





OWNERSHIP STATEMENT

This document, the data contained in it and copyright therein are owned by Bayer Agand/or affiliated entities. No part of the document or onv information court is but the bayer Agand/or

Right in this desired in this



Version history

| | Version history | ø° & |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| Date | Data points containing amendments or additions ¹ and brief description | Document identifier and |
| 2021-03-24 | Original MCP as submitted by applicant | M-766069-07-1 |
| 2021-07-05 | Addition of reliability assessments for aquatic organisms | <u>M-766069202-1</u> |
| | and update of aquatic macrophyte endpoint and risk | |
| | assessment. All changes by the applicate have been | |
| | | |
| Tt in much start 141 | | |
| SANCO/10180/ | 2013 Chapter 4 'How to revise are essment Report' \Im | |
| 5/11/00/10100/2 | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | J' J |
| | | |
| | | |
| , A | | |
| ~0 ~ | | ^v |
| , Or | | |
| N. C. | | |
| <u>E</u> S ⁴ | | |
| | | |
| ð | | |
| a. | 8 5 U N N N | |
| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | |
| 4 | | |
| | | |
| , K | JA & JA | |
| ~~~ | | |
| <u></u> | | |
| O ^Y | | |
| | | |
| S S | 1 Op The second se | |
| | J' L' | |
| L. S | "(U" 4, 17 - 43 | |
| í _c ôř | | |
| \bigcirc | | |



Table of Contents

| CP 10 | ECOTOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES ON THE PLANT PROTECTION |
|--------------------------------|--|
| CP 10.1 | Effects on birds and other terrestrial vertebrates |
| CP 10.1.1 | Effects on birds |
| CP 10.1.1.1 | Acute oral toxicity |
| CP 10 1 1 2 | Higher tier data on birds |
| CP 10 1 2 | Effects on terrestrial vertebrates other than birds |
| CP 10 1 2 1 | Acute oral toxicity to mammals $\sqrt{2}$ |
| CP 10 1 2 2 | Higher tier data on mammals A Q a° A b° |
| CP 10 1 3 | Effects on other terrestrial verteleate wildlife (reatiles and amphibians) |
| CP 10.2 | Effects on aquatic organisms (|
| CP 10 2 1 | Acute toxicity to fish acuable invertebrates or affects on a gratic globe and |
| CI 10.2.1 | macronhytes |
| CP 10 2 2 | Additional long term and throng to vicity studies on the adjustic/invertebrates |
| CI 10.2.2 | and sediment dwelling@rganistas |
| CP 10 2 3 | Further testing on agostic organismo |
| CP 10.2.5 | Effects on arthronome |
| CP 10.3 1 | Effects on base 2000 107 |
| CP 10.3.1 | A oute toxicity de boot |
| CP 10.3.1.1 | Acute toxicity to bees 112 |
| CP 10.3.1.1.1 CP 10.2.1.1.2 | Acute oral toxicity to bees? |
| CP 10.3.1.1.2 CP 10.2.1.2 | Acute contract to xully to bees. |
| CP 10.5.1.2 CP 10.2.1.2 | Effected on he with a selected and a there have here life at the selected on 127 |
| CP 10.3.1.3 | Sub Sub a factor of the state o |
| CP 10.3.1.4 | Subsectional effects 7 127 |
| CP 10.3.1.5 | Case ano game rests 2 |
| CP 10.3.1.6 | |
| CP 10.3.2 | Effects on non-target articipods other than beese 140 |
| CP 10.3.2.1 | Standard laboratory testing for non-target arthropods |
| CP 10.3.2 | Extended laboratory testing, aged residue studies with non-target arthropods 154 |
| CP 10.52.3 | Semi-field stories with non-target orthropodsO |
| CP 10.3.2.4 | Field studies with non-target arthropods |
| CP 10.3.2.5 | Other routes of exposure for non-target arthropods |
| CP 10.4 | Effects on nor target soil meso- and macrorauna |
| CP 10.4.1 | Earthwormsc. 157 |
| CP 10.4.1.1 × | Earthwornes sub-lothal offects |
| CP 10.4.1.2 | Earthworms field studies |
| CP 10.4 | Effects on non-starget soil preso- and macrofauna (other than earthworms) 165 |
| CP 10.4.2.1 | Species level testing |
| CP 10.4.2.2 | Higher the testing |
| CP 10.5 | Effects on soil nitrogen transformation |
| CP 10.6 | Effects on terrestrial non-target higher plants |
| CP 10.6.1 | Summary of screening data |
| CP 10.6.2 | Testing on nonstarget plants |
| CP 10.60 | Extended laboratory studies on non-target plants |
| CP 10.6.4 | Send-field and field tests on non-target plants |
| CP210.7 | Effects on other terrestrial organisms (flora and fauna) |
| CP 10.8 | Monitoring data |
| Õ | |



