparius	$EC_{15} > 100000$	24.50		
	4		*	

The TERLT values for the active substance provalicarb and its metabolite MPO meet the required trigger as set in Annex VI of Council Directive 91/414/EEC, indicating an acceptable long-term rise to aquatic insects for application of the product

TERA for an aquatic crustacean species IIIA 10.2.1.7 TERA for an aquatic crustacean species insecticide and the active substances do not show an insecticidal mode of action. The risk for these organisms is covered by the aquate risk assessment provided in this dossier

TERLT for an aquatle crustacean species **IIIA 10.2.1.8**

Please refer to point IIIA 90.2.1,3

TER₄ for an aquatic gastropodomollusc species

No studies on aquatic gastropped mediuscs are deened accessary according to current requirements. The risk for these organisms is covered by the aquatic risk assessment provided in this dossier.

LILA 10.2.1.16 TERLT for an aquatic gastropod mollusc species Please refer to point IIIA 0.2.1.0

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 *(Submission for Annex I renewal)*

IIIA 10.2.1.11 TERLT for algae

Table 10.2.1.11- 1: TERLT calculations for algae based on maximum PECsw values according to FQCUS

Ste	p 2		°	N Contraction
Species	Endpoint [µg/L]	PEC _{sw,max} [µg/L]	THERLT	AnnexVI
]	provalicar	<u> </u>	
P. subcapitata	$E_b C_{50} > 10000$	£ 24.92	ِنْ × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×	
		Mas		
P. subcapitata	$E_b C_{50} > 10000$	0.561	. © × > 17825 ∖	
	Ş	د M10¢ کې		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
P. subcapitata	E_bC_{50} 7180	× 8.009 0	x 832°	
	Ś	~M15~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	ASI	
P. subcapitata	$E_bC_{50} > 100000$	V 1.155	^م ر \$\$\$86580	

The TER_{LT} values for the active substance iprovalication and its metabolites meet the required trigger as set in Annex VI of Council Directive $\sqrt{1/414/EEC}$, adjusting an acceptable long term risk to algae for application of the product.

IIIA 10.2.2 Acute toxicity (aquatic) of the preparation

IIIA 10.2.2.1 Esh acute to xicity EC59, freshwater cold-water species

Report:	KIICA 10,2.2.1/0 K
Title:	Agute toxicity of Iprovalicate 9.0 WC + Folloet 56.9 to fish (Oncorhynchus mykiss).
Document No:	M-079959-04-1 (Report No DOM 22067)
Guidelines:	OECD Guideline No. 203, "OECD-Guideline for Testing of Chemicals", "Fish,
* *	Acute Toxicity Test", updated and adopted version of July 17, 1992
GLP	Yes (certified aboratory) 0 0

Material and methods:

Test item Iprovalicate 9.0 WG - Folper 56.3 content: Iprovalicarb 10.0% / Folpet 55.4%, specification: (batch no.: 07373/0048 (0046) development-no.: 3000244654), rainbow trout (*Oneorhynchus mykiss*, pean body length 55 cm, mean body weight 2.1 g), 10 fish per test concentration were exposed for 96 h under static test conditions to nominal concentrations of 0.0313, 0.0625, 0.125 0.25 and 0.50 mg test item / E.

Findings

Acute toxicity to fish (based on nominal concentrations)

Test item	Iprovalicarb 9.0 WG + Folpet 56.3
Test object	Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss)
Exposure	96h, static
minimum concentration causing 100%	0.125 mg test item / L

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

mortality (96 h)			
LC ₅₀ (96h)	0.088 mg test item / L		
(95 % C.I.)	(0.063 - 0.125)	ð	
NOLEC* (96h)	0.0625 mg test item / L	S	4 . 4

*no-observed-lethal-effect concentration (NOLEC)

Observations:

There were neither adverse effects nor any mortality in the control group. The no-observed effect concentration (NOEC) was 0.0313 mg test item / L. Up to five sh showed the following transient symptoms at 0.0625 mg test item / L: Remained for unusually long periods at the water surface, showed labored respiration, were inactive or displayed abnormally low activity.

IIIA 10.2.2.2 Acute toxicity (24 & 48 h) for Daphnia preferably Daphnia magna

Report:	KIIIA 10.2.2.2/012 2003 0 20 5
Title:	Acute toxicity of provalicarb 9.0 WG & Forest 565 to water fleas (Daphnia magna)
Document No:	M-078438-91-1 (Report No: DOM 22053)
Guidelines:	OECD 202 and EPA EERA 72-2 4 OF O
GLP	Yes (gertified aboratory)

Material and methods!

Iprovalicarb 9.0 $\sqrt[3]{G}$ & Folpet 56.3; a.s. content 10.0 % Iprovalicarb; 55.4 % Folpet, Fl-No.: 07373/0048(0066), article No.: 0003539447); young *Daphnia magna* (4st instars < 24 h old, 3 x 10 animals per concentration) in a static test system were sposed for 48 h to nominal concentrations of 0, 0.10, 0.22, 0.48, 1.1, 2.3, 5.2 and 14 mg formulation/L Measured concentrations of the a.s. were 100 to 120% (on average 104%) of forminal during this study.

Findings:

Toxicity to Waterfleas (based on nominal concentrations)?

				Ser O	ล้ 🕼			
	<u></u>	Test substa	nce		Iprovalica	b 9.0 W	G & Folpet 56.3	
	Ŵ	Testobje	cty 💙 🔿			Daphnia	magna	
Ľ	2	×,		Q ~	🖓 m	g formu	lation/L	
v		_@ ,Exposur			24 h, static		48 h, static	
		EC 50		, Q	7.9		1.6	
	(9\$	% confidence	e limits)		4.9 – 13		1.2 - 2.3	
	a, Y	\$ 0	N.	v				

Observations

Statistically significant immobilisation occurred in concentrations ≥ 2.3 mg formulation/L after 24 hours. After 48 hours statistically significant immobilisation occurred at concentrations ≥ 0.22 mg formulation/L. There was no concentration causing 100 % immobility. Highest immobilities were 93 % after 48 hours. Abnormal behaviour or appearance of symptoms were not observable at concentrations which showed no significant immobilisation

ð

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.2.2.3 Effects on algal growth and growth rate

Report:	KIIIA 10.2.2.3/01: 2002		
Title:	Toxicity of Iprovalicarb WG 9 & Folpet 5 (formerly <i>Selenastrum capricornutur</i>) in	56.3 to Pseudokirchr a 72-hour agal grov	eriellosubcopitata
Document No:	M-065958-01-1 (Report No: 844711)	Q.	
Guidelines:	OECD 201 Directive 92/69/EEC	Å .	
GLP	Yes (certified laboratory)		

Materials and methods:

Test item: Iprovalicarb WG 9 & Folper 56.3; contents of active ingredients: Folpet (ENT 26539) 55.4%, Iprovalicarb (SZX 0722) 10.0%, specification: Batch no. 07373/0048(0046); Tox. no. 6124-00; *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitato* was exposed under static conditions (stirring cultures) for 72 hours. The following nominal test tem concentrations were tested: 0.32, 1.6, 3.2, 40, 32, and 100 mg formulation/L. Calculations are based on nominal concentrations of the formulation. Measured concentrations of the a.s. were 94 to 100 % of nominal during this study.

Findings and observations:

Effects on algal average growth rater (results based on nominal test item concentrations):

		<u> </u>	
	Testitem	Iprovakcarb V	₩G 9 & Folpet 56.3
	Jest system	Pseudokirchn	eriella subcapitata
n A	Exposure C 33 C 5	<u>کې کې 72</u>	h, static
* ¥		Biomass	Growth rate
	EC_{50} ($\overline{0}$ -72 hours) $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$ $\overline{0}$	<u>ک</u> ۲۵	>100
4	Lowest observed effect concentration	3.2	3.2
	Highest tested concentration without effects (0-72 hours NGE C) [99g for fullation/L]	1.0	1.0
<i>~</i> у '		1	

Growth rate related values are preferred because the validity criteria according to exponential growth are fulfilled

Conclusion:

The E_bC_{50} for the WG formulation of Folpet + Iprovalicarb was 16 mg product/L and the E_rC_{50} value was >100 mg product/L

IIIA 10.2.2.4 Marine or estuarine organisms acute toxicity LC50/EC50

According to the current data requirements, no studies on marine or estuarine organisms are necessary of The potential risk for these organisms is covered by the aquatic risk assessment provided in this dossier.

IIIA 10.2.2.5 Marine sediment invertebrates, acute toxicity @C50/EC50 (

According to the current data requirements, no studies on marine or estuarine organisms are necessary. The potential risk for these organisms is covered by the aquatic risk assessment provided in this dossier.

IIIA 10.2.3 Microcosm or mesocosm stody

No microcosm or mesocosm studies were performed with the formulated product. Based on the toxicity data and application rate of the product, the risk assessment (TER calculations) presented above indicates acceptable risk to aquatic organisms. Therefore, micrososm or mesocosm studies with the formulated product are not deemed recessary.

IIIA 10.2.4 Residue data m fish (long Germ)

Iprovalicarb:

The steady state bioconcentration factor for iprovalicarb in a laboratory study with Bluegill sunfish was determined to be in the range of 8,56-11.4 (mean 10, see Annex II, chapter 8.2.6). Iprovalicarb is bio-concentrated very rapidly by Bluegill sunfish. When exposure ceases, the radioactivity is depurated very quickly with a half-fife of tess than half a day Additionally, it was considered that the BCFs obtained may have been everestimated because all calculations referred to total radioactivity (including parent compound and metabolites). This was confirmed by a residue analysis. The BCF for the parent compound in whole fish was determined as 1.4 (additional submission to AII, point 8.2.6).

Folpet

Folpet does for accumulation fish The overall BCF value was 56 (whole fish) (see EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, Appendix 1 tip of entroints).

IIIA 10.2.5 Chronic fish foxicity data

Chronic studies with the formulated product were not considered necessary, as the relevant information on be obtained from studies with the active ingredient.

IIIA 10 2.5.1 Chronic posicity (28 day exposure) to juvenile fish

See statement provided under Point IIIA 10.2.5.

IIIA 10.2.5.2 Fish early life stage toxicity test

See statement provided under Point IIIA 10.2.5.



IIIA 10.2.5.3 Fish life cycle test

See statement provided under Point IIIA 10.2.5.

IIIA 10.2.6 Chronic toxicity to aquatic invertebrates

s the . per relevant for Chronic studies with the formulated product were not considered necessary information can be obtained from studies with the active substances

IIIA 10.2.6.1 Chronic toxicity to Dapknia magna

See statement provided under Point IIIA 10,2

esent IIIA 10.2.6.2 Chronic toxicity for a rep

See statement provided under Point JIA 102.6

species of aquatic inserts gastropod

Accumulation in aquatic non-farget organisms &

Based on the information given under Point IIIA 40.2.4 considerable accumulation of residues of the product and/or metabolites in aquatic organisms is unlikely to occur.

represent, 10.26 in aquatic non-target organ aquatic organismes is unlikely to occur in aquatic organismes

IIIA 10.3 Effects on terrestrial vertebrates other than birds

IIIA 10.3	Effec	ets on terrestrial vertebrates other than birds		
Toxicity of iprovalicarb to mammals A summary of the toxicity of iprovalicarb to mammals is provided in the following table Table 10.3-1: Toxicity of iprovalicarb to mammals (selected studies)				
Test species	Test design	Ecotoxicological endpoint		
Rat	acute, oral	$LD_{50} > 5000 \text{ mga.s./kg/bw} $		
Rat	Two- generation study	NOAEL eproduction 146.3 mg a.s./kg bw/day NOEC 2000 mg a.s./kg feed 2000 mg a.s./kg feed 66.1/01 (EU point IIA, 66.1/01 (EU point IIA,		
Bold letters	: endpoints us	ed in risk assessment of a the second s		

Metabolites of iprovalicarb

The parent compound was the moor component found in all residue studies, and the only metabolites of quantitative significance (4 hydroxymethy) SZX \$722 and its Queoside [M01 and M02]) found in any study were determined in very minor absolute quantities and represent a metabolic pathway also seen in animals.

unlikely that this metabolite poses a risk to mampals, even as us toxicity is in the same range as for the parent compound. However, an acute Deeding study with M10 has been conducted and a tier 1 risk assessment will be carried out a suming 100% Conversion & iprovalicarb to M10.

Ĩ

Table 10.3- 2: Toxicity of the iprovalicarly metabolite 1000 to mammals

Test species	Test@esign	Reference
Rat	acute Gral C LD ₅₀ 300-500 mg pm/kg bw	(1996) 25319 M-000505-01-1 IIA 5.8.1.1/01 (EU point IIA, 5.8.1.1/01)

Bold letters Endpoints used in risk assessment

Toxicity of forpet to mammals

A summary of the toxicity of folpet to mammals is provided in the following table:


(M)

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Table 10.3-	5. Toxicity	of topet to manimals		
species	Test design	Ecotoxi	cological endpoint	Reference
Rat	acute, oral	LD50	> 2000 mg a.s./kg bw	(see EFSA Scientifie
Rat	Two- generation study	NOAELreproduction NOEC	140.9 mg a.s./kg bw/day 1500 mg a.s./kg feed	Report of Folger, Appendix 1 list of endpoints

Table 10.2 2. Torisity of folget to mammala (solosted studies)

Bold letters: endpoints used in risk assessment

Metabolites of folpet

Phthalimide, phthalamic acid and phthalic acid are confirmed mammalign metabolites of folpet (see EFSA Scientific Report for Folpet, Appendix 1 list of enopoints and their toxicity was accounted for in the acute and long term studies of forset in mammals. manmalian risk assessment for folpet adequately addresses risk for colpet metabolites

Toxicity of the formulated product

Ŵ The acute oral toxicity of the formulated product was determined

Mammalian toxicity data of the formulated product Iprovaliearb + Folpet WG 65.3 Table 10.3-4:

	× 1			. ♥	
Test species	Test design	Ecotoxicolo	ogical endpoint	K Reference	
Rat	Cacute oral		300 Ang/kg bw	2000) 30395 M-026075-01-1 KIIIA 7.7.1/01	
, Ô		JA A			

m

A

For more details reference is made to Point 10.3 of this dossig

Selection of endpoints for risk assessment

The selection of mammalian endpoints for fisk assessment follows the same principles as described in A suidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & detail under point 10.1 for birds. £₽FS Mammals (2009).

K, Risk Assessment for mammals

The risk assessment procedure for wild mammals follows the same principles as described in detail for birds i.e. KESA Goidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & Mammals under point §0.1 (2009)

The screeping step before the real risk assessment as described in the guidance based on indicator species level will be omitted.



). Baver

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Mammalian generic focal species for Tier 1 risk assessment

The product Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 is intended to be used in grapes with four applications of 2.4 kg product/ha corresponding to 0.216 kg iprovalicarb/ha and 1.3512 kg foret/ha at BBCH 15.55 with a minimum interval of 10 days. This is an artificial GAP that provides a risk envelope for the intended uses.

Folpet is a 3rd party substance procured from

CropScience AG is using a risk envelope approach for the risk assessment of the representative formulation. Within the scope of this supplementary dossier, up to 4 application at 1,35 kg/hg folper are proposed as a safe use in grapes. This is much below the critical GAP that ourrently defends in this crop in the EU, where 10 applications of up to 1.6 kg/ha have beep approved, with all other parameters such as interval between applications or fre-harvest interval being identical or very similar. Therefore, Bayer CropScience AG considers it Justified to refer to folget data owned by wherever appropriate. A folpet-specific risk assessment is not considered necessary to defend the Ô Annex I listing of iprovalicarb. Ľ

According to the EFSA Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & Manmals (2009) the Table 10.3- 5: Relevant generic mammalian focal species for Tier I risk assessment. following generic focal species have to be addressed in Tier Drisk assessment.



Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

				Shorte	ut value 🔊	
				For long-	For acute	Ç,
Cron	Growth stage	Generic focal species	Representative	term RA	ŘA (P
crop	(BBCH)	Generic ideal species	species	based on	based on	
			l	RUD		
			.1	mean 🤞	90 th perc.	ħ
Vineyard	10-19	Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph"	Brown hare	6.7	×16.3	
Vineyard	20-39	Large herbivorous mamma "lagomorph"	Brownhare		12.6	Ó
Vineyard	\geq 40	Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph?"	Brown hates		8.1	ľ
Vineyard	10-19	Small insectivorous mammal	Some Shrew		, zF	
Vineyard	\geq 20	Small insectivorous mammal	Common shiew	1.90	5.4 <i>f</i> °	
Vineyard	10-19	Small her Divorous manipal	Common vole	43.4	81.9	
Vineyard	20-39	Small herbixorous normmal	Common vole	چ 36 چ	© 68.2	
Vineyard	\geq 40	Small hesbivorous manipal	Common vol	211.7 ×	40.9	
Vineyard	10-19 🗸	Small ommorous mammal	Wood mouse	4.7 ⁰	10.3	
Vineyard	20-39	Small connivor frs manmal	Wood mouse	~~3.9	8.6	
Vineyard	<i>4</i> 0 <i>7</i>	Small omnivorous mammal	Wood mouse	2.3	5.2	



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.3.1 Toxicity exposure ratios for terrestrial vertebrates other than birds

Summary of calculated TER values for mammals

Table 10.3.1-1:	Summary o	f TER values	for acute	toxicity
	•/			•/

		A.	\bigcirc	
Crop (BBCH)	Generic focal species	Compound SV90	TER¥	Refinement
Vineyard (10-19)	Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph"	16.3	6 943	
Vineyard (10-19)	Small insectivorous mammal "show"	. 7.6	> 2000	no on
Vineyard (10-19)	Small herbivorous mammal wole"	all of the second secon	م گ ¹⁸⁹	C neg
Vineyard (10-19)	Small omnivorous mammal "mouse"		> 150,5	Ano o
Vineyard (10-19)	Large herbivorous maniful 'Lagomorph'		£ 57	nd nd
Vineyard (10-19)	Small insectivorous manimal "shrew"		1205	no
Vineyard (10-19)	Small herbitorous mammal, "vole	5 4 51.9		y no
Vineyard (10-19)	Small opprivorous mannal "mouse"		90	no
		·	Ø	

Table 10.3.1-2: Summary of TER values for long-term fricity

Crop (BBCH)	Genetic focalspecies 🖉 Compound	SV m	TERLT	Refinement
Vineyard (10-19)	Largeherbivorous mammal Hagomorph"	Ø 6.7	98	no
Vineyard (10-19)	Small presectivorous mammal shrew?	4.2	163	no
Vineyand (10=19)	Small her bivorous mammal "vole"	43.4	16	no
Vineyard (10-19)	Small Smniverous marimal mouse?	4.7	146.3	no

Conclusion: According to the presented ask as as some of, the risk to mammals from the use of the product in grapes is acceptable

Acate toxicity exposure ratio (TERA) **IIIA 10.3.1.1**

Tier I acute toxicity exposure ratio for manimals

The tier 1 risk assessment has been performed for grapes for an application rate of 4×0.216 kg

iprovalicarbera at a minimum application interval of 10 days.

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

		LD50	Γ	DDD				
Crop	Generic focal species	[mg/kg bw]	Appl. rate [kg/ha]	SV90	MAF ₉₀			D rigger
		Iprova	licarb		4		Q.	
	Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph"		Ő	16.3		5.3	\$943	
Granes	Small insectivorous mammal "shrew"	> 5000	[™] 4 [©] 0 216	7.60	1.5	2×5	> 2000	
Grapes	Small herbivorous mammal "vole"	> 3000	0.210	81.9		26.5	م م الالا الالالا	
	Small omnivorous mammal "mouse"	×0,		16,3		D M	> 1515	
		AM S		N L		7		, Č
	Large herbivorous mammal			103		line line		Ő
Granes	Small insectivorous martinal "shrew"	ି ଅନ୍ତି ଅନ୍ତି		7.6		2.50	126	10
Grapes	Small herbivorous mamma "vole?"	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~				26.5	°¶1	
	Small omnivorous man mal "mouse"			103		3.Cz	91	

Table 10.3.1.1- 1: Tier 1 acute TER calculation for mammals

All TER values are dove the trigger of 10 for active exposure. Accordingly an unacceptable acute risk to mammals from the use of the product according to the use pattern can be excluded.

Acute risk assessment for manmals thinking contaminated water

For further details, reference is made to Point 101.1 of this dessier. However, according to EFSA Guidance Document for Blads and Mammals (2009), unlike for birds the scenario of pools formed in leaf axils is not colevant for mammals. Therefore the risk assessment for mammals is limited to the scenario of puedles formed on the ground over application.

The acute risk from water in puddles formed on the soil surface of a field when a (heavy) rainfall event follows the application of a pesticide to a ctop or bare soil is covered by the long-term risk assessment under Point 10.3.1.3 of this docsiler.

IIIA 10.3.1.2 Short-tern toxicity exposure ratio (TERst)

Not required under Directive 91/414/EEC.

 \swarrow

IIIA 19.3.1.3 Long-term toxicity exposure ratio (TERLT)

Tier 1 ceproductive/long-term toxicity exposure ratio for mammals

The tier 1 risk assessment has been performed for grapes for an application rate of 4×0.216 kg iprovalicarb/ha at a minimum application interval of 10 days.

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

.3-1: Tier 1 long-term TER	calculation	for mammals	5				<u>n</u> ° f
	NO(A)EL		DDD				
Generic focal species	[mg/kg bw/d]	Appl. Rate [kg/ha]	SVm	MAF _m	ftwa	DDD	TER Trigger
	Ipr	ovalicarb		4	0		
Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph"		J.	6.7		8	1.5	
Small insectivorous mammal "shrew"	146.2	april 6	4.2		0.52	×0.9	
Small herbivorous mammal "vole"	140.5	0.210	A 3,4		0.53 Q	20 ⁶ /	
Small omnivorous mammal "mouse"			4.7			1.0	146.3
	3- 1: Tier 1 long-term TER Generic focal species Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph" Small insectivorous mammal "vole" Small omnivorous mammal "mouse"	3- 1: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation Generic focal species NO(A)EL [mg/kg bw/d] Image herbivorous mammal "lagomorph" Image herbivorous mammal "lagomorph" Small insectivorous mammal "shrew" 146.3 Small herbivorous mammal "vole" Image herbivorous mammal "shrew" Small omnivorous mammal "mouse" Image herbivorous mammal	3- 1: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation for mammals Generic focal species NO(A)EL [mg/kg bw/d] Appl. Rate [kg/ha] Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph" Small insectivorous mammal "shrew" Small herbivorous mammal "vole" Small omnivorous mammal "mouse"	I: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation for mammals Generic focal species NO(A)EL [mg/kg bw/d] DDD Appl. Rate [kg/ha] SVm Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph" Forovalicarb Small insectivorous mammal "shrew" 146.3 Small herbivorous mammal "vole" 146.3 Small omnivorous mammal "mouse" 4.2	I.3- 1: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation for mammals NO(A)EL DDD Generic focal species NO(A)EL Make SVm MAFm Generic focal species Img/kg bw/d] Appl. Rate SVm MAFm Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph" Small insectivorous mammal "shrew" 6.7 4.2 1.9 4.3 1.9 4.3 1.9 4.3 4.7 4.7 5 5 4.7 5 5 5 6 1.9 5 5 5 5 5 5 1.9 5 5 6 1.9 5 5 6 1.9 5 1.9 5 1.9 5 1.9 5 6 7 4 5 1.9 5 5 4 4 5 5 6 7 4 5 5 6 1.9 5 6 7 4 5 6 7 4 5 6 7 4 5 6 7 4 5 6 7 4 5 6 7 4	I.3- 1: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation for mammals Generic focal species NO(A)EL [mg/kg bw/d] DDD Appl. Rate [kg/ha] SVm MAFm fm/m Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph" Frovalicarb 6.7 4.2 0.53 Small herbivorous mammal "vole" 146.3 0.216 4.3,4 0.53 Small omnivorous mammal "mouse" 0.53 0.53 0.53	I.3- 1: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation for mammals MO(A)EL [mg/kg bw/d] DDD Appl. Rate [kg/ha] SV _m MAF _m ftp DDD Iprovalicarb Large herbivorous mammal "lagomorph" 6.7 1.5 0.9 Small insectivorous mammal "shrew" 146.3 0.216 1.9 0.53 0.9 Small omnivorous mammal "mouse" 0.53 0.53 0.53 0.53 0.53 0.53

All TER values are above the trigger gr 5 for the long-term exposure. Ascordingly any unacceptable acute risk to mammals from the use of the product according to the use

Long-term risk assessment for mammals drinking contaminated

m

For further details, reference is made to Point 10 1/1 of this dossfer

Table 10.3.1.3- 2:	Evaluation	of potential	concern	for expo	sure via	drinkingw	vater of n	ammals (escape
	clause	N. S.	<i>Q</i> 1	S.	K, Y	0 💞	, L	

	<i>V</i> , <i>i</i>				V	-
	Koc	Application	NO(A)EL	Ratio (Application rate	© "Escape > clause"	
	⊃ [L/i@] ⊘	rate * suAF [g aSha] 《	tmg as kg bw/d]	* M&F) / NQA)EL©	No concern if ratio	Conclusion
Iprovalicato	113.9	216×12	0 46.3 ⁰	2.8 0	\leq 50	No concern
	Õ		<i>C</i>			

This evaluation confirms that the risk for manipuls from drinking water that may contain residues from the use of the product is acceptab

Effects on tervestrial vertebrates other than birds **IIIA 10.3.2**

Acute oraptoxicity of the preparation IIIA 10.3.2.1

The findings of an acute enal with the formulation with rat are summarised in the following study table.

1: Manmalian toxicity data of the formulated product Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 Table 10.3.2.

Test species Test design	Ecotoxicological endpoint	Reference
Rat acute, oral	$LD_{50} > 2500 mg/kg bw$	(2000) 30395 M-026075-01-1 KIIIA 7.7.1/01

A comparison of the acute endpoints of the formulation Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 derived from a

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

study on rats with calculated theoretical endpoints (calculated according to Finney's formula GIFAP. 1990) is shown in Table 10.3.2.1-2.

Table 10.3.2.1- 2: Comparison of acute toxicity: active ingredients vs. formulation

S	iprovalicarb 9% + folpet 56.3%	Iprovalicarb + Folpet 🕅 G 65 🖉	Ô
Species	Calculated [mg product/kg]	Study results [mg product/kg]	J
Mammal (Rat)	3339 ¹	$D_{50} > 2500$	e
1 based on: iprovalicarb –	$LD_{50} > 5000 \text{ mg/kg bw; folpet} - LD_{50} > 20$	000 mg g bw	Å

The comparison of results of this testing with the results of mixed to active active according to Finney showed that the preparation can be expected to be not more toxic than on its active ingredient content base.

Thus a risk assessment based on the product would not change the conclusion derived from the fisk assessment based on the individual active substances and is therefore omi

Acceptance of brait, granules **IIIA 10.3.2.2** or

Not applicable for spray application.

K 1

Effects of secondary poisoning **IIIA 10.3.2.3**

The octanol/water partition coefficients (Log Poppior iprovalicarb have been determined as 3.18 (Diastereomer A) and 3.20 (Diastereomer B), so provaticarb will be valuated for potential effects of secondary poisoning of mammals For details please offer to MA 10,1.9.

Risk assessment for Dioaccomulation and food chain Dehaviour for mammals

The risk assessment procedure for with manihals follows the same principles as described in detail under Roint 10.1.9 for birds i.e. Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & ÊFS Mammals (2009).

Mammalian generic for al species for Tim 1 ris Dassessment

According to the EFSA Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds and Mammals (2009) the following generic focal species have to be addressed in the Tier 1 risk assessment.

Table 10.3.2.3- 1:	Mammahan	generic	focal speci	for the	Tier 1 risk assess	ment of sec	condary poisoni	ing
	0							

Generic f@al species 🔗 Body weight [g]	Example	FIR/bw
Earthworm earlier 2 100	Common shrew	1.28
Ash eater S , 6000	Otter	0.142

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Long-term TER calculation for earthworm-eating mammals

Table 10.3.2.3- 2: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation for earthweeter	orm-eating manimals
---	---------------------

Long-term TER calculation for Table 10.3.2.3- 2: Tier 1 long	r earthworm-eating mam g-term TER calculation for o	mals earthworm-eating manma	ls
Compound	Iprovalicarb	Origin of value	
PEC _{worm} [mg/kg]	3.064	Table 10∕⊀1∕.9-2	
	DDD calculation:		N N . V . V . V
FIR/bw	1.28	∠ ¶efault _ ©	
DDD [mg/kg bw/d]	3.92	L C	
	TERLT calculation		
NO(A)EL [mg/kg bw/d]	146.3	🕎 UIQ 10.3 👋 🔪	
TER _{LT}	37. °		
Trigger			
Refined risk assessment required?	No		by gr gr

The TER value is above the trigger of 5. Accordingly an unacceptable risk to earthworm eating mammals from the use of the produce according to the proposed are p Be excluded

Long-term toxicity exposure atio for fish-eating mammals

¢, Table 10.3.2.3- 3: Tier 1 long-term TER calculation for fish-eating mammals

Compound of Iprovalicated of Origin of value	
$PEC_{fish}[mgkg] / 0.028 / Table 10.69-3$	
C V V DDD calculation: V V V	
F_{A} by \mathcal{O} O	
$DDD [mg/kg for /d] ~ \sqrt[4]{} ~ 0.004 ~ \sqrt[6]{} ~ 0.004 ~ $	
K K TER calculation:	
NQtQt/EL [mg/kg by/d] 🔊 🖏 146.3 🖓 🔊 IIIA 10.3	
$TER_{LT} \sim 5\%$	
Trigger y y y 5 y y	
Refined risk assessment required	

The TER value is above the trigger of 5. Accordingly an unacceptable risk to fish-eating mammals from the use of the product according fo the proposed use pattern can be excluded.

Supervised cage of field rials or other appropriate studies IIIA 10.3.3

<u>r</u>...are studies <u>r</u>...are stu The risk assessment based on the active substances indicates acceptable acute and long-term risks to mammals (see Points 10, 1.1 and 10, 1.3 of this dossier). For this reason and also considering animal welfare,

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 *(Submission for Annex I renewal)*

IIIA 10.4 Effects on bees

Studies on effects on bees are available for the product Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 and the active substances iprovalicarb and folpet. The results are summarised in the following table.

Table 10.4- 1:	Acute toxicity to ho	ney bees	s de la companya de l	
Test species	Test design	Ecotoxicological endpoint	Reference	e a a a a a
Iprovalicarb		Ŷ	R	
Honey bee	acute, 48 h oral acute, 48 h contact	$\begin{array}{c} & & & & \\ LD_{50} & > 1000 & \mu g a s. \\ LD_{50} & > 200 & \mu g a s. \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & $	bee bee bee LIQX 8.7.1	(1995) 06K 36-01-1 901 ti IIA, 8.3.1.1/01)
Folpet				
Honey bee	acute, 48 h oral acute, 48 h contact	LDst >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>	bee A Sectist of Section	f endpoints (EFSA Report 2006)
Iprovalicarb +	Folpet WG 65.3		w 2 Q	Ş O
Honey bee	acute, 48 h oral acute, 48 h contact	LD ₅₀ 213 µg prod LD ₅₀ 200 µg prod	0 d./bee d./fee M-30220 KIIIAO	2008) 3 3 4 -0 1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1 -1

IIIA 10.4.1 Hazard Quotients for bees

An indication of hazard (Hazard Quotient Q_H) can be derived according to the EPPO risk assessment scheme, by calculating the ratio between the maximum single application rate (expressed in g or mL/ha) and the lowest haboratory contact and oral LD_{50} (expressed in μg /see).

 Q_{HO} and Q_{HO} resp. = Application rate [g or mL/ha] / Lb \mathcal{G}_0 or al or LD \mathcal{G}_0 contact [µg/bee]

 Q_H values can be calculated using data from the studies performed with each of the active ingredients and with the formulation. Q_H values higher than 50 are assumed to reflect levels of concern which trigger higher tiefed tests for clarification of the risk to honey bees.

The product Iprovalicarb Folget WGG5.3 is intended to be used in grapes with four applications of 2400 g product/ha corresponding to 246 g iprovalicarb/ha and 1351.2 g folget/ha. This application is worst case and covers all other GAP applications

Folpet is a 3rd party substance proceed from the second process of the representative formulation. (The second of this supplementary dossier, up to 4 applications at 1.35 kg/ha folpet are proposed as a safe use in grapes. This is much below the critical GAP that the second currently defends in this erop in the EV, where 10 applications of up to 1.6 kg/ha have been approved, with all other parameters such as interval between applications or pre-harvest interval being identical or very similar. Therefore, Bayer CropScience AG considers it justified to refer to folpet data owned by where ver appropriate. A folpet-specific risk assessment is not considered necessary to defend the Annex I listing of iprovalicarb.

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.4.1.1 Oral exposure Qho

Table 10.4.1.1- 1:	: Hazard quot	tients for bee	s – oral exposure				<u> </u>
Сгор	Exposure route	LD50 [µg/bee]	Application rate [g/ha]	Hazard quotient Qно	Tögger	Refined risk assessment	
Iprovalicarb + 1	Folpet WG 65	5.3		4			6
Grapes	Oral	> 213	2400	< 11.3	° 50 _°	O NG V	Ņ
Iprovalicarb				is and	K		C
Grapes	oral	> 199	216	< 1.10	50	No 🖉	Š

50), Therefore, no The hazard quotient for oral exposure is below the trigger of concern^o (Q_{HQ} A C · unacceptable risk to bees is expected using the product according to the proposed use pattern? A A A A A

IIIA 10.4.1.2 Contact exposure QH

		\sim	~ 7	
Table 10 / 1 2 1. Hazard quoties	nte for h		ntaet o	vnomra
1 abic 10.4.1.2- 1. IIazai u guvuci	1113 101 1	ノビビシノー しし	man c	ALAUBUIC

140101010101	azara quone	nes for bees	, contact ch				
Сгор	Exposure	LD ₅₀	Application	rate Haza	ard quotient	Teigger	Refined risk
	route	[µg/beee]	je (g/fini)		[™] Q _{H€} [™]		assessment
Iprovalicarb + Fo	lpet WG 65.3	Q A			0 0		°≈ ≈
Grapes	contact	@_>200	<i>∞</i> 2400		\$\$\$2 °	50 00 e	Ňo
Iprovalicarb	2	Ş X	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		Ŭ ⁴ la	Ŭ Õ	1
Grapes	contact	>200	C 246	Ø Å	'<115 .	\$ 50	No
	Ĉo		Jr W			Y , 4	

The hazard quotient for contact exposure is below the trigger of concern $(Q_{10})^{-1}$ 50). Therefore, no unacceptable risk to bees is expected using the product according to the proposed use pattern.

Acute toxicity of the preparation to bees IIIA 10.4.2 🔊 Acute oral toxicity IIIA 10.4.2.1

Report	KIUA 10.42.1/01; 2008 0
Title:	Effects of Folpet + Iprovalicarb W@9 + 5633 % w/w (Acute Contact and Oral) on
	Ploney Bees Apis melliferal.) in the Laboratory
Document No:	M-39228491-1 (Report No: 42361035)
Guidelines:	OPCD Guideline 213 and 21 (1998)
GLP	Yes (certified aboratory).

Executive Summary:

The aim of the study was to detormine the effects of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 9 + 56.3% w/w on the mortality of the honeybee (pis mellifered after contact and oral exposure. For the assessment of contact toxic@y, 50 worker bees per treatment were exposed for 48 hours to a single dose of 200 µg product per bee for topical application as a single 5µL droplet to the thorax (contact limit test). There was no mortality in the study and the LD₅₀ (48h) was 200 µg product/bee in the contact toxicity test. For the assessment of oraktoxicity, 5 replicates each consisting of 10 bees in which 50 worker bees were exposed for 48 hours to a single dose of 200 µg product per bee for feeding (oral limit test, value based on the actual intake of the test item). Mortality was used to determine the endpoints. There was no mortality in the study and the 48-hour LD₅₀ was >213 μ g a.i./bee. Dimethoate was included as the referenced item and the contact and oral LD_{50} (48h) values were calculated to be 0.17 and 0.12 µg a.i./bee, respectively.