CP 10 ECOTOXICOLOGICAL STUDIES ON THE PLANT PROTECTION **PRODUCT**

Fluopyram was included in Annex I to Council Directive 91/414/EEC in 2013 (Regulation (EU) 802/2013, Entry into Force on August 22, 2013). This Supplementary Dossier Contains only data which were not submitted at the time of the Annex I inclusion of Fluopyram under Council Directive, 91/414/EEC and which were therefore not evaluated during the first EU review. All data which were already submitted by Bayer AG (former Bayer CropScience) for the Annex I inclusion under Council Directive 91/414/EEC are contained in the Draft Assessment Report DAR) and its Addenda and are included in the Baseline Dossier provided by Bayer.

The formulation FLU SC 500 is an SC formulation containing 500 g/kg of Fluopyram. This formulation is registered throughout Europe under trade names such as Luna Privilege. FLU SC 500 was already a representative formulation of Bayer AG for the Annex & inclusion of Fluopy tam under Council Directive 91/414/EEC.

beed for use in the field on apples based on the application FLU SC 500 is an end use product prop pattern shown below.

Use pattern considered in this

| Table 10.1- 1: | Intended applicati | on pattern | | | , y I |
|----------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Crop | Timing of application | A with the second secon | Application interval | Maximum Tabel sate (range) | Maximum application rate, individual treatment (ranges) [kg a.s./ha] Fluopyram |
| Apple | BBCH 71 59 | | | 0.15 | 0.075 |
| | | | | | |



Definition of the residue for risk assessment

The definition of the residue for risk assessment has been derived in the environmental fate chapter (see MCA 7.4.1). For ecotoxicology only soil, surface water and sediment are elevant environmental compartments. The residue definition for risk assessment is therefore given as

Ĉa

| Table 10.1- 2: | Definition | of the residue | for risk | assessment |
|-----------------|------------|----------------|----------|------------|
| 1 able 10.1- 2: | Definition | of the residue | for risk | assessmen |

| Compartment | Residue definition for risk assessment | |
|---------------|--|---|
| Soil | Fluopyram, Fluopyram-7-hydroxy, Trifluoroacetic acid@TFA) | |
| Groundwater | Fluopyram, Fluopyram-7-hydroxy, Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) | |
| Surface water | Fluopyram, Fluopyram-7-hydroxy, Prifluoroacetic acid (TPA) | |
| Sediment | Fluopyram | 0 |
| Air | Fluopyram | |
| | | _ |

EFSA (2019) provided guidance on now to document the results of metabolisin and esidue studies in plants and animals for consideration in the ecotoxicological risk assessment °~

As part of this guidance, a template was provided for a question naire for the use of residue data extracted from Vol. 3 B.7.to support the ecotoxic logical assessment of pesticides.

According to EFSA (2019), the respective RMS may consider this questionnaire as useful in their r. **K** assessments. Ô \bigcirc X

Therefore, the question naire with the information from the relevant stories with fluopyram is provided on the following pages. Ó

| Data Point: O' | KCP Section 10/04 & O O |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Sitle: | Fluepyram: Residue information supporting the ecotoxicological assessment |
| Report No: | ÆnSa-24-6155 O V V A |
| Document No: | <u>M-76@94-04-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed inQ | |
| study: | |
| Deviations from current | Current Suideline: not applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous valuation: | No, Got previously Submitted |
| ^^_ | |
| GLAOfficially | Stot applicable Q 39 |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability Reliability: | Xes V |
| | |



Metabolism in primary crops

Reference material: Test No. 501: Metabolism in Crops (OECD, 2007a)

Question 1: Are the provided metabolism studies in primary crops submitted in the residue section sufficient to depict a metabolic pathway of residues? If yes, which are the crop groups covered by the available metabolism studies?

Is a metabolism study available in a crop that belongs to the same metabolism crop group that GAP(s) under assessment? Please provide an overview of the available information.¹

Applicant response:

The metabolism studies are compliant with the use patterns sought (type of application dose offe, BBCH growth stage, PHI). They are presented in Vol. 3 B.7 of the DAR. No data gas is identified as 3 crop groups are represented (foliar) and the metabolism is similar. A metabolism study (grapes) is available in a crop that belongs to the same metabolism crop group as the GAP(s) onder assessment (grapes and apple).

| Report reference | Author, Year | Crop'~ 0 | Crop | Application | Øluopyram label |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|----------------------|--|
| <u>M-282177-01-1</u> | 2006 | Fruit (19 | Grages | Roliar 2 | [UL)-14C-phenyl] |
| <u>M-282460-01-1</u> | 2006 ~ | | s. | | Q2,6-14 [2,6-14] |
| <u>M-286400-01-1</u> | 2607 | Root cops | ° ⁴ | | [Uto ¹⁴ C-phenyl] |
| <u>M-286531-01-1</u> | 20079 | | | Fonar J | [2,6- ¹⁴ C-pyridyl] |
| <u>M-283161-02-1</u> | | Pulses and | | | [UL-14C-phenyl] |
| <u>M-299067-010</u> | 2908 | | | ^s rollar, | [2,6- ¹⁴ C-pyridyl] |
| <u>M-298790401-1</u> | 2,008 | Espit (F) | Bell . | Drip | [UL- ¹⁴ C-phenyl] |
| <u>M-298741-01-1</u> | 2008 | | pepper | IIIgation | [2,6- ¹⁴ C-pyridyl] |
| <u>M-345948-0</u> | 2009 | Coeal/Gross | Wheat | Seed treatment | [UL- ¹⁴ C-phenyl] & [2,6- ¹⁴ C-pyridyl] |
| <u>M-615284,01-1</u> | | | Dias | Falian | [UL- ¹⁴ C-phenyl] |
| <u>M-615282-01-1</u> * | 2018 | | Kice | Follar | [2,6- ¹⁴ C-pyridyl] |

The following metabolism studies are available for Fluoryram:

UL : uniformly labelled. *For information only, not relevant for the crops during AIR review, will not be detailed further.

Metabolism Fudies have been conducted in three crop groups with foliar applications, namely fruit (F), root (R) and Fulses and oilseed (PO). Since the metabolism is similar in all three crop groups thus all three crop groups are covered. Additional studies are available covering rice, the drip

¹ The metabolism study should be conducted on a crop which belongs to the crop category representative of the GAP/intended use/representative use (e.g., a metabolism on fruit crops should be provided to support the GAP on pome fruit). It is also relevant to highlight that the metabolism study should be compliant with the GAP in terms of type of application (foliar, soil treatment, etc.), location, covering the dose rate of application, BBCH growth stage at application, PHI.



irrigation and seed treatment uses. Apart from the wheat seed treatment study, and the rice study, all of the foliar applied metabolism studies have been previously reviewed at the EU level; the following, conclusion was drawn from these studies:

all of the second secon EFSA Journal 2013;11(4):3052: "After foliar applications, fluopyram constitutes the prajor component of the radioactive residues, accounting for more than 85% TRR in grape, potate leaves and bean leaves, collected 4 to 51 days after the last application. Fluopyram was however observed in lower proportions in potato tubers and bean seeds, representing 5% to 21% TRR. In these matrices





Question 2: Which are the plant metabolites recovered in the study(s) in relative amount and absolute amount (greater than 10 (TRR %) and/or 0.05 mg/kg)² addressing the metabolic pathway of the representative use(s) ³?

Applicant response:

The metabolite pattern can be regarded as similar in all primary crops and under different application techniques (spraying, drip irrigation, seed treatment (see below, question 5)). Parent (see below, question 5)). Parent (see below, question 5)).