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Objective:

Honey bees (*A. mellifera*) can be affected by pesticide residues as a result of indirect contact on plant surfaces, via oral intake of contaminated food or water, via inhalation of vapour or by direct overspray in the course of an application in the field according to normal agricultural practice. If the proposed use pattern of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 9 + 56.3% w/w indicates such a possible exposure of honey bees, acute contact and oral toxicity data is necessary for the registration of the pesticite use in question. This study provides:

- the acute toxicity levels of the formulated test, them and the corresponding Ooxicity levels of its active ingredients to honeybees;
 toxicity information comparable to expected residues from standard rates, for assessment of the
- toxicity information comparable to expected residues from standard rates, for assessment of the potential hazard to honey bees;
- information to support precautionary label statements.
- · information to indicate the need for further testing e.g. sensi-field or field studie

Material and methods:

<u>Test item</u> A WG for pulation of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56 \mathcal{F} 9A W

Specification No.: 102000011659,

TOX-No.: TOX08081-09;

Batch ID.: EM20002600;

content of a.s. (analysed); Folpet (\$R-400) 54.9 %w/w kprovabcarb (\$ZX 0722) 9.00 %w/w date of completed analysis \$1 000 2007, BCS-D-FT shalysis & Services,

Reference Item

Name Dimethoate product Batch No.: 1814 Formulation: Perfekthion EC (BAS 152 11) Active ingredient/content? Dimethoate 400 g/L.

Test Species

Honeybees (Apisopiellifeta carptea): female worker bees collected from local hives.

Test Design 🔍

Folpet + Introvalicarb WG 9 + 36.3% W/w. (introvalicarb (SZX 0722) 9.00 % w/w, folpet (SR-407) 54.9 % w analytical), Specification: Batch ID EM20002600; under laboratory conditions *Apis* mellifera (50 worker bees per dose) were exposed for 48 hours to a single dose of 213.0 µg product per bee for feeding (oral value based on the actual intake of the test item) and for topical application (contact) with a single dose of 200.0 µg product per bee.

Test Conditions

Temperature: 250C; relative homidity: 38% - 58%; darkness (except during observation)

Validity Criteria:

The control mortality should not exceed 10% at test end.

The 24μ LD₅₀ of the reference item (dimethoate) should be within the range of 0.10 - 0.30 µg a.i./bee (contact test) and 0.10 - 0.35 µg a.i./bee (oral test)

The following table summarises the validity of the study:

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

		Q° '	ð
Control Mortality:	Contact Test		N.
	CO ₂ /water control:	0.0 %	
	Oral Test		
	Water/sugar control:		
LD ₅₀ of Reference Item (24	Contact Test:	0.17 μg a/i./bee	
hrs):	Oral Test:	0.12 kg a.i./bee	
Validity of the Tests:	The contact and oral test are consid	dere dvalid as the control mortality	Š
	in each case was $< 10\%$ and the LI	Dovalues obtained with the of of	
	reference item (dimethoate), were	within the required ranges.	

Findings:

Toxicity to Honey Bees; laboratory test

to money bees, haboratory test		. "0"		~~	~	\sim	\bigcirc	
Test Item	Ž	Folpet	↑ prov	valitarb	WG 9	+ 50.3 %	Ś W W	
Test object	ý , ý	Š 4		Apis m	Hifera			
Application rate µg product/Dee		2130	S	Z.		200		, Ôg
Exposure	Øral (sugar so	kution)	a Usoluti	on in A	contact Däsit (9	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	°≫ (ater)
LD ₅₀ µg product/bee	Ş	> 213.0	~		× _ Ø;	> 200 0	0	
		<u></u>	<i>'0</i> ''	- \			L.	

 \bigcirc

Observations

At the end of the contact toxicity test (48 hours after application), there was 0,0% mortality at 200.0 µg product/bee. No mortality occurred in the control (water + 0.5 % Adhäsit).

In the oral toxicity test the maximum nominal test level of Polpet Aprovaticarb WG 9 + 56.3 % w/w (200 µg product/bee) corresponded to an actual intake of 213.0 µg product/bee. This dose level led to no mortality after 48 hours. No mortality occurred in the control (50 % sugar solution).

No test iten and uced behavioural effects were observed at any time.

Conclusion

A The toxicity of Foret + Iproval carb WG 9 + 56.3% www.was tested in both an acute contact and an oral toxicity test on honey bes. The LD₅₀ (48 h) was >200.0 µg product/bee in the contact toxicity test. The LD₅₀ (48 h) was >.0 mg product/bee in the oral toxicity test.

Acute contact tox

Please refer to point Point to.

IIIA 10.4.3 Effects on bees of residues on crops

The findings reported under 10.4.1 and 10.4.2, and based on the requirements of Directive In view 91/41 ginex [II, Poin 10], no further studies are required. The Q_{HC} value is <50.

Cage tests

Please refer to point Point 10.4.3.



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.5 Effects on arthropods other than bees

Toxicity tests on non-target arthropods have been carried out with Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG \$5.3 on the two indicator species *Tuphlodromus* musicard (1) the two indicator species Typhlodromus pyri and Aphidius rhopalosiphi. Further studies pave been conducted on two additional species, *Coccinella septempunctata* and *Chrysoperla carnea*. A sumpary of the results is provided in Table 10.5-1.

Table 10.5- 1: Iprovali	carb & Folpet WP 65.3: Ecoto	xicological endpoints for arthropode other than bees
Test species,	Tested Formulation, study	Ecotoxicological Ondpoint & & &
Dossier-file-No.,	type, exposure	
reference		
Aphidius rhopalosiphi	IPV + FLP WG 65.3 \Im	
M-065136-01-1	Laboratory, glass plates &	Corr. Montality [%] Effect on Reproduction [%]
Rep No [•] 20021105/01-	0.725 kg prod	
NLAp	10.50 kg prod./ha	Q 17.5Q 39.3 Q 4
· 2002		
, 2002 KIIIA 10.5.1/01		
Aphidius rhopalosiphi	IPV + FLP WG S.3 (&R ₅₀ [kg/prod/ba]: 1.964
M-071277-02-1	Extended lab (expostore on `	Corr Effection Repetency rel.
Rep.No: 14871002	potted barle plants	Mortality [%] Reproduction [%] to control [%]
	@ 325 Kg prod./ba	\$ 0.0 \$ 011.1 ₂ & -19.6 ^A
; 2003	0.725 kg prod/ha	" ^𝔐 № 6.7 ^𝔅 𝔅 70.6 ^𝔅 ^𝔅 -18.8 ^𝔥
KIIIA 10.5.2/01	1.80 kg ptod./ha	⊕ 53.3 → [*] n.a. ₆ -19.6 ^A
	4.80 kg prod./ha	80.Q (4. a. (9.2
	10.50 kg prod	© × × 1.5
Aphidius rhopalosiphi	$\Psi V + E P W G 85.3$	
M-311332-01-1	Aged residues, sprax deposits	
<u>Rep.No.: CW08/048</u>	on potted marze plants, 1	Cont. Effect on Repellency rel.
2008	appl. of 🖏 l kg prod./ha	Mortality [22] Reproduction [%] to control [%]
KIIIA 10.5.3/04	Residues aged for 0 days: 🛛 🗶	3.6 2.6 n.sign.
	Residues aged for 7days: 🔬 🧟	3.30° , n.a. 8.7 n.sign.
Aphidius rhopalosiphi	IPV + FLPWG 65-3	
M-391612-01-1	Semi-fredel, sprag deposits on	
<u>Rep.No.</u> \$10-02746	barlex plants	Effect on Reproduction [%]
, 2010 🔊	5.1 Kg prod tha 💭 🔬	× 23.2
KIIIA 10.5.3/02	A Q L T	
Typhlodromus pyri	(P V + F\$P WG (05.3)	Ç Ş
M-066828-01-1	Laboratory, glass plates	Corr. Mortality [%] Effect on Reproduction [%]
Rep.No.: 2002 105/01-	627 kg@fod./h@	2.1 18.6
NLTp	1925 kg prod ha	-1.0 ^B 14.2
.; 2002		
KIIIA 10.5.1/02		
Typhlodromus pyri 🖤	IPX FLE WG 650 20	LD ₅₀ [kg prod./ha]: > 8.5
M-296923-01-1	Extended ab., spray deposits	
Rep.No.: CW 07/964	on detached bean leaves	Corr. Mortality [%] Effect on Reproduction [%]
2008 ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	kg prod./ha	-1.1 ^B 11.2
KIIIA 10.5.2902 🔬	kø15 køprod./ha	-8.9 ^B -19.1 ^C
Ű ÁS	َنَ اللَّهُ (Construction of the second sec	-4.4 ^B 13.4
	√√4.186 kg prod./ha	-8.9 ^B 12.1
	\swarrow \swarrow 8.5 kg prod./ha	1.1 8.4
	<u>.</u>	
	~	
õ		

	Ś	, A	Ś	
Table 10.5- 1: Iprovalicarb & Folpet WP 65.3:	Ecotoxicological	endpoints for	arthropodsot	her@han be



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)



A: A negative value indicates a higher percentage of wasps found on plants in the treatment than in the control. B: A negative value indicates a higher mortality rate in the control than in the treatment. C: A negative value indicates a higher reproduction rate in the treatment than in the control.

n.a.: not assessed a significant at \$% level.

Risk assessment procedures

The risk assessment was performed according to Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology (SANCO/10329/2002) and to the Guidance Document on regulatory testing and risk assessment procedures for plant protection products with non-target arthropods (ESCORT 2, Candolfi et al. 2000³).

As data from Tier 2 tests for 4 species are available for the product the Tier 1 risk assessment was skipped and a Tier 2 risk assessment was conducted.

Potential exposure

The exposure schario is based on the use pattern as given in Table 10- 1. Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG

³ Candolfi Cal.: Guidance document on regulatory testing and risk assessment procedures for plant protection products with non-target arthropods; ESCORT 2 workshop (European Standard Characteristics Of Non-Target Arthropod Regulatory Testing), Wageningen, NL, March 21-23, 2000, SETAC Europe; SETAC publication August 2001

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

65.3 is intended to be applied four times with an application rate of 2.4 kg product/ha in grapes. This application is worst case and covers all other GAP applications.
According to ESCORT2 and the Terrestrial Guidance Document the exposure is calculated as.
in-field: Application rate x MAF x 0.5⁴
off-field: Application rate x MAF x (drift factor / VDF) x correction factor
Application rate: 2.4 kg product/ha (grapes)

- Drift factor = 6.71% (74th percentile for four applications in grapes, late; ESCORT2
- MAF (multiple application factor) = 2.7
- VDF (vegetation distribution factor) \$10 (default value as recommended by the Verrestrial Guidance Document, to take into account the 3-dimensional structure of the of field vegetation; it can only be applied in the context of 2D test systems)
- A correction factor is intended to cover uncertainty with regard to species sensitivity in the off-crop scenario. As proposed by the Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecolexicology (SANCO/10329/2002) a default value of 5 is used in the Tier Tisk assessment.

Table 10.5-2: Exposure calculation for in-field risk assessment

Crop / no. of applicati	ons	Appl. ra [kg/ba]	te [%] Co ⁽ N) (hi	orr:Tactor gh crops) °		∽in-field PECm ∑ ∫ieg/ha]	ax.
Grapes / 4		2.4	0 ×	0.50	£ 2.7	\$ 3.24	
- S	Ø,			D.	0' %	47 ·	

Table 10.5- 3: Corrected exposure for off-field risk assessment @_____

Crop	Application	MAR	Drift	Xeg.	Correction	off=Geld	Remark
	Tate O	, O	[% 0]	distr.	factor	PÉC _{max} Økg/hal	
Grapes	2.4	ی 2.7 لا م	6.71	v 10		0.22	in case of 2-D study design
Grapes	2.4	Ž	<u>6</u> ,71			2.17	in case of 3-D study design
		With Colling and a color a col					

⁴ Correction factor of 0.5 for the in-field exposure assessment in high crops according to ESCORT2 (see footnote "a" in legend on page 19 of the ESCORT2 document)

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 *(Submission for Annex I renewal)*

In-field risk assessment

Table 10 F A. In Fald walk assessment has a day of the	L
- LADIE 10.5-4: IN-TIEIO FISK ASSESSMENT DASEO ON STIL	iv results from inrovalicard + pasadet wurdb
Tuble 1010 II III IIelu IIble ubbebbillene bubeu on beu	y results from the orange of a suber of a solution

Crop	Species	in-field PEC _{max} [kg prod./ha]	LR50 or ER50 [kg prod./ha]	Risk acceptable if:	Refined assessment Frequired?
	Aphidius rhopalosiphi	3.24	> \$325	Effects are < 50%	Yes or
Cronos	Typhlodromus pyri	3.24	8.5	Effects are < 50%	No V
Grapes	Coccinella septempunctata	3.24	> 8.5	Effects are < 50%	NO LO
	Chrysoperla carnea	3.24	$0^{*} > 8.5$	Effects are < 50%	
		, L	•		

The higher tier in-field risk assessment for *Typhlodromus*, *Coccinetts* and *Chrysoperla* indicates that no unacceptable adverse effects are to be expected in the in-field area for arthropod species with a similar sensitivity as these species. The in-field risk assessment for *Aphidius rhop-dosiphi* indicates that initial effects in the in-field area can not be excluded. Therefore, a further refinement is needed.

Refined in-field risk assessment

The results of the tier 2 risk as a sessment indicated that initial effects on species with a sensitivity like *Aphidius rhopalosiphi* can not be excluded As a consequence, an aged residue study and a semi-field study were performed to domonstrate the potential for recovery for *Aphidius rhopalosiphi*, the most sensitive tested species.

An extended laboratory aged residue study has been performed on *Aphidius rhopalosiphi* (100, 2008; M-311332-01-1 (KIIIA (0.5.3/QI)). In this study, Iprovalicate + Forpet WG 65.3 was applied once at a rate of 5.1 kg product ha on potted maize plants. Spray residues were aged under semi-field conditions. Bioassays with freshly dried residues and residues aged for 7 days resulted in a corrected mortality of 0% and 3.3% respectively Reproduction of *A. rhopalosiphi* was tested in the first bioassay with freshly dried residues on reproduction were observed. In both bioassays the test item showed no repellent effects.

Additionally, a semi-field study was performed on *Aphidics rhopalosiphi* (2010; M-391612-01-1, KIIIA 10.5 //02) to further assess the effects of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 under more realistic conditions Females waspe were exposed to barley prants which had been treated with Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 at an application rate of 5 kg product/ha for 48 hours. Afterwards, the reproductive capacity of the treated wasps was assessed. No adverse effects on the reproduction of *Aphidius rhopalosiphi* were observed.

These two stodies indicate that no unacceptable effects (>50%) on mortality or reproduction of the most sensitive species *ophidite rhopalosiphi* are to be expected after an application of 5.1 kg product that. Since the intended use pattern results in an in-field PEC_{max} of only 3.24 kg product/ha, it can be concluded that no unacceptable in-field risk for non-target arthropods has to be expected from the use of provalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 according to the proposed use pattern.

۶Ç

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Table 10.5.5. Off field risk assassment based on study results from Inrovalicarh

Off-field risk assessment

Сгор	Species	off-field PEC _{max} [kg prod./ha]	LR50 or ER50 [kg prod./ha]	Risk acceptable if:	Refined assessment Frequence?
	Aphidius rhopalosiphi	2.17	0.325	Effects are < 50%	Yes of
Cranad	Typhlodromus pyri	0.22	<i>₹</i> × 8.5	Effects are < 50%	No V
Grapes	Coccinella septempunctata	0.22	> 8.5	Biffects are < 50%	NOC O
	Chrysoperla carnea	0.22 🖉	> 8.5	Effects are 50%	× NO

The off-field PEC is calculated to be 0.22 kg/ha for 2D-test systems and 2.17 kg/ha for 310 test systems. For Typhlodromus pyri, Coccinella Septempunctata, and Chrysoperla carnea there are no effects > 50% neither on mortality nor on reproduction of the spected off-field exposure pates. The off-field risk assessment for Aphidius rhopalosipli indicates that initial effects in the off-field area can win th not be excluded. Therefore, a further refinement is needed

Refined off-field risk assessment

For the most sensitive species Aphidius rhopalosiphi, effects on reproduction > 50% were observed in an extended laboratory study at rates exceeding 9.325 kg product/ha, which is lower than the off-field PECmax of 2.17 kg product/hatfor 3D test systems@Therefore, a semi-field story (, 2010; M-391612-01-1, KIIIA 10.5.3/02) was performed to test for effects provaticarbe Folpet WG 65.3 under more realistic conditions (see in field fisk assessment above). In this study, an application of 5.1 kg product/ha did not lead to adverse effects on the reproduction of *A. rhopalosiphi*. In addition, an aged residue study on A. popalo aphi (2008; M 3/1132201-1 KIIIA, 10.5.3/01) showed that already in the first bioassay with freshly dried residues no adverse effects on mortality or reproduction occurred Therefore, it can be concluded that at an application rate of 5.1 kg product/ha, which clearly maxof po unacceptable off-field risk for non-target arthropods has to exceeds the off-field REC 2.**k**∕/ kg be expected.

Conclusion ~

Based on the provided risk assessment fran be concluded that the application of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65 Faccording to the proposed use pattern does not result in unacceptable adverse effects on NTA species in the fiffield or the fif-field area.

Report:	² KIID 10.51/01, 2002
Title:	Folpet + Jorovalicarb WG 65.25: Acute Toxicity to the Aphid Parasitoid, Aphidius
	Appalasiphi DeStefani Perez (Hymenoptera, Braconidae) in the Laboratory
Document 250:	M-065136-01-1 (20021105/01-NLAp)
Guidelines.	IOBC guideline Mead-Briggs et al (2000)
GLP: U	Yes

Effects of sensitive species already tested, artificial substrates IIIA 10.5.1 🖉



Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Materials and methods:

Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25 (Batch No. 07373/0048(0046), Article No. 00-05539447, Sample No. TOX05905-00, purity: 9.8 % Iprovalicarb and 55.7 % Folpet was diluted in water and applied with a spray application volume of 200 L water/ha to glass plates at rates equivalent to 0.725 kg product/ha and 10.50 kg product/ha. When dry, the glass plates (length of edges: 10 cm) were used to form the floor and the ceiling (treated surfaces inwards) of shallow arenas anto which adult wasps were introduced. 10 wasps of equal sex ratio were placed into each exposure unit $(n_{f} = 6 \text{ pertreatment})$ Deionized water was applied as control (200 L/ha) and Perfekthion (content oDa.i.: 417.5 g/L) was applied at 0.30 mL product/200 L water/ha as a toxic reference treatment Assessments of direct treatment effects were made after 0.5, 2, 24 and 48 h. To ossess any impact on the coundity of surviving individuals, 15 females from the control group and also from the two test substance treatment groups were taken after 48 h and confined individually over aphid-infested parley plants for a further 24 h period. The numbers of parasitised aphids that developed was recorded 10 days later The mortality of the toxic standard group was 400%.