The metabolism of fluopyram consists as a first step, of the hydroxylation of the parent compound to the metabolites fluopyram- 7-OH (M08) and fluopyram-8-OH (M18), which undergo further loxose conjugations. Cleavage of the hydroxylated metabolites and subsequent oxidation give two distinct groups of metabolites; those containing the tribuoromethyl-prenyl moiety [fluopyram-benzamade (M25), fluopyram-benzoic acid (M33)] and those containing the pyridyl moiet [fluopyram-DAA (M40), fluopyram-PCA (M43)].

| | Øyerall | Maximum Conc | entration (fotar and drip) 🖉 🦉 |
|---|---------|-----------------------|---|
| Metabolite | WTRR | mg@arent eg/kg | Comment of A |
| | 1.0 | ₩.43 🗸 🔨 | Grape leaves 5 |
| | 0.3 | 0.20 | Grape (Subimer Cut: leaves |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy | 125 | ر 0.60 | Bean foliage |
| AE C656948-7-hydroxy / M08 / 0* | P.I | 0.20 | Bean straw |
| BCS-AA10065 | 3.5 | | Pepper (Mtermediate plant) drip Trrigation |
| | 6,8 ~ | 0.24 2 | Pepper (rest of plant) drip irrigation |
| | 0.8 | 0.36 | Botato Leaves |
| | 0,70 | <u>0</u> .35 🚬 | Grape leaves |
| Fluopyram@-hydroxy-glc | ↓0.2 ° | 0.12 | Grape (Summer Cut: leaves BCH71) |
| AE C656948-/-hydroxy@lc / MQA | 8.9 | 631 | Pepper (rest of plant) drip irrigation |
| | 66 | ≫0.25% Å | Bean foliage |
| | 0.7 3 | 0.1 | Bean straw |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy- | 3.2 | \$ ¹ 22 \$ | Bean foliage |
| AE C656948 - hydroxy-glc MA / MV2 (conjugate of M08) | A.7 6 | 0.900 | Bean straw |
| | 0.8 | -Q.34 | Grape leaves |
| Fluopyram-8-hydrox | | 0.13 | Grape (Summer Cut: leaves BBCH71) |
| AE \$030948-8-nydroxy / 20118 | 0.5 | 0.21 | Bean foliage |
| A A P IT | 0.9% | 0.17 | Bean straw |
| | Ş | | |

² These trigger value of 0.05 mg/kg or 10%TRR of total radioactive residues are only meant as guidance. In some circumstance, generally governed by toxicological concerns, it may be necessary to identify terminal metabolites, which are present at concentrations lower than 0.05 mg/kg or <10%TRR of total radioactive residues (European Commission, 1997). ³ For the ecotox section, a selection of the relevant metabolites should reflect only the representative uses. It is not necessary to cover the residue situation for consumer risk assessment but the expected residue situation in the field for the use(s) under assessment. It is recommend consulting whether metabolism studies were summarized following harmonized templates for further assessment (I.e. EFSA/OECD templates).



| Fluopyram-hydroxy-glyc-gluc AE C656948-hydroxy-glyc-gluc M22 | 10.4 | 0.013 | Dry beans |
|--|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| | 51.6 | 0.04 | Succulent bean |
| Eluonyram hanzamida | 64.0 | 0.08 | Dry bean |
| AE C656948-benzamide | 0.5 | 0.17 | Bean foliage |
| AE F148815 | 0.6 | 0.10 | Bean straw |
| BCS-AA10014 | 10.1 | 0.36 | Pepper (rest of plant) strip in sation |
| M25 | 16.1 | 0.006 | Pepper (fruit) drip itrigation |
| | 0.5 | 0.23 | Portato leaves 0 9 0 |
| Fluopyram-hydroxyethyl-glc AE C656948-hydroxyethyl-glc M35 | 0.2 | 9.06 | Bean foliage |
| Fluopyram-hydroxyethyl-di-glc AE C656948-hydroxyethyl-di-glc M36 | 7.0 | 8016 C | Pepper (rest of plant) drip irrigation |
| Fluopyram-pyridyl-acetic acid | Q9.5 🔊 | 0.05 | Succulent bean 🖉 🔬 🐒 |
| AE C656948-pyridyl-acetic acid PAA / BCS-AA10139 / M40 | 22.6 | | Dry bean of the second se |
| Fluopyram-PAA-glycoside | 38.0 Q | 0.023 | Pesper (froit) dripûrrigatiôn |
| | 31.0 | 0.05 | Succulent bean |
| | 39.5 | 0.10 0 | Dry bean 🧳 🖉 |
| N 4 | Q0.6 S | 0.14 | Bean straw |
| Fluopyram-pyridyl-carboxylic fid | 0.50 | (b)19 · · · · | Bean foliage |
| AE C656948-pyridy garboxylic acid | 43 <i>9</i> .5 🐔 | 0.026 | Pepper (fruit) drip irrigation |
| PCA / AE C657188 M43 | 0.8 ~ | 0.33 | Grape leaves |
| | 0,30 | 0 .21 | Grape (Summer Cut: leaves BBGH71) |
| | 49.8 | 0.000 | Potato tuber |
| | p | | N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N |