Findings:

r munigs.		
Test substance	Folger + Ipperalicarts WG (\$25	
Test object	Aphidirus rhopalosiphi O	
Exposure	Glass plates A &	
Application	Mortanty* affer 48 b[[%] K Febundity mummies/female)	
Control 🔬		
Application rate	Mortality* Conjected mortality* Omumnies/ Reproduction	
A A	after 48 1 [%] after 48 h [%] for ale relative to the	
	\sim	
0.725 kg protorct/ha	$\bigcirc 0.0 \ \bigcirc^{\vee} \ 16.60^{(2)} \ 62.88$	
10.50 kg pgoduct/ha	$17.50^{(1)}$ 1050 17.60 66.67	

* based on the number of dead organisms

(1): Statisfically significantly different from the control QF isher's Exact Pest, p < 0.05)

(2): Statistically significantly different from the control (Kruskal-Wallis Test, p < 0.05)

Discussion and Conclusions

The results of the control group indicate that test organisms were in good conditions (0.00 % mortality and 26.40 mummies/female). The results of the toxic@eference group indicate that the test system was sensitive & harmful substance (mortality: 100 %)

Statistically significant effects were observed on mortality in the 10.50 kg product/ha treatment group Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25

Report: 0 0	KIHA 165.1/02, 2002
Title:	Acute Toxicity to the Predatory Mite, Typhlodromus pyri SCHEUTEN (Acari,
	Phytoseiidae) in the Laboratory
Document No:	M-066828-01-1 (20021105/01-NLTp)
Guidelines:	IOBC (Blümel et al. 2000)
GLP:	Yes



Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Materials and methods:

Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25 (Batch No. 07373/0048(0046), Article No. 00-05539447, Sapple No. TOX05905-00, purity: 9.8 % Iprovalicarb and 55.7 % Folpet) was diluted in water and applied with a spray application volume of 200 L water/ha to glass plates at rates equivalent to 6.9 kg product/ha and 10.5 kg product/ha. Deionized water was used as control and Perfekthion (analysed content of a ki 417.5 g/L) was applied at 12 mL product in 200 L water/ba as a toxic reference treatment. The test units consist of two glass cover slides. They were fixed together by means of two glass bars which were glued on them in the horizontal direction. In order to prevent the potes from escaping, non-drying glue gel barrier was set on the glass plates. The glue barrier was formed as a square arena which resulted in an exposure area of approximately 10 - 12 cm² After application when resultues were dry, the glass plates were placed treated surface upwards on wer filter paper. The thin gap between the two cover slides was filled with water by capillary forces and served as drinking water supply. Twenty protonymphs were placed with a fine-bristled brush onto each replicate unit (units n = 5 per treatment).

Assessments of direct treatment effects (mortality assessments) were wade after 3 and 7 days. The fertility test was conducted with those treatment groups where the corrected mortality was ≤ 50 %. Fecundity assessments were carried out 90, 13 and 14 days after treatment by counting the number of eggs and juveniles present in each test unit and determining the cumulative number of eggs per female. Ô

Findings: Summarised results of the study

Test substance 🖉 🧳 🥱 🕺 Folp# Iprovalicart WG 65	.25
Test organism	
Exposure of the second se	
Application Mortanty ¹⁾ ster Reproduction	
Application A days [3] [egg/female]	
Control \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} 11.3	
Application rate	Reduction in reproduction
Application rate $after 7 dags [\%] \sim solutive to control [\%]$	relative to control [%]
6.9 kg product/ ha 2 2 2 6 81.4	18.6
10.5 kg product/ 10^{-1} 3.5 3.6 3.6 3.6	14.2

¹⁾ Mortality based on the number of dead and missing organisms

* Negative value means that the portality in the ontrol group was higher as in the test group

Conclusions

Up to the 40.5 ke product/ha pplication rate no statistically significant effects neither on mortality nor on fectividity were observed. The reduction in reproduction was below 19 %.

Corrected number of escapees in all treatment groups was below 6.5 % (escape rate in control was 3.0%).



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.5.2	Effects on non-target terrestrial arthro	pods in ext	t. laboratory tests 🖉 🖉
Report:	KIIIA 10.5.2/01,	; 2002	
Title:	Effects of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25 Extended Laboratory Study - Dose Response	on the Parasit	oic Aphidius rhopalosiphi?
Document No:	M-071277-01-1 (14871002)	, L	
Guidelines:	IOBC guideline Mead-Briggs et al (2000)	Ű,	
GLP:	Yes	<u> </u>	

Material and methods:

Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25 (active ingredients: Folpet, purity: 57.4 % (provalicarb (SZX,0722), purity: 10.0 %; article no.: 0005539447, batch no. 07373/0048(0046), cample no.: TOX06124-00); under extended laboratory conditions approximately 48 h od adul *Aphidtus rhopalosiphi* (5 tenales per replicate) were exposed to dried spray deposits of 0.325, 10.5 cg product/ha (alluted in 400 L deionised water/ha) on treated potted barley seedings (6 replicates per treatment group). Deionised water was used as a control treatment and Performance of the survivors was examined for another 24 hour period using females from the control and from those test item concentrations where corrected mortality was < 50.0 %. The toxic standard treatment caused 63.3 % corrected mortality.

Findings:

Aphidius rhopalosiphe extended laterator resting dose response test O

	<u>§</u> (* * ¹ ~		9
Test item 🖉	Folper + I	provalicate WG 65.25	
Test object		us rhovalosiphi	
Expoşute	y, y? A A Ba	rleyseedlings	
Treatment	Wortality after 48 19 [%] 4 2 After 48 2 After 48 h [%]	Munics per Female ^b	Reduction in reproduction relative to control [%]
Control		S 37.7	-
0.325 kg product/ha		33.5	11.1
0.725kg product/ha	×16.7 × 16.7	11.1 *	70.6
1.80 kg product/ha	535 * * & 38.3	not assessed	-
4.80 kg product/bg	80.0 * * * * 80.0	not assessed	-
10.5 kg product ha	86.7	not assessed	-
8.5 mL Perfektfoon/ha (Toxic Reference)	63.3 × 63.3	not assessed	-
LR (CL 95%)°	1.964 kg product/ha	a (1.413 - 2.731 kg pr	oduct/ha)

^a * \cong significant; Fisher Exact Test, $\alpha = 0.05$

^b * = significant; Bonferroni-U-Test, $\alpha = 0.05$

 c CL = Confidence Limits



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Observations:

At 1.80 kg product/ha 1 parasitoid, at 4.80 kg product/ha 2 parasitoids and at 10.5 kg product/ha parasitoid showed behavioural abnormalities (moribund and affected) after 48 hours of exposure repellent effect was observed.

The LR₅₀ for mortality is 1.964 kg product/ha with no effects on either mortality of reproduction at 0.325 kg product/ha.

Report:	KIIIA 10.5.2/02, 2008 20 2008
Title:	Toxicity to the predatory mite Typhlotyomus gyri SCHEUTEN (Acari, 2019
	Phytoseiidae) using an extended laboratory test
	Folpet + Iprovalicad WG 56.3+9 W V V
Document No:	M-296923-01-1 0 W0 #964) 7 7 8 8 8
Guidelines:	IOBC (Blümebet al. 2000)
GLP:	Yes Q X O S Q S S A

Executive Summary:

The objective of this study was to investigate the lethal and sublethal toxicity of Polpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56.3+9A W to the predatory inte Typhlodiomus pyri when exposed to detached treated leaf surfaces.

Survival and reproduction were determined at the rates of 0.5 1.015 2.062, 4.186 and 8.5 kg product/ha applied to detached bean leaves

No significan dose related effect on mortality and reproduction could be observed. In the highest dose rate of 8.5 kg product/ha test item there was b1% corrected mortanty. The reduction of reproduction relative to the control was 8.4%. At the lower rates of 0.5, 9.015, 2.062 and 4.186 kg product/ha -1.1, -8.9, -4.4 and -8.9% corrected mortality were found and the reduction of reproduction was 11.2, -19.1, 13.4 and 12.1%.

The figures obtained for the reproduction fulfil the validity criteria of laboratory method using glass plates.

The LD50 was estimated to be kg product

Objective:

The objective of this stude was to investigate the lethal and sublethal toxicity of Folpet + Iprovalicarb the predatory mite Typplodromus pyri when exposed to detached treated leaf WG 56.3+9A sto surfaces

Material and methodse

X WG formulation of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56.3+9A W Test item. Specification No .: 102000011659; 4OX08081-00; TOX-No EM20002600; Batch ID content of a.s. (analysed): Folpet (SR-407) 54.9 %w/w Iprovalicarb (SZX 0722) 9.00 %w/w



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 *(Submission for Annex I renewal)*

date of completed analysis: 11 OCT 2007, BCS-D-FT Analysis & Service's, D-Monheim

The test item was applied at rates of 0.5, 1.015, 2.062, 4.186 and 8.5 kg product/ha and the effects were compared to a water treated control. A toxic reference (a.i.: dimethoate) applied at 0.1038 kg product/ ha was included to indicate the relative susceptibility of the test organisms and the test system.

Mortality of 100 protonymphs was assessed 1, 4, 7, 10, 12 and 14 days after exposure by Sounting the community of living and dead mites. The number of escaped mites was calculated as the difference from the total number exposed.

The reproduction rate of surviving mites was then evaluated over the period of 7-14 days after treatment by counting the total number of offspring (eggs and larvae) produced.

Validity Criteria:

The validity criteria are based on these of the laboratory method with glass plates (BLÜMEL ET AL., 2000).

0	7		$\overline{\alpha}$	~~~		
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~			Ś		Validity criteria	a Finding
MortEscrate in the control group of	n 🖉 🔊		°		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	10 %
day 7	0 ô	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~				
Average mortality in the references	tem 🖒		, OX	× u	<u>م</u> 50%.	100 %
Average number of eggs female (ca	lournated ason	um of asses	sphent	o y	- A	
dates - from day 7 of in the control	1 group 7		y w	L.	$\bigcirc \geq 4$	4.3
Č 🔊 4	· (, '	$\sim$ $\sim$	S.		¥	

#### **Findings:**

The mortality / escaping rate in the control chambers of to day 7 after treatment was 10.0%. The mean corrected prortality of the nymons, and the mean reproduction rate of the surviving females exposed to the test them and the sprice reference is given below.

		y N	(Con)	O.	~			
Mortality (7 days after treatment) Reproduction								
Reproduction								
			Į,	Ś,			Red. rel. to	
Treatment	kg product / ha	Uneorr.	°Corr.	🖉 P-Va	lue(*)	Rate	Control [%]	P-Value(#)
Control 🖉		<u>∼</u> 10.0 <i>L</i>	0.0	×		4.3	0	
Test item	~~~ 0.5 ~~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~	o″ 9.0_©″		1.000	n.sign.	3.8	11.2	0.84 n.sign.
Test item	1.045 0	2.0	<b>8</b> .9	0.165	n.sign.	5.1	-19.1	0.852 n.sign.
Test item	3.062 O	~~6.0	2-4.4	1.000	n.sign.	3.7	13.4	0.972 n.sign.
Test item 🖉	4.186	2.00	-8.9	0.165	n.sign.	3.8	12.1	0.979 n.sign.
Test item	\$ 8 x	11.0	1.1	1.000	n.sign.	3.9	8.4	0.997 n.sign.
Reference item	0.1038	100.0	100.0			n.d.	n.d.	

LD50: \$ 8.5 kg product/ha

* Easher's Exact test, two-sided, p-values are adjusted according to Bonferroni-Holm

# one-wa@ANOVA, p-values are adjusted according to Dunnett

n.d. not detected

n.sign. not significant

sign. significant

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

No significant dose related effect on mortality and reproduction could be observed. In the highest dose, rate of 8.5 kg product/ha test item there was 1.1% corrected mortality. The reduction of reproduction 8.9, -4.4 and -8.9% corrected mortality were found and the reduction of reproduction was 1.2 13.4 and 12.1%.

13.4 and 12.1%.	
The figures obtain	ed for the reproduction fulfil the validity criteria of aboratory method using grass
plates.	
Conclusion	
The LD ₅₀ was estim	nated to be > 8.5 kg product/ha?
Report:	KIIIA 10.5.2/03, 2008 2008 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
Title:	Toxicity to the ladybird beetle Soccine la septemputotata LS Coleoptera
	Coccinellidae) orsing an extended laboratory test Forpet + (provalie arb WG 56.3 +
	9AW V A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A
Document No:	M-295911 01-1 (CW07/065)
Guidelines:	IOBC guideline et al (2009)
GLP:	Yes Y A S A S A

### **Executive Summary:**

The aim of the fudy was to determine the foxicity of freshly dued residues of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56.3+9AW applied onto leaves of Phaseolus vulgatis to the ladybird beetle Coccinella septempunctata.

Survival and reproduction were determined at the rates of 63, 1.015, 2.062, 4.186 and 8.5 kg product/ha applied to detached bean leaves?

At the dose rate of 0.5 kg product/ha 41.4% corrected mortality occurred. The dose rates of 1.015, 2.062, 4.186 and 8.5 kg product/ha had no influence on preimaginal mortality. Therefore it can be assumed that the effect at 0 \$kg product/ba was not test item related.

Reproduction was assessed in all rates of Folger + Ippovalicarb WG 56.3+9A W. The mean number of fertile eger per female and day was \$2.9 in the control and 22.6 and 15, respectively, in the 0.5 and 1.015 kg product/ha rate. At the rates of 2062, 49.86 and 8.5 kg product/ha rates 16.2, 19.8 and 19.2 fertile eggs per female and day, respectively were found. Because the reproductive performance was within the historical data base for control beetles ( $\geq 2$  fertile eggs per female and day, ΕT AL. 2000) this parameter is considered as not impacted by all test item rates.

The LD₅₀ was estimated to be > 8.5 kg product/ha.

### Objective:

The asm of the study was to determine the toxicity of freshly dried residues of Folpet + Iprovalicarb W& 56.3 9A W applied onto leaves of Phaseolus vulgaris to the ladybird beetle Coccinella septempenctata.

#### Material and methods:



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Test item: Specification No.:	A WG formu 1020000116	ulation of F 59:	Folpet + I	provalic	arb WG 5	6.3+9A W		
TOX-No ⁻	TOX08081-0	)0·				~	ST OF	
Batch ID ·	EM2000260	0·				4		
content of a s (analyse	d): Folm	et (SR-407	7) 54 9 %	w/w		10°		
Contract of the (until ) of	Iprovalicarb	(SZX 0722	2) 9.00 %	w/w	Ľ			
	date of com	oleted anal	lysis: 11	ÔCT 20	007 BES-	D-FT Analysis	& Services	
	D- 40789 M	onheim	.joio: 110	Wer =	Q			
	,		, Ô		4	, Š		
The test item was appl	ied to leaves of	of Phaseol	us malga	ris at rat	tes of 0.9	1.0.6, 2.062, 4.	1.86 and \$.5	
kg product/ha and the	e effects were	compared	to a w	ater the	ated contr	ob A toxic ref	erence a.i.:	
dimethoate) applied at 0.0804 kg product/ha was included to indicate the relative susceptibility of the								
test organisms and the test system								
The preimaginal morta	lity was moni	torectover	the dura	tion of t	he study.	The toxicity of t	he test ttem	
residues to the larvae an	nd pupae are s	unamarise	below.	.4		7 8 2	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	
The fertility and fecun	dity of the su	winghat	ched adu	hts were	then eval	luated over the p	period of 14	
days.	Á	Ō	`مy' s		× >>		S [°]	
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		¢, ¢	5	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		1	
Validity Criteria:	, S		- Or	~~~				
The validity criteria are	e based on the	se of the l	abørator	y metho	d with gla	ss plates (ET AL.,	
2000).		Q A	ž L		S.			
~		<u>% </u>		<u> </u>		. 8		
Q.		, [°]	S x	j ^y () _v y	Validity criteria	Finding	
Mortality in water control	<u>1 / ,)</u>	<u> </u>	<u>~~~~</u>	<u></u>	A I	$\swarrow \leq 30\%$	27.5%	
Corrected mortality refer	nce item 🖉 👔			- Se	<u>S</u>	> 40%	96.6%	
Mean number Mertile	ggs peOfemale	ind day in w	vater contr			≥ 2	13.9	
°°		A	y F		K R			
Findings	0 <u>2</u> 9 4	°.	S	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	\sim			
Mortality and reproduc	tion in each of	the treatm	nents are	summar	ized as fol	lows:		
	<u> </u>	<u>~</u> ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~						
Mortality / Reproduction	A S	ő 📈		<u> </u>		r		
<u> </u>		· _ O'	• Mortali	ť ¢ [%]		Reprodu	ction	
	$\mathcal{O} \sim \mathcal{O}$	S A	þ <i>"</i> ð			Fertile eggs	Fertility	
	6 ²					per female	[hatching	
Treatment k	g product/ha	Uncorr.	çorr.	P-Va	lue(*)	and day	rate in %]	
Control∕ √		8 4.5	≫ 0.0			13.9	95	
Test item	00.5 °	<u>37.5</u>	41.4	0.061	n.sign.	22.6	91.8	
Test item	<u>\ 1.015</u> ~	× 30:Q	3.4	1.000	n.sign.	15	89.2	
Test item	2062	\$5 .0	10.3	1.000	n.sign.	16.2	91.9	
Test item	C¥.186 S	20.0	-10.3	1.000	n.sign.	19.8	92.9	
Test item	8,50	27.5	0.0	1.000	n.sign.	19.2	88.7	
Reference item	0,0804	97.5	96.6			n.d.	n.d.	
A C	E.							
è ^{0°}								

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Mortality / Reproduction									
			Mortal	lity [%]	Reprod	uction			
					Femile eggs	Feitility			
					per female	hatching			
Treatment	kg product/ha	Uncorr.	Corr.	P-Value(*)	and day	rate m/%]			
LD ₅₀ : > 8.5 kg product/ha									
* Fisher's Exact test, two-sided, p-values are adjusted according to Bonferroni folm									
n.d. not detected			L	, Ô¥	\$				
n.sign. not significan	nt		AU'						
sign. significant			- Or V	<u> </u>	<u></u>				
		(j	. <i>b</i>						
At the dose rate o	of 0.5 kg product/	na 41.4%)	corregie	d mortality occurre	d. The dose ra	tes of 1.015,			
2.062, 4.186 and	8.5 kg product/ha	had no in	fluence	on preimaginal mo	ortality. Thoref	oreort can be			
assumed that the en	ffect at 0.5 kg proc	luct/ha was	not tes	t item related					
Reproduction was	assessed in all rate	es of Folpe	t + Iprø	valicarb W@56.3	9A W The me	an number of			
fertile eggs per fer	male and day was	J3.9 in th	e contro	l and 22.6 and 15,	respectively, in	n the 0.5 and			
1.015 kg product/h	na rate. At the rafe	's of 2.062,	4.186	and 8.5 kg product/	harates 16.2, J	9.8 and 19.2			
fertile eggs per fer	male and day resp	pectively m	ere fou	nd. Beeause the re	productive perf	ormance was			
within the historic	al data basesfor co	ontrol beet	les (222	fertile eggs per fe	male and day,	ET			
AL. 2000) this para	AL. 2000) this parameter is considered as bot impacted by all test item pates of the second s								
	× .4	Q L							
Conclusion	\$ \$ J	ģ Õ	Š	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~					
The I D., was activ	The LD was actime to be 9.5 years duat/here with the state								

The LD₅₀ was estimated to be > 8.5 kg product/nay

Report: 🔬 🖗	KIIIA 10.5.2/04, 2008 Q
Title:	Toucity to the green lacewing Chrysoperla carnea Steph. (Neuroptera,
	Chrysopidae) using an extended laboratory test; Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56.3 +
5 5	
Document No:	M-295914091-1 (GW07/066)
Guidelines:	BC guideline Vogt et al (2000)
GLP:	Yes of a gradient of a gradien
<u> </u>	

Executive Summary The study was to determine the topicity of freshly dried residues of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56.3+9A W applied onto bean leaves, to the green lacewing Chrysoperla carnea.

The test item was applied of detached bean leaves at rates of 0.5, 1.015, 2.062, 4.186 and 8.5 kg product/ha and the effects were compared to a toxic reference (a.i.: dimethoate) applied at 0.0415 kg product/ha, and a water weated control.

The prephaginal mortality was monitored over the duration of the study. The toxicity of the test item residues to the larvae and pupae are summarised below.

The fertility and fecundity of the surviving hatched adults were then evaluated over the period of one week.

The dose rates of 0.5, 1.015, 2.062, 4.186 and 8.5 kg product/ha had no influence on mortality and reproduction and the LD₅₀ was estimated to be > 8.5 kg product/ha.



D-

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Objective:

The aim of the study was to determine the toxicity of freshly dried residues of Folpet + Iprovalicant WG 56.3+9A W applied onto bean leaves, to the green lacewing *Chrysoperla Carnea*.

Material and methods:

Test item:	A WG formulation of Folp	et + Iprovalica	arb W& 56.3	+9A W	
Specification No.:	102000011659;	¥ م.	<u>A</u>	Ű,	ĴŽ "ČŽ "ČŽ
TOX-No.:	TOX08081-00;	, O	Á.	, °° °°	
Batch ID.:	EM20002600;			Q.	
content of a.s. (analysed	$1): \qquad \text{Folpet} (\text{SR-407}) \ 34$	4.9 %w/w 🔊			5 5
	Iprovalicarb (SZX 0722) 9	.00*%w/w		S.	4
	date of completed analysi	£ 11 Ø€T 20	(97, BCS-D-]	FT Analysis	& Services,

The test item was applied to detached beap leaves at rates 4@/86 and 8.5 kg dometheate) applied at 0.0415 kg product/ha and the effects were compared to a toxic reference (a.i.: n N N , Colored Colored residues to the larvae and pupae are summarised below. The fertility and fecundity of the surviving hatched adults were then evaluated over the period of one week.

Validity Criteria: The validity criteria are based on those of the Jaboratory method with glass plates (VOGT ET AL. 2000).

		,
	Validity criteria	Finding
Mortality in water control	$\leq 20\%$	12.5%
Corrected mortality reference stern	50 - 100%	57.1%
Mean number of eggsper female and day in water control	≥ 15	17.2
Mean Hatching Rate of the eggs (certility) in water control	$\geq 70\%$	74.3%

Findings:

Mortality and reproduction in each of the treatments are summarized as follows:

Mortafity / Reproduction							
· *		Mortalit [%]		Reproduction		
L.					Eggs	Fertility	
		, O			per female	[hatching	
Treatment 🖉 🖉	kgsproduct ha	Uncorr.	Corr.	P-Value(*)	and day	rate in %]	
Control		12.5	0.0		17.2	74.3	
Test item	\$ ⁷ . 65	10.0	-2.9	1.000 n.sign.	10.3	68.1	
Text item	<u>گ</u> .015	10.0	-2.9	1.000 n.sign.	12.2	71.6	
Test item	2.062	17.5	5.7	1.000 n.sign.	16.8	79.1	
Test item	4.186	7.5	-5.7	1.000 n.sign.	13.3	70	
Test item	8.5	15.0	2.9	1.000 n.sign.	18	74.5	
Reference item	0.0415	62.5	57.1		n.d.	n.d.	

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Mortality / Reproduc	tion					^ ^
		Mortality [%]		Reproduction	
					€ggs	Fertility
					per female	hatching
Treatment	kg product/ha	Uncorr.	Corr.	P-Value(*)	and day	rate m//
LD ₅₀ : > 8.5 kg prod	luct/ha			\$. ×		
* Fisher's Exact test,	two-sided, p-values	s are adjusted	d accordia	to Bonferroni	m 🖉	N ÓY
n.d. not detected		5	đ.	* 64	Ű.	y y o
n.sign. not significan	t		, Û	Ś.	jõ , ^Q	
sign. significant			, A			
00			N		m a *	
The dose rates of	0.5. 1.015. 2.062.	4.186 and	8.5 kg	product/hashad no	influence on n	nortality and
reproduction	,,,	4	1			
reproduction.		S.		Y A. A.	ST .	
Conclusion			y d		y a w	and the second sec
The I D _{co} was estin	nated to be > 8.5 k	Sproduct/				, U
The LD50 was estim					S. S.	L.
	Q°.	õ õ	2		ర్ సి	Ý
IIIA 10.5.3	Effects on non-t	arget terr	estrial	arthropods in se	mi-freid tests	
Report:	KIIIA 10.5.34	<u>, ()</u> 1:	2008			
Title:	Toxicity to the	natasitoid	vasn <i>Apl</i>	hidius.rhonAbsinhi	DESTEPHAN	I-PEREZ)
THU.	(Hymenontera)	Braconida	e) nsing	an extended laborat	orv têst (under s	semi-field
	Conditions age	residues o	n Zea m	avs) Folget + Jorov	alicarb WG 56	3 + 9 A W
Document No:	M-241332-07-	1 (Report-N	O. CMAR	8/048	».	
Cuidalinas			Maria D	Driada at all Drade	0.6 Condelf	$a = \frac{1}{2001}$
	AVICAU-DINESS C	al. (2009),	Ivigau-E	onges et ac (Drail 2	ooo), Candolli (et al. (2001)
IGLP 🔊	A es (certified)	aboratøry)				

Objectives

The aim of the study was to determine the toxicity of Folpet + provalicarb WG 56.3 + 9 A W to the parasitoid wasp *Appendius rhopalosiphi* in an extended aboratory test after residual contact exposure to under semi-field conditions agent residues on potted plants of Zea mays.

Materials and methods:

Ô

A water dispersible granule formulation of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56.3 + 9 A W was tested, specified by sample description. TOX 0808400; specification no.: 102000011659, batch ID: EM20002600 [analysis completed: 11 QCT 2007, BCS-D-FT Analysis & Services, D-40789 Monheim;].

The test item was applied with 5.1 kg product/ha in 400 L water/ha on potted maize plants. The control was treated with depended water in the same way as the test item. The toxic reference Dimethoate was applied at 0.0136 kg product/ha (5 g a.i./ha) in 400 L water/ha on potted maize plants as well. For the further exposure dates it was applied directly on the cut maize leaves. It was included to indicate the relative susceptibility of the test organisms and the test system.

Aging of the spray residues of the test item on the potted maize plants took place under natural semifield conditions with rain protection during the whole study.

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Mortality of 30 females was assessed 2, 24 and 48 hours after exposure on maize leaves for ach bioassay started on day 0 and 7 after application.

Repellency of the test item in both bioassays was determined during the initial & h after the repease of

real of the second seco plants infested with *Rhopalosiphum padi* for a period of 24 hours The number assessed 11 days later. From these data the endpoints mortality and effects on reproduction were (summarized on the next table.

Ŵ

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Findings:

	S. S.
Test item	Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56.3 + 9 W
Test object	Aphidius rhopalosiphi 🚿 😽 🚀
Exposure	Dried spray deposits on maize leaves
Start of bioassay	$0 \text{ DAA}^{a} \qquad \qquad$
	Mortality (%) after 48 h
Control	
Test item	
Reference item	93.3
	6 Corrected Mortanty (2) S
Test item	0 (p-value 1.000 not significant) 3.3 (p-value 1.000, not significant) b
Reference item	$293.3 \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc $
	Repellency (comparison per mean values)
	A K K aspson plant O S O
Control	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Test item	
Reference item	
	Rel. to control (%)
Control	
Test item	2A (p-value 0.982 not significant) ^c 8.7 (p-value 0.81, not significant) ^c
Reference item	1.4 × × 25.8
	Reproduction
	Nomber of mumpies percremale
Control	<u> </u>
Test item	
	Reduction relato control (%)
Test iter	مَنْ (p-value 0,854, not@gnificant) د.
a Dava ofter application	

Days after application

^b Fisher's Exact test, Dwo-sided, p-values adjusted according to Bonferroni-Holm

° Wilcoxon test, two-side p-values adjuged according to Bonforoni-Holm

^d invalid results Bee val Qity criteria, chapter 5. °

Conclusion: In this extended laboratory test the lethal and subjective affects of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 56.3 + 9 A W residues (aged wider semi-field conditions) on the parasitoid wasp Aphidius rhopalosiphi were determined after application of §.1 kg producina onto Zea mays.

In this study no mortality of the test itere was found in the first bioassay started on day 0 after application. The reduction of reproductive success relative to the control in this bioassay was 3.6%.

A second boassay was sharted days after application and showed a corrected mortality of 3.3%. In this bioassay the observation on potential reproduction effects were not valid due to insufficient control performance 3 wasps produced zero reproduction in water control). Since the first bioassay indicated low mortality with low effects on reproduction the study was not prolonged.

No statistically significant repellent effect of the test item could be observed in both bioassays.

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Report:	KIIIA 10.5.3/02; 2010
Title:	Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (9 + 56.3 % w/w): Effects on the reproduction of
	Aphidius rhopalosiphi (De Stephani Perez) (Hymenoptera, Braconidae) under
	semi-field conditions.
Document No:	M-391612-01-1 (Report-No: EBSZX159)
Guidelines:	Barrett et al. (1994), Mead-Briggs et al. (2000), Candolfi et al. (2001)
GLP	Yes (certified laboratory)

Objective: The objective of the study was to determine the effects of fresh residues of Iprovalicarb Folpet WG 65.3 on the reproduction of the aphia parasitoid *Aphidius Biopalosiphi* (De Stefani Perez) (Hymenoptera, Braconidae) under semi-field exposure conditions.

Materials and methods: Test item: Iprovalicarb Folpet WG 5.3 (9 + 56.3 % www), specified by sample description: TOX 09082-00; specification no. 102000011659-02 batch ID: EM20002600, analysed content of active ingredients: 4.4% w/w folpet and 8.88% w/w iprovabcarb.

Test organism: the parasitoid wasp *Aphidius rhop dosiphi*, approve 48 bold adults. The test item was diluted in water and applied with a spray application volume of 400 k water/ha to barley seedlings at 5.1 kg product/ha. Deionized water was used as control and Perfekthion (analysed content of dimethoate: 414.8 pL) was applied at 40.0 g product/ha in 400 L water/ha as a reference treatment.

5 replicates per treatment contained 4 remale wasps each. The adults were provided with artificial food. The parasitoids were exposed to the treated barley plants for 48 h under semi-field conditions, before the reproduction units for the fertility test were preserved into the cages for 24 h of oviposition. Counting of parasitised apriles was carried out 12 days after the start of the fertility test. The parasitic capacity of the treated temales was compared to that of the control.

Findings: The results can be considered as valid, as all validity criteria of the test were met. Corrected mortality of the reference item was 100% (> 50% required) and the mean reproduction per female in water control was $9.9 \ge 5$ required).

	0	
Test object	Applidius rhopalosiphi	
Exposure \mathcal{O}^{*} \mathcal{O}^{*} \mathcal{O}^{*} \mathcal{O}^{*}	Barley seedlings	
Treatment groups	Mean mummies per female \pm SD	R [%]
Control	9.9 ± 20.2	-
Iprovalicarb + Folpet XG 65,3	76+137	23.2
at 5.1 kg product/ha 🗸 🖉 🖓	1.0 - 15.7	23.2
Reference item (Perfekthion) at	0.0 ± 0.0	100.0
40.0 g product/ha	0.0 ± 0.0	100.0
SD: Standard eviation		

R: Reduction in reproduction rate compared to the control

Conclusion With respect to the test results it can be concluded that Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 caused no adverse effects on reproduction of *Aphidius rhopalosiphi* under semi-field conditions at an application rate of 5.1 kg product/ha when applied on barley seedlings.



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Report:	KIIIA 10.5.3/03, 2002		
Title:	Toxicity of Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65 pyri SCHEUTEN under extended labora	.25 to the predatory write Ty tory conditions (age -residu	phlodromus
Document No:	M-073796-01-1 (02 10 48 057)	4	\$ \$ \$
Guidelines:	IOBC guideline Blumel et al (2000)		
GLP:	Yes 🕎		

Material and methods:

The fungicide Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25 (portiv: 10 % SZX 0720+55.4% Foret; specification: Development No.: 3000244654; TOX No.: 06134-00, Batch No.: 07073/0048(0046) was tested under extended laboratory conditions on the predatory write Tschlodromus pyri SCHEUTEN after residual contact exposure to freshly applied under semi-field conditions aged residues on excised wine leaves. The test item was applied at a rate of 5.42 kg product/ha in 400 \$ deionized water/ha to potted wine plants. The control was freated with dephized water (400 I/ha). Dimethoate EC 400 (30 ml product/ha in 400 l/ha of water) was used as a toxic reference treatment. Aging of the spray residues on ported wine plants tool place under noural field conditions with rain protection (UV-permeable) from the application (DAF 0) until DAF 7. After that time, rain protection was necessary, because frequent shower were predicted, i.e. plants were protected against rain in a carport. Over a tone of the days, it was possible, to place the treated plants outdoor, because there was no rainfall (see Appendix 4). Protonymply's of the predatory mite Typhlodromus pyri SCHEUTEN were exposed in Oreplicates of 20 miles (perspeatment group) to the spray residues of the dest item, reference item and control, respectively. During the assessments the mites were fed with pollen (pine and birch). The number of sarviving, dead and escaped predatory mites, behaviour and the number of eggs laid per evaluation period were recorded for each exposure over a period of 14 days. From these data the endpoints mortality and the effect on reproduction were calculated. The toxic reference treatment resulted in 59.5 % (DAT 6), 52.0 % (DAT 7) and 51.0 % (DAT 14) corrected mortality within & days. \bigcirc

Findings			
Mortality 🖉 🖉	No v		
Test item 🖉 🖉	<u>, ~ ~ ~ </u>	Fopet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25	5
Testobject		Ryphlogromus pyri SCHEUTEN	J
Exposure 🧳		d spray deposits on excised wine	leaves
Treatment ~		Mortality after 7 days	
Exposure time (DAT)		5 7	14
Control	\mathcal{L} 30 \mathcal{L}	0	2
Application rate A		Corrected Mortality	
[kg protect/hat]	<u> </u>	[%]	
<u>6</u> .42 × Č	^م 48.5*	14.0*	1.0

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

<i>Fecundity</i> Test item		F	olpet + Iprovali	icarb WG 65.	25	
Test object		T	vphlodromus py	vri SCHEUTE	EN 🏷	
Exposure		Dried s	pray deposits of	n excised win	e leaves	
Treatment		(mear	Fecur No. of eggs p	ndity er surviving fo	ennale)	
	mean No. of eggs/ female	Reduction relative to control (%)	mean No. of eggs/ female	Reduction relative control	mean No. of eggs/	Reduction
Exposure time DAT	0	1				
Control	n.d	- 1	1 1 1 1 1 1	Q,	° 6,20 Ô	
Application rate [kg product/ha]						
5.42	n.d.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	× 902		

* statistically significantly different (0 < 0.05) n.d. = not determined (corrected montality for the test item from >00%) DAT = Day(s) After Treatment

Conclusions:

The results of the control group indicated that the text organisms were in a good condition (mortality: 3 % (DAT 0); 0 % (DAT 7), 2 % (DAT 14)).The results of the toxic standard group indicated that the test system was sensitive to harmful substances (corrected mortality: 51.3% (DAT 0); 52% (DAT 7), 51% (DAT 14)).

Mortality: 🖏

7 days after the 1st exposure (DAT 0) and the 2nd (DAT 7) exposure, respectively, statistically significantly differences in mortality were observed in the test item group compared to the control group.

No poisoning symptoms and anomalous behaviour of the treated predatory mites were recorded in comparison with the control group for all exposures.

Reproduction:

No statistically significant difference in reproduction (mean number of eggs/surviving female) was observed in the test user group (DAT 7 and DAT 14) when compared to the control group. The reduction of reproduction relative to control was 9.2 % (DAT 7) and 0.5 % (DAT 14).

IIIA 10.5.4 Field tests on arthropods species

In view of the findings reported above, and based on the current requirements, no semi-field studies with the preparation have been conducted.



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.6 Effects on earthworms and other soil macro-organisms The toxicity data for Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 and the individual active substances and their soil metabolites are shown in the following table. Ê metabolites are shown in the following table.