Based on the metabolism data and field residue triats, the definitions of residues in plants were established by EESA:

| | Residue definition, | | Reference |
|---------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 4 | Monitoring | fluopyran@paren@nly) | EFSA Scientific |
| Food of plant | | Quopy and thopyram-benzamide (M25) | Report EFSA |
| origin 🖉 | Risk assessment | expressed as Quopyram | Journal 2013:11(4):3052 |
| | | | , ., |
| RMS comment: | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | <i>1</i> 9 | | |



Ouestion 3: Is any translocation of pesticide residues observed in the different parts of the plants? Could it be drawn a general conclusion on translocation of residues based on the available data?

I.e. is there any particular distribution of the residues observed in specific plant tissues (leaves, grains roots, etc)? Is this occurring over time?⁴

Applicant response:

A transport via the xylem moves a chemical into regions with high water bosses, particularly to the older leaves. On the other hand, phloem mobility moves a chemical to sizes of utilization of products

Following application of radiolabelled Fluopyram to grapevine, potatoes, beans, red bell pepper and wheat employing both ¹⁴C-labels, the highest radioactive residue levels (PDD voltage). in leaves and foliage of the treated plants, whereas the fruits (grapes, porato tubers, beans, bell pepper fruits and wheat grain) contain comparable low TRR levels. The major residue component of the TRR is the parent substance Fluopyram. Therefore, high Ruopyram levels were observed in the aves and foliage; low levels were observed in theirs and seeds. This residue pattern shows that Fluopyram is xylem mobile, at least to a vertain extent

However, it should be admitted that nost of the residue of on the leaves after foliar opplication is assumed to consist of immobilized desidue on the plant sufface. This behaviour can be derived from the relative high residue levels in on for age of grapevine, potatoes and beans (for application) compared to the far lower residue levels in foliage of jed bell pepper and wheat (or p application and seed treatment). On the other hand, the Flug yram residues in succeeding crops (uptake via the roots) were higher in foliage than in seeds and roots suggesting a certain xyleor transport (see next question).



⁴ Special attention must be given to compare results at same BBCH/sampling time; particularly, for avoiding erroneous



Metabolism in rotational crops

Reference material: Test No. 502: Metabolism in Rotational Crops (OECD 2007b), Test No. 504: Residues in Rotational Crops (OECD, 2007d)

Question 4: Do results of the rotational crops show any translocation of residues (uptake from soil) from roots to the aerial parts of the plant⁵? If so, which metabolites might be observed as $\sqrt{2}$

Is there any indication of accumulation of residues over time occurring in the rotational crop scenario? If so, in which crop categories (leafy, roots, cereals)/crop parts is the accumulation observed?

Applicant response:

The metabolism of fluopyram (AE C656948) was investigated in rotational crops opring wheat Swiss chard and turnips) following soil application of either [pheayl-UL-¹⁴C] or [pyridyl-2,6-¹⁴Q] radiolabelled active substance. The application rates (534 and 514 g a sona, respectively) were slightly higher than in agricultural practice (2x250 = 500 g a s./ha was the anticipated maximum seasonal application rate).

The plant back intervals were 30, 139 and 280 days for all crops

TRR accumulated at ≥ 0.01 ppm in all rotated erop matrices from all BIs, except wrnip roots from the 280-day PBI. TRR ranged from 0.00 ppm in turnip roots planted 280 days after soil application to 6.156 ppm in mature wheat straw planted 30 days after soil application. TRR generally declined with the later plantback intervals, except in wheat forage which increased at the 109-day PBI, but decreased at the 280-day PBI, to ~2x the mitial value. The TRB values for all RACs are given in the following table (Table B.7.9-1 from DAR).

Table B.7.9-1 : Total Radioactive Residues (RRRs) in the different RACS of the three rotations (expressed as parent compoind equivalents, mg/kg)

| TRR | Û, | | Wheat | , S | à a. | 0 | Swiss | turnip | |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------------|-------|---------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| [mg/kg] | | | forage | hay . | Straw & | Grado | clard | leaves | roots |
| 1 st rotation (30 dat | ŝys) | Ś | 0/100 * | 1.783 | 6.150 | 0 67 | 0.540 | 0.884 | 0.065 |
| 2 nd rotation (12 | days) | 0 | 6785 & | 1.120 | 3 50 | 0.054 | 0.377 | 0.113 | 0.013 |
| 3rd rotation (280 d | lay 🖉 🕺 |) Ča | 0.197 | 1:527 | 1032 C | 0.023 | 0.164 | 0.103 | 0.009 |
| | \$ | Ś | | 0° | | , O | | | |

Excerpt from DAR, Vol 3 B.

"Parent AE C656948 accounted for the Diajor part of the residues in all RACs of all rotations and covered 56 – 84% of the TRR in the RACs of the 1st rotation, 33 – 78% of the TRR in the RACs of the 2nd rotation and 280, 59% of the TRR in the RACs in the 3rd rotation. In general, the levels of the parent comported decreased with subsequent plant-back intervals. AE C656948-7-hydroxy and its various conjugates with glucose, malouic acid (2, somers) and sulphuric acid were important metabolites mainly in Swiss chard, where the AE C656948-7-hydroxy yielded 21% of the TRR in the 1st rotation increasing to about 35% of the TRR in the following rotations. In the other RACs, the amount of AE C656948-7-hydroxy was distinctively lower; <10% TRR, except in wheat hay and straw from the 3rd rotation in which AE C656948-7 bydroxy accounted for 12.3-12.6% TRR. The sulphuric acid conjugate of AE C656948-7-hydroxy, AE C656948-7-OH-SA, was also a prominent metabolite in Swiss chard increasing from 7% of TRR in the 1st rotation to 16% and 12% of the TRR in the 2nd and 3rd rotation, respectively. AE C656948-7-OH-SA was also detected at low levels in turnip leaves (0.7-1.0% TRR; 30- and 39-day PBIs), but not in the other rotated crop RACs.

⁵ It must be noted that this information may not only refer specifically to the succeeding crops/crops growing in rotation; but also, it may be useful to give indications on a possible residue situation for the new emerging plants in the crop area after certain uses. For instance, the data can be used to disregard a possible residue situation to non-target organisms originated due to the consumption of contaminated seedlings /residues in weeds.



AE C656948-8-hydroxy and its conjugate were only of minor importance. Both or at least one of them were detected in all RACs but at very low levels of <2.7% of the TRR in sum. AE C656948-phenolglc was detected in turnip leaves only, where it amounted to 10%, 16% and 10% of the TRRs of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd rotation, respectively. Two label specific metabolites were identified: AE C656948benzamide and AE C656948- benzoic acid. AE C656948-benzoic acid accounted for 0.6-6.9% TRR in wheat forage, hay and grain, and turnip leaves and roots from the 30-day PBI; 0.3-0.4% TRR in wheat forage and hay, and 13.6% TRR in wheat grain from the 139-day PBI; and 13% TRR in wheat forage hay, straw and grain, and turnip leaves and roots, and 11.4% TRR in Swiss chard from the 30-day PBI, 3.2-7.4% TRR in all RACs from the 139-day PBI; and 5.9-8.0% TRR in wheat forage, hay straw and grain, and turnip leaves and turnip leaves from the 280-day PBI.

The metabolism of [phenyl-UL-¹⁴C]AE C656948 in confined rotational crops corresponds very well with the metabolism in confined rotational crops after application of (pyridy 2,6- %C) AE C656948."