Table 10.6- 1: 1	Effect on soil macro	-organisms -	– earthworm	18	S,		L.
Test species	Test design	E	cotoxicologi	icalendpoint		Reference	ř.
Iprovalicarb	1	1	ıř.		Ş <u> </u>		
Eisenia fetida	acute, 14 d (10 % peat in test soil)	LC50	> 5000	mg ass/kg d	No N	HBF/Rg 22 M-@0083c01-1 IIA 8-9.1/01 MA 8-4.1/01	
Eisenia fetida	chronic, 56 d (10% peat in test soil)	NOEC	≥. 05 5 ⁷ ,2,3) ^A ∠ ^A 7 ^A 2 ^A 7 ^A 7 ^A 2 ^A 7	mga.s./kgd	ws s	HBF/Rg 52 HBF/Rg 52 HBF/Rg 52 H2000750-01-1 HA 8.9.2001 (EU ©oint IIA 8.4.2/04)	0
Eisenia fetida	chronic, 56 d (10% peat in test soil)		<u>20</u> 5 ^{1, 2, 4)}	mag a.s./kg d	ws or	MPE/Rg 370/01 M-053073-01-1 IIA 8.9.2/02	
Eisenia fetida	chronic, 56°d (5% peat in test soil)		€ ² 64 € ⁴	mg a.s./kg d	ws ^{ty y}	(2011) AT-Rg-R-85/11 M-405822-01-1 IIA 8.9.2/03	
Iprovalicarb-	carboxylic acid (M(<u>) </u>	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~			<i>•</i>	_
Eisenia fetida	chronid, 56 d 4 (5% peat in test (50) (1)	y ~~ SOEC	© ≥ 100	ng pavkg d	ws b	(2011) 59691022 M-406133-01-1 IIA 8.9.2/04	
PMPA (MH))			Q				
Eisenia fetida	actite, 14, 1 (10, % peat in test sot)		× , 0 [×] , 5 [×] , 5 [×] , 5 [×]	mg pm/kg d	ws	(1999) HBF/Rg 302 M-016516-01-1 IIA 8.9.1/02 (EU point IIA, 8.4.1/02)	
Eisenia fefda	chronic, So d (10% peat in test) soft)	NØEC		» mg pm/kg d	ws	(2001) MPE/Rg 369/01 M-043357-01-1 IIA 8.9.2/05	
Eisenia fetida	A (NHS) ohronic, 56 d (5% peat in teat	NOEC 4	60.2	mg pm/kg d	ws	(2010) 52291022 M-368040-01-1 IIA 8.9.2/06	
Eisenia fetida	acute, 14 d 10 % peat in Jest Soil)	LC50	> 500 ¹⁾	mg a.s./kg d	ws	EFSA Scientific Report	
Eisenia	chronic, 56 d (10% peat in test soil)	NOEC	5.18 ⁵⁾	mg a.s./kg d	ws	for Folpet (2006)	

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)



Predicted environmental concentrations in soil (PECsh) values were calculated for the active substance iprovalicate and its metabolites as described in detail in Point 9.4 and Point 9.5 of this dossier. A soil layer of A cm with a bulk density of 1.5 g/cm³, and conservative DT₅₀ values of 68.56 days for iprovalicate 1.852 days for M63, 18033 days for M10 and 0.929 days for M15 were considered. The accumulation potential of M10 after long term use was also assessed considering a soil mixing depth of 10 cm. The highest maximum PEC_{soil} values were calculated for the use in vines, early (4 216 g a.s. /bit, 4 × 60% interception, 10 days interval). The PEC_{soil} values used for the risk assessment are presented in Table 10.6-2.

Table 10.0-20 Manufactors	in values	
Crop	Graj	Des
	PEC _{soil} [mg/kg]	PEC _{soil} (twa, 21 d) [mg/kg]
Iprovalicarb 4 Folper WG 68.3	5.120 ¹	-
Iprovalicato	0.398	0.359
M03 🖉	0.013	0.002
M10	0.110 ²	0.090
M15	0.019	0.001

¹ based on an application rate of 4×2400 g product/ha and $4 \times 60\%$ interception



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

² PEC_{soil, total} (background PEC_{plateau} in 10 cm depth + maximum residue of one year in 5 cm depth)

Toxicity exposure ratios for earthworms, TERA and DERLT **IIIA 10.6.1**

The risk assessment procedure follows current regulatory requirements and the Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology.

T) the TER values are calculated using the $\sqrt{2}$ $\sqrt{2}$ Based on most sensitive endpoints (see Table $10.6_{\overline{e}}$ following equations:

 $TER_A = LC_{50} / PEC_{soil}$ $TER_{LT} = chronic NOEC / PEC_{soil}$

The risk is considered acceptable, if the TE

For lipophilic substances (log Pow 2) the Terrestrial Guidance Dostment & Compends to apply an additional assessment factor of 2 for the ecotogicological endpoints (LC NOEO), if the study was conducted in artificial soil with a high content of organic matter (i.e. 10% peat), to consider the possible sorption of these compounds to the organic matter.

0 and the DERLE

Table 10.6.1-1: TER calculations for earthworms

Compound test design	kg soil] PECmax [mg/kg[soil]	TERA /	Trigger	Refined risk assessment?
Iprovalicarb + Folipet WQ 65.3 🐓 (NOEC 🗡 🛛	000 7 5 20 2	ž 195	5	No
Iprovalicarb, acute S O LC S	500 ¹ 0 0.398	≥ 1256	10	No
Iprovalicarby chronic Q NOEC >>	640 0.398	≥161	5	No
M03, chronic O S SOEC >	Q00 Q Q013	\geq 7692	5	No
M10, acute A LC A	500,1 \$9.110	> 4545	10	No
M10, chronic S NOEC S 13	580 0.110	1436	5	No
M15, chronic	9 .2 0.019	3168	5	No
	405			

¹ Study endpoint wided by factor

Conclusion.

The TER values are above the trigger of concern indicating no unacceptable risk for earthworms from the application of the product according the preded GAP.

Açute toxicitv **IIIA 10.6.2** to earthworms

No study on acute toxicity was performed with the formulation. Please refer to Point IIIA 10.6.3 for the reproduction study conducted with the formulation.
(1) n

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

111A 10.0.3	Sublethal effects on earthworm	IS	
Report:	KIIIA 10.6.3/01, 200	2	
Title:	Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25: E	ffects on Reproduction a	d Growth of S
	Earthworms <i>Eisenia fetida</i> in Artif	icial Soil with 5 % Peat in	the Test Substrate
Document No:	M-066524-01-1 (Rep. No.: 148720	002)	
Guidelines:	BBA 1994, ISO 11268-2 (1998)		
GLP:	Yes		

TTT A 10 C 3 Sublethal effects on conthruch

Materials and methods:

Folpet + Iprovalicarb WG 65.25 (Development No.: 3000244054, Batch No.: 07373/0048(0046), Tox No.: 06124-00) was mixed into the soil at 100, 1782316, \$62 and 1000 mg product/kg artificial soil (dry weight). The soil was based on OECD 207 bat with reduce organic matter conont (5 % peat)/It contained 5 % Sphagnum-peat, air-dried and finely ground (2 mm), 20 % Kaolin clay (Kaolinite content >30 %); approximately 0.2 % Chalk (CaCO2) added to addist philo 6.0 0.5; approximately 74.8 % fine quartz-sand (F34) contaioing more than 50 % by mass of particle size 0.05 mm to 0.2 mm. Earthworms Eisenia fetida (40 woons per treatment group) were experied at \tilde{U} - 22 C, light 450 - 800 lux, 16 h light : 8 h dark, fed weekly with drive cattle manufe, initial soil water content 23.6 % - 25.4 % (51.2 % to 55.1 % of the water holding capacity), water content at experimental end 23.6 % to 28.3 % (50.3 % to 61.4 % of the water bolding capacity), initial pH 5.5 to 5.6; pH at experimental end 5.7 to 5.9. Derosal SC 360 (active ingredient carbendazing) was tested as the toxic standard at least once a year in a dose response study control: untreated and the most recent study resulted in an EC50 for reproduction was calculated as 1.46 mg carbenda 2m/kg soil dry weigh



Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Test Item:	الم المالية Iprovalicarb & Folpet WG 65.25					e° s
Test Species	:			Eisenia fetida	1	N S
Exposure:			test iter	n mixed into	the soil	
	control		lprovalica	rb & Folpet V	VG 65.25	
		100 mg product/kg	178 mg product/kg	316 mg product/kg	562 mg ∡product/kg ⇒	9000 mg
mortality [%] ¹	0.0	0.0 -	0.0 -	2.5 8 n.s	5.0 n.s	
	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 0.0	± 5.0	± 5.8 🛒	A)0.0 ()
body weight change [%] ¹	37.2	43.1 n.s. ³	41.8 a.s. ³	40.9 0.s. ³	° 37.6 n.s. ³	35.§ n.s. ³
0	± 6.6	± 6.6	± 4.9	± 8,0 蜿	± 1.8	.±.2.5 √
reproduction	400 + 57	291 n.s. ³ + 134	(400 € s. ³) + 74	\swarrow 292 \oiint s. ³	→ 176 [→] * ³	287 n.s.^3
# Of Juvernies						Q'
amount of food added	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0 °	24.5	24.6 ⁴
[9] ¹	± 0.0	± 0.0	(± 0.00 ×	♀´± 0.0	<u> </u>	/ ± 0.5

¹ mean \pm SD = mean \pm Standard Deviation from 4 replicates; values calculated on the exact raw data \circ lepresent roub not elevant n.s = not significantly different @mpared to the control Fisher-exact test $\alpha = 0.05$ * = significantly different compared to the control Donnett test, α €0.05

Conclusion:

The no-observed-effect-concentration (NOEC) of FolgeP+ Introvalicarb W@65.25 for mortality, growth, reproduction and feeding activity of the earthworm Eisenia fetter found was 1000 mg product/kg dry artificial soil, the highest concentration tested. The statistically reduced number of juvenile earthworms in the concentration of 562 mg product/kg soil dry weight was not considered to be treatment related, since the higher concentration of 1,000 mg product/kg soil dry weight did not lead to a statistically significant reduction

A

IIIA 10.6.4 tests (effects on earthworms) Field

Considering the todings reported above no farther studies are required.

Residue content of earthworms IIIA 10.6.5

As no significant acute or subgethal effects have been observed at relevant concentrations (see: 10.6.2 and 10,6.3) no further studies have to be considered.

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ an estimated BCF for earthworns is addressed under Annex Point 10.1.9, this Section 6. Based on the information given under Annex Point 10.2.4, this Section 6, a considerable accumulation (bioconcentration) of residues of the product and/or metabolites is unlikely.

An estimation

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.6.6 Effects on other soil non-target macro-organisms

IIIA 10.6.6 Ef	fects on other soil	non-target macro-	organisms	Ø	ð
The toxicity data for i	iprovalicarb and its so	oil metabolites are sho	own in the follow	ing table.	- F
Table 10.6.6- 1: Effec	ts on other soil non-tar	rget macro-organisms	<u> </u>		line and the second sec
Test species	Test design	Ecotoxicological end	point 🖉	Reference 🔪	þ?
Iprovalicarb			Ĩ		, O
Folsomia candida	chronic, 28 d (5% peat in test soil)	NOEC 21000	mg sykg dws	M-368058-01 FRM-COLL-80/10 IN-8.14/00	
Hypoaspis aculeifer	chronic, 14 d (5% peat in test soil)		mg as/kg dws	(2010) M-366603-01-1 kra MR-25/50 IJA 8.14/85	2
Iprovalicarb-carboxy	lic acid (M03)				
Folsomia candida	chronic, 28 d (5% peat in test Soil)	\$\$QEC 20 ≥ 100°	torg pm/kg dws	2 2011) M ₂ 905347291-1 59692016 DIA 8.14/02	
Hypoaspis aculeifer	chronic da d (5% péat in test soil)	NOEC $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}' \geq 100$	Bag pm/kg dwsC	(2011) M-405048-01-1 59693089 MA 8.14/06	
PMPA (M10)		0° %° ₂ 0°)	
Folsomia candida	Chroni@28 d (5% peat in the st soft)		mg mi/kg dkys	(2010) M-361572-01-1 FRM-COLL-78/10 IIA 8.14/03	
Rypoaspis actuarijer	(5% peat indest soil)			M-358751-01-1 kra-HR-18/09 IIA 8.14/07	
N-acetyl-PMPA (M15					
Folsomia candida S	chronic, 28 d	$\begin{array}{c} NOGEC \mathbb{O} \geq 160, \\ O^{T}, O^{T}, O^{T}, \\ O^{T}, \\ O^{T}, O^{T}, \\ \\ \\ O^{T}, \\ \\ \\ O^$	mg pm/kg dws	(2010) M-366743-01-1 FRM-COLL-81/10 IIA 8.14/04	
Hypoasport aculeifer	Chronic Q4 d (5% peat in test soil)	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	mg pm/kg dws	(2010) M-364283-01-1 kra-HR-24/10 IIA 8.14/08	
dws = dry weight foil pm = pure metabolite		Q_{f}^{ν}			

Table 10.6.6- 1:	Effects on	other soil n	on-target	macro-organism
------------------	------------	--------------	-----------	----------------

Chronie toxicity exposure ratios for soil non-target macro-organisms

Ecotoxicological endpoints and PEC_{soil} used for TER calculations for soil non-target macro-oragnisms are summarised below. TER values were calculated using the equation:

 $TER = NOEC / PEC_{soil}$

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

The risk is considered	l acceptable,	if the TER _{LT}	is >5.				
Table 10.6.6- 2: TER c	alculations fo	or soil macro-or	ganisms				
Compound Test design	Endpoint	[mg/kg soil]	PEC _{max} [mg/kg soil]	TER	Annex VI Trigger	Refined Pisk Assessment?	
Folsomia candida			Ď		D.		Ø
Iprovalicarb, chronic	NOEC	≥ 1000	0,398	≥ 2503	5_0	No V	Ş
M03, chronic	NOEC	≥ 100	013	≥\$7692	,0	S NO S	/
M10, chronic	NOEC	≥ 1000	0.110	909 <i>‡</i> ©	Q ⁴⁵ d	No A	
M15, chronic	NOEC	≥100 [°]	0.019	$2 \ge 5263$	~ 5×	No C	
Hypoaspis aculeifer		× 0				\sim	
Iprovalicarb, chronic	NOEC	≥ 1000 s	0.398	Q [≥] 2513	5 0	No 4	
M03, chronic	NOEC	≥ 100 \times \sim	× 0.013 0	≥ 7692	0° 5 _%	No	
M10, chronic	NOEC	≥ 1000 °	¢.110 ~	≥ 0 091 ≪			
M15, chronic	NOEC	2000	\$0.01 0	@≥ 5263	\$\$ 5 \$	No	

Conclusion: The TER values are above the trigger of concern, indicating to unacceptable risk for soil non-target macro-organisms a e. collembola soil mites Ŵ

Ô

Effects on organic matter breakdown

IIIA 10.6.7 Effects on organic matter breakdown A study on the organic matter breakdown is not required based on the DT₉₀ value of the active substance and accessible of EP value of the active





Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

IIIA 10.7 Effects on soil microbial activity

Studies are available for the product Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3, the active substances iprovalicarb and folpet, and the metabolites of iprovalicarb. The results are summarised in the following table.

.3 no influence no influence no influence no influence	22.67 mg/kg 17 kg/ha 6.6 mg/kg 4.95 kg as	dwso M-359 09\02 KUTA M-000 kWs M-07 KUTA M-000 KUTA M-000 KUTA M-000 KUTA	(2009) 102-01-1 18 052 N 10 7.1/01 10 7.1/01 10 96 10 96 1
no influence	22.67 mg/kg 17 kg/ha 6.6 mg/kg 405 mg/kg as 17 kg as 10 k	dwo M-359 09 V0 KOTIA KOTIA M-000 M-000 AU AU AU AU AU AU AU AU AU AU	(2009) 102-01-1 48 052 N 107.1/01 (1996) 096-01-1 12896 8.2/01 (EU IA, 85%01)
no influence no înfluence	6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 6.6 7. 6.6 7. 6.6 7. 7. 8.8 a s for the set of th	M-000 Ms Of M-000 Ma DOI14 MA 8 MA-000 MIA 8 point	096-01-1 42896 8.2/01 (EU IA, § 3/01)
no influence no influence no influence	6.6 9 Ping/kga 495 - kg as 7 - kg as 7	Aws of Arona	(1996) 096-01-1 12896 9.2/01 (EU IA, § \$/01)
no Miluence			
	4.95 kg a.s./	dws ha S AJO M-000 AJO IIA 8.1 point I	(1996) 094-01-1 42996 0.1/01 (EU IA, 8.5/02)
(M03) 6 5			
no influence	13 3 Omg pm h0 S kg par	/kg dws /ha /kg dws IIA 8.1	(2011) 388-01-1 48 055 N 0.1/02
		, Ø	
no influence	6.93 S mgpm 0.7 kg pm/	/kg dws M-366 /ha FRM-1 IIA 8.1	(2010) 832-01-1 N-139/10 0.1/03
no influence	1.20° mg pm 0.913 kg pm/	/kg dws M-366 /ha FRM-1 IIA 8.1	(2010) 828-01-1 N-138/10 0.1/04
	,		
no influence	15.93 kg a.s./	ha EFSA	Scientific Report
	no influence	no influence 15.93 kg a.s./	no influence 1.20° mg pm/kg dws kg pm/ha H-366 FRM-N IIA 8.1 no influence 15.93 kg a.s./ha EFSA for Fol

According to current regulatory requirements the risk is acceptable, if the effect of the recommended application rate of a compound/product on nitrogen or carbon mineralisation is < 25% after days. In po case deviations from the control exceeded 25% after 28 days, indicating low rik to soil micro-organisms.

Thus, no unacceptable risks to soil non-target micro-organisms is to be expected from the use of

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 *(Submission for Annex I renewal)*

Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3, if the product is used according to the recommended use pattern.

IIIA 10.7.1 Laboratory test to investigate impact on soil microbial activity

		1// 14	
Report:	KIIIA 10.7.1/01; .; 2009	4	57 55 6
Title:	Folpet + iprovalicarb WG 65.3 (56.3+9)A W: Eff microflora (Nitrogen transformation test)	fects on the activity	of soil
Document No:	M-359102-01-1 (Rep. No: 09 10 48 052 N)	Š ^e z	
Guidelines:	OECD 216; adopted January 21, 2000, OECD or Chemicals, Soil Microorganisms: Nitrogen Trans	uideline for the Test	ing of
GLP	Yes (certified laboratory)		

Objectives: The objective of the test was to determine the influence of 2.27 and 20.67 mgFolper+ Iprovalicarb WG 65.3 (56.3+9)A W/kg dry weight soil on purogen transformation in an agricultural soil.