| | Overall Maxi | | |
|---|--|------------------|--------------------------|
| Metabolite | * TRR | mg parent eq.(kg | Comment |
| Fluopyram-phenol-glc | ¥10.4 × | 0.0927 8 | Turnip Seaf & |
| AE C656948-phenol-glc / M06 | | S so ao | |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy | 12.6 | 0.193 Q | Wobeat Hay |
| AE C656948-7-hydroxy / M08 🗸 🦓 | 7.4 2 | 0.494 | Wheat Straw |
| BCS-AA10065 | 280 | 0.160 | Swiss chard |
| Fluopyram-7-OH-SA AE C656948-7-OH-SA M10 | \$\$.8 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | 0.058 4 | Source and |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy-glc 🔬 🔗 🛷 | 3.1 ~ ~ | 0.203 | [®] Wheat Straw |
| AE C656948-7-hydroxy gle / M117 (conjugate of M98) | 34 | Q.052 5 5 | Wheat Hay |
| Fluopyram-7-Bydroxysglc-MA | 11,10 | 0.176 | Wheat Hay |
| AE C656948-7-hydroxy-glc-MA/\$412 | 67 | 0448 | Wheat Straw |
| (conjugate of NIO8) | | | |
| AE C656948-8-hydroxy / M4/8 | 1.4 4 | 0.087 | Wheat Straw |
| Fluopyram-benzapide 🔬 🖉 🛫 | 62 | 0095 | Wheat Hay |
| AE C656948-benzamid | 2.8 0 4 | 0.169 | Wheat straw |
| AE F1488120BCS-AA100049 M125 \$ | 1105 0 | 0.06 | Swiss chard |
| | 27 5 | 0.086 | Turnip leaf |
| Fluopyfam-benzoic acity AE Q656948-benzoic acity | 13.6 | 0.007 | Wheat grain |
| | 40) | 0.088 | Wheat Hay |
| Fluopyram-pyrigyl-carboxylic acid | Q16.5 | 0.026 | Wheat forage |
| AE C050948-pyildyladarboxxic actor PCA | 0.9 | 0.060 | Wheat straw |
| | 55.9 | 0.230 | Wheat grain |
| Fluopyam-methyl-sulfoxide AE C636948 methyl sulfoxide AE 3344122 / M450 | 49.0 | 0.035 | Wheat grain |
| | | | |

Apart from parent (main component found), The metabolites (greater than 10 (FRR %) and/or 0.05. mg/kg) are described in the table below:



RMS comment:

Question 5: If the GAP is for a seed treatment or other pre-emergency⁶ treatment, is any information related to the magnitude of residues at early post-emergence (BBCHs 40) for the opp(s) and er assessment?

Applicant response:

Although the soil spray + incorporation use or seed treatment dises are not included among the representative uses sought for the Fluopyram renewal, the seed treatment study is presented here for the sake of completeness.

The metabolism of fluopyram was investigated in wheat after seed treatment with [phenyl-UL-¹⁴C]AE C656948 and [pyridyl-2,6-¹⁴C]AE C656948 formulated as SC 500. Due to the low intended dressing rate of 1 g a.s./dt (decitonne = 100 kg) in agricultural practice, only an overdose experiment has been conducted with a dressing rate of approx. 10g a.s./dt.

Wheat forage and hay were collected as intermediate plant samples and wheat straw and grain were harvested at maturity.

Parent compound was the predominant residue in all plant matrices Hydroxylation of the test item was detected as the main metabolic path, resulting in AE C656948-7-hydroxy and AE C656948-8-hydroxy. Subsequent conjugation of the hydroxylated metabolites with glucose and malonic acid followed. As a consequence, AE C656948-7-hydroxyglc-MA and AE C656948-8-hydroxy-gle MA were detected. Hydrolytic cleavage of the hydroxylated metabolites was Observed, as well. AE C656948-benzamide was identified as direct cleavage product of AE C656948-8-hydroxy Subsequent hydrolysis of the metabolite resulted in AE C656948-benzamide. AE C656948-benzamide was detected as corresponding counterpart to AE C656948-benzamide. AE C656948-benzamide. SE C666948-byridyl-carboxylic acid was further transformed by substitution of the chloring to form AE C656948-methyl-sulfoxide.

Because this is a seed treatment the parent compound fluopyram (AE C656948) is also subjected to metabolic conversion in the soil. Metabolites formed by molecule cleavage may also be related to the degradation of the test tem in the soil. Uptake of these metabolites via the roots could be - at least in part - the reason for their occurrence in the plant matrices.

| | | » O' | ~ |
|---|-------------------|------------------|--|
| 6 A S | Øverall M | aximum Co | reentration (seed treatment) |
| Metabolite | [©] %TRR | ,mg 0 parent⊖ | 7 Comment |
| | | eq. /kg | |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy AE C656948-7-hydroxy / M08 / BCS-AA10065 | ×11.1 4 | \$0,053 | Wheat straw (seed treatment 10X overdose) |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy-glc-MA | \$2.3 × | 0.017 | Wheat forage (seed treatment 10X overdose) |
| AE C656948 Anydroxy-glc-MA / | M5.2 × | 0.073 | Wheat straw (seed treatment 10X overdose) |
| M12 (conjugate of M08) | 110 | 0.034 | Wheat hay (seed treatment 10X overdose) |
| Fluopyrator-benzamide AE Co56948-benzamide AE FQ48815 BCS-A10014/ M25 | 10.4 | 0.01 | Wheat grain (seed treatment 10X overdose) |
| | | | |

⁶ Consideration for the seedling scenario, relevant for bird & mammals and the guttation water scenario for bees might be necessary.