Materials and Methods: Folpet \neq iprovalicate WG 65.3 (56.3+9) A W (analytical findings: Folpet (SR-407) 54.9 % w/w, Iprovalicate (SZX 0722) 9.00 % w/w, Spectrication No. 702006011659, Batch ID: EM20002600, Sample description: TOX08081-00) was used in the test. A loamy sand soil (DIN 4220) was exposed for 28 days to 2.27 and 22 67 mg test item/kg soil dro weight. Application rates were equivalent to 1.7 and 17 kg test item/fa. Determination of the nitrogen transformation (NO₃-nitrogen production) in soil prinched with lucerne meal (concentration in soil 0.5 %). NH₄-nitrogen, NO₃- and NO₂-nitrogen were determined using the Autoanalyzer II (BRAN+LUEBBE) at different sampling intervals (0, 7, 14 and 28 days after treatment).

The coefficience of variation in the control (NO3-N) were maximum 3 % and thus fulfilled the demanded range ($\leq 15^{\circ}$ %).

		2	, k	, C	0/	O ¥	y x	A)			
	Ő	J")	A	Ű	Ø	Appl	ication rates	1			
	Q,	. (°		εjΩP-	+IPŶ⁄W	G 🔊 3 (56 🖓 9)A W			
Time Interval	Co	ntro	1 20	2.27	/ mg	kg dry g	veight soil	22.67	7 mg	/kg dry v	weight soil
(days)			. Ŵ		C.			3.7%		1	%
Â,	Nıtra	te-№		Niti	rate-	N	anterence	Niti	rate-	N ¹)	difference to control
v		L.									10 0011101
0-1/	1.93	±	0,1	2,00	±~	0.12	3 ^{n.s.}	2.14	±	0.05	11*
7-14	0.20	`±	0.16	\$9.43 _A	Å Ø	0.04	109 ^{n.s.}	0.42	±	0.17	107 ^{n.s.}
14-28	0.67	大	0.10	0.67	۴±	0.12	1 ^{n.s.}	0.77	±	0.13	14 ^{n.s.}

Findings Effects on won-target soil microorganisms.

The calculations were performed with unrounded values

1) Rate: Nifrate-N/fr mg/kg dry weight soil/time interval/day, mean of 3 replicates and standard deviation

n.s. $\sqrt{p} = No statistically significant difference to the control (Student-t-test for homogeneous variances, 2-side <math>p \le 0.05$).

* Statistically significantly different to control (Student-t-test for homogeneous variances, 2-sided, p 20.05) Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

In a separate study the reference item Dinoterb caused a stimulation of nitrogen transformation of +37.9 % and +48.3 % at 16.00 and 27.00 mg Dinoterb per kg soil dry weight, respectively, 28 days after application (Appendix 4: Reference test, 5. Results of the reference test, page 28).

Observations: At time interval 7-14 days after treatment both test concentrations caused a temporary stimulation of the daily nitrate rate. No adverse effects of Folpet + iprovate arb WG 65 3, (56.3, 49) A w on nitrogen transformation in soil were observed in both test concentrations (2.27 mg/kg dry soil and 22.67 mg/kg dry soil) after 28 days.

Only negligible differences to control of 1 % (test concentration $2\frac{2}{7}$ mg/kg dry Soil) and +14% (test concentration 22.67 mg/kg dry soil) were measured at the end of the 28 day in Obation period.

Conclusion: Folpet + iprovalicarb WG 65.3 (56.3+9)A W caused no adverse effects (difference to control < 25 %, OECD 216) on the soil nitrogen transformation (measured as NO₃-5) production) at the end of the 28-day incubation period. The study was performed in a field soil at concentrations equivalent up to an application rate of 10 kg test item transformation.

IIIA 10.7.2 Further testing to investigate impact of soil microbial activity

Since laboratory testing has demonstrated that the active substances and their metabolites would not be expected to cause any significant effects on either soil anicrothora respiration or nitrogen transformation at concentrations above the maximum field rate to additional testing has been performed.

IIIA 10.8 Effects on non-target plants

IIIA 10.8.1 Effects on non-target terrestrial plants

The risk assessment is based on the "Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology", (SANCO/40329/2002 rev2 final, 2002). It is restricted to off-field situations, as non-target plants are non-crop plants located outside the treated area. Spray drift from the treated areas may lead to residues of a product in off-goop areas.

In the case of a non-herbicide screening results and/or Tie 1 studies give first information about the likelihood for cerrestical plant effects. The risk can be considered acceptable if there are no data indicating more than 50% phytopxic effect at the maximum application rate.

Seedling emergence and vegetative vigour studies have been conducted with Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 following OECD testing guidelines 208 and 227, respectively (see Annex Points IIIA 10.8.1.3 and 10.8.1.2). They each involved to species tested at the maximum application rate of 2.55 kg product/ha

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

	Ipr	ovalicarb + Folpet V	VG 65.3	·
Plant species	Seedling eme	rgence	Vegetati	ve vigour
	Max. effects at highest	Parameter	Max. effects at highest	Parameter 🔊
	rate tested [2.55 kg/ha]		rate tested [2.55 kg/ha]	
Buckwheat	10.5 % reduction	emergence 炎	no negative impact	
Cucumber	0.8 % reduction	shoot biomass	no negative impact	
Oilseed rape	7.3 % reduction	shoot biomass	no negative impact	
Soybean	11.5 % reduction	shoot bromass	12.0 % reduction	Shoot biomass
Sugar beet	23.5 % reduction	survival o	no negative impact	
Sunflower	0.5 % reduction	shoot bio@ass	ono negative impact	
Tomato	5.4 % reduction	shoot boomass@	no degative impact	O' Q' A
Corn	5 % reduction	emorgence	too negative impact	
Oat	6 % reduction	shoot biomass	y no negative impact @	ý <u>-</u> 0
Onion	6.3 % reduction 0°	🔗 surwyval 🗸	no negative impact	
Reference	(2009) (2		(2009) 0 Report No. VV 69/048	
	Doc No. M-357371-01-1 KIIIA 10.8 1.3/01		Doc 46. M-357376-01- KIIIA 10.8 Y.2/01	

Tabla 10.0.1 1.	Factoricalogical	and nainta far non	towast townsetwist nl	
1 able 10.0.1-1:	ECOLOXICOIO2ICAI	enabolints for non-	target terrestrial dia	ants

In the case of Iprovalicarb + Follpet WG 65.9, neither the seedling emergence nor the vegetative vigour studies showed phytoroxic effects 30% of the maximum rate of 2.4 kg product/ha.

Thus, no unacceptable osks to non-target terrestrial plants are to be expected from the use of Iprovalicarb + Folpet NG 65.3, when used according to the recommended GAP. IIIA 10.8.1.1 Seed germination Please refer to Anne Point MIA 10.8.1.2

		``		Ň	, K
ША	10.8.1	1.2	Ve	øetat	ive

~~~ (	
Report:	KINA 10.81.2/01 2009
Title:	Iprovalicarb + Folpet VG 9 + 56.3 % w/w: Effects on the vegetative vigour of ten
	species of non-target terrestival plants (Tier 1)
Doctyment No:	M-3\$7376-01-1 (Rep. No VV 09/048)
Guidelines:	OECD 227: OF CD Guidelines for the testing of Chemicals, Terrestrial Plant Test:
	Vegetative Vigour Test (July 2006)
GLP	yes y o

**Objective:**  $6^{\circ}$   $7^{\circ}$   $7^{\circ}$  The purpose of this specific study is to evaluate the effect of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 9 + 56.3 % w/w on the vegetative vigour of ten plant species representing a broad range of both dicotyledonous and monocotyledonous plant families.

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

## **Materials and Methods:**

Test item: Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 9 + 56.3 % w/w, workorder: 07035734, sample description TOX 08081-00, product: FLP + IPV WG 56.3 + 9A W, batch-ID: EM20002600, material no.: 06061579, specification no.: 102000011659, content for release: Folpet 54.9% w/w and provalicarb 9.00% w/w, appearance: dark brown granules.

In total, plants of ten species including seven dicotyledonous species buckwheat (*Fagopyruw* esculentum), cucumber (*Cucumis sativus*), oilseed rape (*Brassica navus*), soybean (*Glycine max*), sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*), sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*) and tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*) plus of three monocotyledonous species; oat (*Avena sativa*) onion (*Allium cepa*) and corn (*Zea max*) were grown in pots in the glasshouse.

At the 2-4 leaf stage plants were treated with Iprovalicarb  $\frac{1}{2}$  Folper WG 9 + 56.3 % www.usurg a laboratory track sprayer applied at 2.55 kg product? ha and a volume rate of 200 L/ha. Each pot contained 4 plants and there were 20 plants treated i.e. Freplicates. Control pots were treated with deionised water.

Pots were grown and maintained under glasshouse conditions with a temperature control set at 23  $\pm$  8°C during day and 18  $\pm$  8°C at night with a 76 h photoperiod.

The study was terminated 2 days after application? The parameters measured were survival, visual phytotoxicity, plant growth stage and show dry weight.

Statistical analysis of data was performed to obtain significance, carried out using the Pairwise Mann-Whitney-U-Test (one sided smaller;  $p \leq 0.05$  by Torkat statistics.

## **Findings:**

Analysis of iprovalicarts of the bighest application rate revealed it to be 95.6 % of nominal. This study can be considered valid of the validity criteria of 90% survival at the end of the test in the untreated controls were achieved for all species.

A summarised of the findings for each species is summarised of the following table:

I	~X		$\sim$ $\sim$	<b>A</b>	$\wedge$	v	8	8		
	buck-	Lucum ber	oilseed	¢≪soy- Soy-	suga bæ	sun- flower	toma- to	corn	oat	onion
Survival * (% inhibition)	0				0	0	0	0	0	0
Phytotoxicsty					0 - Af	0	0	0	0	0
Shoot Dry Weight *** (% inhibition)	@12.8)		¥ (2 <b>2</b> .6)	ر پ ² /12.0	(4.2)	(9.5)	(8.4)	(13.7)	(0.9)	(5.9)

# Effects of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 9 @ 56.3% w/w in the 21 days vegetative vigour test

* survival is a measure of treated plants that urvived at the end of the study and is expressed as an inhibition compared to the uppeated control

** see materials and methods for a description of the phytotoxicity rating

*** inhibition of reduction is expressed on a per plant basis

() figures in parentheses indicate that there was an increase when compared to the untreated control

Bold figures are statistically significant (Pairwise Mann-Whitney-U-test, one sided smaller;  $p \le 0.05$ ).

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

# **Observations:**

In general this study revealed a very low level of phytotoxicity as a result of a foliar application of Fiprovalicarb + Folpet WG 9 + 56.3 % w/w at 2.55 kg product/ha.

There was no mortality in any species following an application of Iprovalicator + Folpet W&9 + 5 % applied at 2.55 kg product/ha.

Slight stunting was observed as visible phytotoxicity in soybean, sugar bet and cucumber. Shoot dry weight was not adversely affected in any species apart from bybean were there was a reduction, which was statistically significant.

# **Conclusion:**

Following a foliar application of Iprovalicarb Folpet WG9 + 56.3 % w/w applied at 255 kg product/ha to ten terrestrial plant species at the 2 to 4 leaf stage the adverse effects on survival and shoot dry weight exceeding the 50% effect trigger for further testing were obtained in this regetative vigour study.

Report:	KIIIA 10.8.1.3/01
Title:	Iprovalies $F$ by $F$
	growth of terkspecies of nor target restrial plants (Tier)
Document No:	M-257371-01-1 (Kep. No SE 09/047) 2 2 2
Guidelines:	QECD 208: OECD Guidelines for the testing of Chemicals Terrestrial Plant Test:
	Seedling emergence and Secoling Growth Pest (July 2006):
GLP	$\mathcal{A}$ yes $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathcal{A}$ $\mathcal{A}$

# IIIA 10.8.1.3 Seedling emergence

# **Objective:**

The purpose of this specific study is to evaluate the offect of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 9 + 56.3 % w/w on the seedling energence and growth of ten plant species representing a broad range of both dicotyledonous and monocotyledonous plant families.

# Materials and Methods?

Test item: Iprovalicar $0^+$  Fotpet WC 9 + 50.3 % www.workorder: 07035734, sample description: TOX 08081-00, product: FLP FIPV WG 560 + 94 W, batch-ID: EM20002600, material no.: 06361579, specification no.: 102000011659, content for release. Folpet 54.9% w/w and Iprovalicarb 9.00% w/w, appearance: dark brown granules.

In total, plants of ten species including seven dicotyledonous species buckwheat (*Fagopyrum* esculentum), cucumber (*Cucums sativus*), offseed rape (*Brassica napus*), soybean (*Glycine max*), sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*), soaflower (*Helianthus annuus*) and tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*) plus three monocotyledonous species, oat (*Atena sativa*), onion (*Allium cepa*) and corn (*Zea mays*) were sown in pois in the glasshouse. The soil surface of the pots were treated with Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 9 + 56.3 % w/w using a laboratory track sprayer applied at 2.55 kg product / ha and a volume rate of 200 L/ha pack pot contained 5 seeds and there were 20 seeds treated i.e. 4 replicates. Control pots were treated with deionised water.

Pots were grown and maintained under glasshouse conditions with a temperature control set at  $23 \pm 8^{\circ}$ C during day and  $18 \pm 8^{\circ}$ C at night with a 16 h photoperiod.

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Following the spray application to the soil surface of the pots, emergence was assessed daily until 20% emergence of control seedlings. Emergence, survival and phytotoxicity were recorded 7 and 14 days after this time and assessment were made against the water treated controls.

were emergence, survival of emerged seedlings, visual phytotoxicity, plant growth stage and show dry weight.

Statistical analysis of data was performed to obtain significance, carried out using the Pairwise Magn-Whitney-U-Test (one sided smaller;  $p \le 0.05$ ) by ToxRat statistics.

# **Findings:**

Analysis of iprovalicarb of the highest application rate revealed it to be 95.6% of nominal. This study can be considered valid as the validity criteria of 70% emergence and 90% survival of the emerged seedlings at the end of the test in the untreated controls over achieved for all species. A summary of the findings for each species is summarised in the following table:

# Effects of Iprovalicarb + Folpet W6 9 + \$6.3 % w/w on seedling emergence

			10220 1						9,0	
	buck- wheat	cucarn-	offseed	sox-	sugar	Jun-	Ctoma-	corm	©° ∕oat	onion
	wheat		J Tupos	Oscan	goet	SaloweO.		Q.		
Emergence	10.5 🐇		~G	· 0·	[≁] 10 5 [©]	× .	a(53)	$\mathbb{Q}_{5}^{\mathbb{Y}}$	0	(14.3)
(% inhibition)	10.5			× ~ @	10.29				v	(14.5)
Survival *	Ĩ,	4 0 ⁽		Ŕ	@3 5			0	0	63
(% inhibition)		ã, s	Ő		0* ^{5.5} &	0 · ©	, Ő	U	v	0.5
Phytotoxicity **	Ş 0 (			0-A		©Ă <i>f</i>	~~0	0	0	A b
Shoot Dry Weight	, Ó ^y	^م ر کر		\$\$ \$	Q.					
***	×16.6)	^{~~} 0.8~	73	<b>∮</b> 1.5	~(11.7)	0:\$	5.4	0.4	6.0	(6.6)
(% inhibition)			<b>V</b>			, O				
* curvival ic amagaira	oftracted	In later that	Anne in a de	+ + h a Air d	of the atu	diand in a	woragaad	i	nhihit	ion

* survival is a measure of treated plants that survived at the ond of the study and is expressed as an inhibition compared to the untreated control and the study of the study and is expressed as an inhibition

** see materials and methods for a description of the phytotoxicity rating

*** inhibition or reduction is expressed on a per plant basis &

() figures in parentheses indicate that there was an orcrease when compared to the untreated control

Bold figures are statistically significant (Pairwise Mann Whitney U-test, one sided smaller;  $p \le 0.05$ ).

# Observations:

In general this study revealed a very low level of phytotoxicity as a result of a soil application of Iprovalicarb + Folper WG 9+56.3% w/wat 2.55kg product/ha.

The most sensitive species for emergence were puckwheat and sugar beet with 10.5% reductions.

The species showing the greatest effect on survival was sugar beet where there was a 23.5% reduction.

There were lighted phytotosic symptoms in this study with only slight stunting with soybean and sunflower and a slight necessis of onion

Soybean was the most sensitive species for shoot dry weight, with a 11.5% reduction which was statistically significant.

# Conclusion:

Following a soil surface application of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 9 + 56.3 % w/w applied at 2.55 kg product/ha to ten terrestrial plant species, no adverse effects on emergence, seedling survival and shoot



dry weight exceeding the 50% effect trigger for further testing were obtained in this seedbing emergence and growth study.

#### **IIIA 10.8.1.4 Terrestrial field testing**

Further studies were not considered necessary.

#### Effects on non-target aquatic plants **IIIA 10.8.2**

plants is presented under Am The toxicological spectrum of the active substances towards aquat Point IIIA 10.2.

### Aquatic plant growth - Lenna **IIIA 10.8.2.1**

produ as plant growth Due to the use of the product as a fungicide and since the regulator, tests on aquatic plants are not required

#### **IIIA 10.8.2.2** Aquatic field testing

The spectrum of the biological activity of the product is well represented by the cosults and the risk assessments in Point 10.2 Therefore, further sudies are not considered necessary

 $\bigcirc$ 

#### Effects on other non-target organisms believed to be at risk **IIIA 10.9**

The spectrum of the biological activity of the product is well represented by the results and the risk assessments in Point 10.2 to 10.8 of this dosser. Therefore further data from biological primary screening of other preliminary tests are not coordered relevant for the risk assessment.

## **IIIA 10.9.1** Sommary of preliminary data: biological activity & dose range finding Not relevant. See statement provided under

#### Assessment relevance to potential impact on non-target species IIIA 10.9.2 ded under Poir Not relevant. See statement pro

#### Other/special studies **IIIA 10.10**

L.

The spectrum of the biological activity of the product is well represented by the results and the risk assessments in Point 10,2 to \$0.8 of this dossier. Therefore, further data from biological primary screening or other preliminary tests are not considered relevant for the risk assessment.

#### IIIĂ 10.40.1 **Other/special studies - laboratory studies**

Not relevant. See statement provided under Point 10.10.

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

# **IIIA 10.10.2**

Not relevant. See statement provided under Point 10.10.

# Other/special studies - field studies statement provided under Point 10.10. Summary and evaluation of points IIIA 9 and IIIA 10.1 to 10.40 Predicted distribution and fate in the environment and time courses **IIIA 10.11**

**IIIA 10.11.1** 

## Summary on the fate and behaviour in soil

From the studies on the route of degradation is soil, it can be concluded that provalicarb was thoroughly degraded in soil under aerobic conditions to the final degradation product CO2. Three metabolites were identified in the soil along with the parent compound and ¹⁴CO₂. The major metabolites (> 10% of the applied radioactivity (AR)) were SZX 0722-carboxylic acid (M03) and PMPA (M10). Terephthalic acid (M23) was found as minor metabolite. Unextractable residues reached 29.5 to 33.9% of AR at study end (valime-label, day 21) and up to 27.9% of AR and 30.5% of AR (phenyl label, 20°C, day 100 / day 365, Aprovancarbe was metabolised to the endpoint CO2 via two routes. In one route the breakdown of the malecule started with the cleavage of the amide bond between the L valine and PMPA more thes. This leg to the main metabolite PMPA (MUO). The other route proceeded via oxidation of the mothyl group on the pheny ring to a carboxylic group (SZX 0722-carboxylic acie/M03) and further exidation.

Under anaerobic conditions provatiearb was degraded appreciably in soil and would not be expected to persist in this type of environment. Pprovalicarb degraded to two major degradates. One major degradate, PMP (MLO), formed under aerobic conditions and increased under anaerobic conditions. During the amerobic phase N-aceyl-PMPA (1995) was formed as major metabolite. In addition, SZX 0722-aminoacetonitrile (M30) was formed as more degradate later in the study under anaerobic conditions. Unextractable residues reached 39.8% by the end of the study.

It can be concluded from the starty concerning the motodegradation of iprovalicarb on soil surfaces that photodegradation will not significantly contribute to the degradation of iprovalicarb. A total of five degradation products including CO₂ were detected in the soil extracts. Two of these degradates were identified as SZX 0722-corboxy acid (M03) and PMPA (M10). All individual degradates accounted for less than 5% of the applied radioactivity in the irradiated samples, with CO2 representing 2.8% of AR following the irradiation period. The breakdown of iprovalicarb proceeded oxidation of the 4-methy group to SZX 0722 carboxylic acid, cleavage of the amide bond to PMPA and ring cleavage followed by formation of O2.

The rate of degravation of iprovalicarb in soil has been investigated in laboratory trials, which were run with different soil types ander aerobic conditions at 20°C and with one soil under 10°C. The degradation under maeroble conditions and the soil photodegradation were also estimated based on laboratory rials. Furthermore, 6 field trials were conducted at different sites in northern and southern Europe: To derive kinetic parameters suitable for modelling purpose and environmental risk assessments a kinetic evaluation of these data was performed according to FOCUS kinetics (FOCUS, 2006) for the parent compound the major soil metabolites.

For <u>iprovalicarb</u> the non-normalised  $DT_{50 \text{ mod}}$  for modelling purpose were in the range of 1.99 to 68.56 days and the normalised  $DT_{50 \text{ mod}}$  in the range of 1.77 to 68.56 days (geom. mean 6.78 days). For persistence trigger evaluation (non-normalised) the  $DT_{50 \text{ initial}}$  were in the range of 1.99 to 18,00 days and the  $DT_{90 \text{ initial}}$  in the range of 6.62 to 252.12 days.

For <u>SZX 072-carboxylic acid (M03)</u> the non-normalised  $DT_{50 \text{ mod}}$  for modelling purpose were in the range of 0.56 to 1.852 days and the normalised  $DT_{50 \text{ mod}}$  in the range of 0.45 to 1.85 days (geom. mean 0.97 days). For persistence trigger evaluation (non-normalised) the  $DT_{50 \text{ initial}}$  were in the range of 0.58 to 1.97 days and the  $DT_{90 \text{ initial}}$  in the range of 1.94 to 653 days.

For <u>PMPA (*M10*)</u> the non-normalised  $DT_{50 \text{ mod}}$  for modelling purpose were in the range of 44.28 to 187.33 days and the normalised  $DT_{50 \text{ mod}}$  in the range of 39.39 to 187.4 days (geom, mean \$4.08 days). For persistence trigger evaluation (non-normalised) the  $DT_{50 \text{ min}}$  were in the range of 44.28 to 239.32 days and the  $DT_{90 \text{ initial}}$  in the range of 147.1 to 759 0 days For <u>N-acetyl-PMPA (*M10*)</u> the non-normalised  $DT_{50 \text{ mod}}$  for modelling purpose were in the range of 0.422 to 0.929 days and the normalised  $DT_{50 \text{ mod}}$  if the range of 0.42 to 0.93 days (geom) mean 0.72 days). For persistence trigger evaluation (non-normalised) the DT_{50 minital} were in the range of 9.0 to 22.3 hours (0.4 to 0.9 days) and the  $DT_{90 \text{ initial}}$  in the range of 9.0 to 4.1 hours (1.6 to 3.4 days).

Iprovalicarb did degrade appreciably inder <u>anaerobic</u> conditions in soil and would not be expected to persist in this type of environment. Iprovalicarb did degrade appreciably under <u>anaerobic</u> conditions in soil and would not be expected to persist in this type of environment. To derive kinetic parameters suitable for modelling purpose and environmental risk assessments a kinetic valuation of these data was performed according to FOCUS kinetics (POCUS, 2006). The degradation of iprovalicarb and two major metabolites in anaerobic soil was evaluated assuming different kinetic models. Best fit of the parent for the persistence purpose could be reached using a DFOP model (DT₅₀ initial = 25.4 days). For modelling purpose according to FOCUS kinetics, the degradation of iprovalicarb is well described assuming SFO decay (DT₅₀ noteding = 30.8 days). The metabolites PMPA (*M10*) and N-acetyl-PMPA (*M15*) were fitted together with the parent compound, to describe best its total degradation pathways. PMPA (*M10*) shows very good to reasonable fits, assuming SFO decay (DT₅₀ for persistence endpoints: 43.1 days). N-acetyl-PMPA (*M15*) shows very good to reasonable fits, assuming SFO decay (DT₅₀ for persistence endpoints: 105.7 days).

It can be concluded from the study concerning the <u>photodegradation</u> of iprovalicarb on soil surfaces that photodegradation will not significantly contribute to the degradation of iprovalicarb. The  $DT_{50}$  values in the irradiated and date samples were 62 and 53 days, respectively.

The kinetic evaluation of six field dissipation trials for persistence or trigger purpose according to FOCUS, functice (FOCUS, 2006) resulted in non-normalised half-lives of 3.7 to12.5 days for iprovahearb and 22,2 to 2284 days for the metabolite PMPA (*M10*). The corresponding  $DT_{90}$  values were in the range of 12.8 to 61.7 days and 73.6 to 758.9 days, respectively.

The <u>adsorption</u> constants  $K_d$  for iprovalicarb calculated by means of the Freundlich adsorption isotherm ranged from 0.60 - 4.64 mL/g. The corresponding  $K_{oc}$  were in the range of 44 - 221 mL/g

Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

with an arithmetic mean of 114 mL/g. For the major soil metabolites SZX 0722-carboxylic acid (M03), PMPA (M10) and N-acetyl-PMPA (M15) the K_d values were in the range 0.012 - 0.354 mL/g, 0.67 - 11.09 mL/g and 0.34 - 0.56 mL/g and the corresponding K_{oc} values were in the range of 0.6 - 13.1 mL/g (mean 5.2 mL/g), 117.9 - 574.6 mL/g (mean 290.2 mL/g), and 32.2 - 53.4 mL/g (mean 39.7 mL/g), respectively.

The results of the field dissipation trials show no mobility of the compound when used in the field was observed in any of the trials; neither residues of iprovaliearb nor of PMPA (M10) were detected in soil horizons below 0 - 10 cm.

Based on the results of a lysimeter study it can be concluded with high probability that iprovalicarb and its metabolites will not contaminate deeper soil layers or groundwater at concentrations  $> 0.1 \ \mu g/L.$ 

Summary on the fate and behaviour in water of a In sterile aquatic systems iprovalicarb was stable to <u>Bydrolysis</u>. Under the experimental conditions no formation of hydrolysis products was observed. Considering the bydrolytic stability determined under environmental pH and temperature conditions, it is not expected that by drolytic processes will contribute to the degradation of provalicarb in the environment.

The UV-VIS absorption data in the environmentally relevant pH range showed that iprovalicarb in aqueous solutions does not absorb any light a wavelengths above 281 nm? Therefore no contribution of the direct photodegradation to the overall elimination of iprovalicarts in the aqueous environment is to be expected.

Studies with in four different natural water/sediment systems under aerobic conditions showed that the compound was thoroughly degraded leading to CO2 as the end product of the mineralisation process PMPA (M10) was identified as major metabolite (> 10% of the applied radioactivity) in the water and sediment lavers and N-acetyl-PMPA (M15) as major metabolite in the water layer. SZX \$722-carboxytic acid (MOS) was found in amounts of 5.2% of the applied radioactivity in one entre system and N. acetyl-N-methy-PMPA (M16) was found in very small amounts (< 0,5% of the appoint radioactivity). Ippovalicate was metabolised to the endpoint CO2 via several routes. In one route iprovalicate was degraded via oxidation of the methyl group of the aromatic system yielding the SXX 0722 carboxylic aeid (M03). In the other route the breakdown of the molecule started with cleavage in one of the and bonds which led to the main metabolite PMPA (MIQ). Subsequently PMRA reacted with an activated acidic acid derivative yielding N-acetyl-PMPA (M15). This metabolite was wethyleded in wery small amounts to form N-acetyl-N-methyl-PMPA (M16). Ultimately the break down of iprovalicarb led to total mineralisation of the aromatic nucleus in the form of carbon dioxide.

To derive kineter parameters suitable for modelling purpose and environmental risk assessments a kinetic evaluation of the data from the two water-sediment studies was performed according to FOCUS kinetics (FOCUS 2006) for the parent compound the major metabolites.

For *iprovalicarb* the DisT₅₀ for modelling purpose in the water phase were in the range of 16.65 to 57.28 days (geom. mean 24.61 days) and in the range of 24.20 to 78.99 days (geom. mean 46.78 days) for the sediment phase. In the total system the DegT₅₀ for modelling purpose were in the range of

Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

19.93 to 58.67 days (geom. mean 34.73 days). For persistence trigger evaluation the DisT₅₀ in the water phase were in the range of 14.84 to 57.28 days and in the range of 24.20 to 78.99 days to the sediment phase. In the total system the DegT₅₀ for persistence trigger evaluation were in the range of 19.17 to 58.67 days. The corresponding DisT₉₀ in the water phase were in the range of 58.2 to 190.3 days and in the range of 80.4 to 262.4 days for the sediment phase. In the total system the DegT₉₀ were in the range of 66.9 to 194.9 days. For SZX 0722-carboxylic acid (M03) the DegT₅₀ in the total systems for modelling purpose and trigger evaluation were in the range of 5.64 to 2545 days (geom. mean 1245 days) arith mean 15.89 days). The corresponding DegT₉₀ were in the range of 18.74 to 86.85 days. For PMPA (M10) a DegT₅₀ in the total systems for modelling purpose and trigger evaluation of 66.34 days is considered appropriate. The corresponding DegT₉₀ is 220.4 days. For N-acetyl-PMPA (M15) no reliable and statistically significant degradation parameters could be evaluated. So, for predictive modelling, aconservative default DT₅₀ of 1000 days might be assumed in a total water-sediment system for N-acetyl-PMPA.

# Summary on the fate and behaviour in air

Based on the results concerning vapaur pressure, thenry and constant and volatilisation in a field experiment it can be concluded that significant volatilisation of provaticarb is not to be expected. In addition, estimates of the chemical lifetime in the troposphere resulted in half-lives 1 day. According to these results an accumulation of iprovalicate in the air and a contamination by wet or dry deposition is not to be expected.

# IIIA 10.11.2 Non-target species at fisk and extent of potential exposure

# Terrestrial Vertebrates

The risk assessment showed that all toxicity to exposure ratios (PER) for birds and mammals meet the a-priori acceptability criteria. Thus, an unacceptable risk to birds and mammals from dietary exposure after use of the product as described in this describe is unlikely.

It was also shown that no unacceptable risk to birds and mammals resulted from exposure via drinking water and from secondary poisoning via earth from secondary poisoning via earth worms of the second seco

The risk from metabolites to vertebrates is considered to be low.

# Aquatic Organisms

The TER values for aquatic organisms based on PEC_{sw} and PEC_{sed} values are in correspondence with the trigger values indicating that the use of the product according to the proposed use pattern does not raise any direct concern. No mitigation measures are required.

# Honey Bees

Tier 1 risk assessment showed that the hazard quotients (oral and contact) are below the EU-trigger value. Therefore the use of the product according to the proposed use pattern does not constitute an unacceptable risk towards bees.



Document M-III / Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

# **Terrestrial Non-Target Arthropods**

The risk assessment indicated that no adverse effects on non-target arthropods are to be expected in the in-field and off-field area from the use of the product.

# Earthworms and other soil not-target macro-organisms

As has been demonstrated by acute and chronic studies no unacceptable effects on earthworks are to be expected following the application according to the proposed use pattern.

# Non-target soil micro-organisms

organismonare to be The risk consideration indicates that no adverse effects on spil micro expected following the application according to the proposed use parter

# **Terrestrial Non-Target Plants**

Overall, it can be concluded that terrestrial non-target plants are not at risk when the product is applied at rates recommended according to good agricultural practice No mitigation measures are required.

#### for non-target organi **IIIA 10.11.3** Short and long term isks

Please refer to point 10.112

#### **IIIA 10.11.4** Risk of fish kills and fatalities in large vertebrates

According to the aquatic risk assessment provided under Point 10.2 application of the product according to the proposed ase pattern and recommended mitigation measures will not result in unacceptable adverse effects for fish.

Based on the information presented order Points 10.1 and 10.3 of is most unlikely that unacceptable string predators when the product is used in accordance risks will occur in large vertebrates and with the label recommendation

## Ő Precautions necessary to avoid or minimize contamination IIIA 10.115

No unacceptable risk to non-target organisms is to be expected from the application of the product



Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

# Abbreviations

Abbreviation	8	
Abbreviation	Explanation	Definition
a.s.	Active substance	
a.i.	Active ingredient	
AR	Applied Radioactivity	
AV	Avoidance Factor	
BCF	Bioconcentration factor	
bw	Body weight	
calc.	Calculated	
C.L.	Confidence limit	
d	Day	
DDD	Daily dietary exposure	
DT ₅₀	Half-life of disappearance	Period required for 50 % dissipation
DT ₉₀		Period tequired for 90 % dissignation &
d.wt.s.	Dry weight substrate	
EAC	Ecologically acceptable concentration	
EC ₅₀	Median effective concentration	Offection concentration for 50% of test organisms
ELS	Early life stage in the stage is the stage i	
E _b C ₅₀	EC related to bromass	
E _d C ₅₀	EC related to cell density	
ErC ₅₀	EC related to growth rate	
$E_yC_{50}$	EC related to geld	
ER ₅₀	Mechan effective rate	
f	female O 2	
FIR / bw	Prood Istake Rate N & V	daily food intake per body weight of animal
h	Hour K a X	
ha 📎	Hectare & & & O	
HC ₅	Hazardous concentration 5%	Cohcentration (HCp) derived from a distribution of
		species sensitivities, that indicates that a certain
		below this concentration.
		In the case of $HC_5$ , $p=5\%$ .
HQ	Hazard Querent N N	
LC ₅₀	Lethal concentration, metrian 👾 🦿	Lethal concentration for 50 % of test organisms
LD ₅₀	Lethal dose, metrian	Lethal dose for 50 % of test organisms
LDD,56	Lethal dietaty dose @nedian	Lethal dietary dose for 50 % of test organisms
LLC	Lowest lethal concentration	
LLD	Lowest lethal dose a 2	
LOAEC	Lowest observed adverse effect	
Q	concentration & O	
LOEC	Cówest observer effect concentration	
LOEL	Lowest observed effect level	
LOE	Lowest observed effect rate	
LR58	Lethal rate 50%	
$\log P_{ow}$	N-Octanol/Water partition coefficient	expressed as logarithm to base ten
m	male	
MAF	Multiple application factor	

## Document M-III /Tier 2, Sec. 6, Point 10 - Ecotoxicological Studies of Iprovalicarb + Folpet WG 65.3 (Submission for Annex I renewal)

Abbreviation	Explanation	Definition
met.	metabolite	
NOAEC	No observed adverse effect	
	concentration	S & S
NOEAEC	No observed environmental adverse	
	effect concentration	
NOEC	No observed effect concentration	
NOEL	No observed effect level	
NOER	No observed effect rate	
NOLEC	No observed lethal effect concentration	
PEC	Predicted environmental concentration	
PEC _{GW}	PEC in ground water	
PECi	PEC initial	
PEC _{max}	PEC maximal	Maximal PEC during multiple applications
PEC _{soil}	PEC in soil	
PEC _{sw}	PEC in surface water	
PEC _{twa}	PEC time weighted average of the second	
p.m.	Pure metabolite	
PD	Portion of Diet Q , S O	Proportion of ifferent food types in the diet
PT	Portion of Time	Proportion of diet abtained in treated area
Q _{HC}	Hazard quotient comact 5	Dose/contact LD (dose = field application rate)
Q _{HO}	Hazard quotient gral	Dose Gral LD50 V S
RUD	Residue per Unit Dose	Estimates from literature) of residues in food
		sources, converted to an application rate of 1 kg/ha
SV	Shoricut value w w	
TER	Foxicity exposure ration	
TER _A Ĉ	TER acute	Toxicity exposure ratio for acute exposure
TER _{ST}	TER short term	Toxicity exposure ratio for short-term exposure
TERLT	TER long term &	Toxicity exposure ratio for chronic exposure
TG 🥎	Techinical Grade 🔬 🛇 😽	
TRR	Total Radioactive Residues	
TWA	Time weighted werage	
w	Week v v v v v	
<	less than a grad of a	
< \$	less than or equal to 🖉 🔆 🗸	
> 🖉	greater than	
$\geq$	greater than or equal to	