RMS comment:

Magnitude of the residues in supervised residue trial Reference material: Test No. 509: Crop Field Trial (OECO, 2009); Guidelines on comparability. extrapolation, group tolerances and data requirements for setting MROS (European Compassion 2017)

Question 6: From the supervised residue trials of there any indication of a residue decline over time?^{7,8} If so, please indicate the reference to the residue trial and the part of the plants where the decline was observed.

Were the residue determinations performed at 0 days after the last application or at a given time closely to the last application(s)?⁹

Applicant response:

Residue trials were conducted for all representative uses for apples and all present decline data that can be relevant for the ecotoxicology risk assessment. Drese sepervised residue trials are summarised and referenced within Appendic 2 of this document.

Gradual declines in the residue levels of AE C656948 were also detected for apple/pear (fruit) on the 16 trials performed in southern and northern Europe, but in 6 trials an upture was observed at the last sampling. The application was performed 14 days before harvest and samples were taken at the day of application and 7, 14, 21 and 28 after that. Residue levels of the metabolites AE C656948-benzamide, AE C656948, AE C656948-7 hydroxy and AE C656948-methyl-sulfoxide were always below the LOQ (50.01 mg/kg), when analysed. Residue levels of the metabolite AE C656948-pyridyl-acetic and were mostly below the LOQ (50.01 mg/kg), when analysed. Residue levels of the metabolite AE C656948-pyridyl-acetic and were mostly below the LOQ (50.01 mg/kg), when analysed. Residue levels of the metabolite AE C656948-pyridyl-acetic and were mostly below the LOQ (50.01 mg/kg), when analysed. Residue levels of the metabolite AE C656948-pyridyl-acetic and were mostly below the LOQ (50.01 mg/kg), when analysed. Residue levels of the metabolite AE C656948-pyridyl-acetic and were mostly below the LOQ (50.01 mg/kg), when analysed.

Samples of apple/pears were taken after the normal commercial harvest in order to assess the decline of residues after the proposed pre harvest interval (PHI). By the time of the last sampling, the apples/pears had reached BBCH 89 (Fruit tape for consumption; truit have typical taste and firmness).

The residues field fials were performed according to the guidance in place at the time when they started. All of the trial were conducted at rates and timings comparable to the requested GAPs for the fluopyram renewal. The residue data are supported by validated methods of analysis and procedural (concurrent) recovery data the deep-frozen storage stability periods for the samples (from the sum of sampling to residue extraction), were covered by separate storage stability studies.

RMS comment:

⁷ Please report if the residue trials were fully validated in terms of storage stability, GAP compliance, etc.

⁸ It is mensioned in the EU data requirement that when planning residue trials, it shall be borne in mind that information on the residues in ripe or unripe crops may be of interest with respect of the risk assessment in other areas like ecotoxicology and worker safety. Please include this information if available.

⁹ Residue determinations close to the application(s) and/or the last application may provide relevant information for certain non-target taxa that can forage in the crop area at a time close to the application(s).



Ouestion 7: On which crops were field residue trials performed? ¹⁰ Has an extrapolation been suggested and is it considered appropriate?¹¹

Applicant response:

Residues trials have been submitted to support the representative uses on apples. For the purposes of the renewal, no additional uses for extrapolated commodities have been gought. Therefore extrapolation to other crops was not suggested.

RMS comment:

Metabolism studies in animals (livestock, fish) Reference material: Test No. 503: Metabolism in Livestock (OECD 2007c) Residues in Livestock (OECD, 2007e), Test No. 305, Bioacoumulation in Fish (@ECD

Question 8: Is a metabolism study in fish broaccumulation study part of the residue Section? If the fish metabolism study is available, does it indicate an occumulation of residues in fish tissues?¹²

Applicant response:

A fish metabolism study has not been undertaken for Fluopyram. According to the current EU guidance (SANCO/11187/2013 rev. 3) the met folism in fish is not require for the Annex I Renewal because the trigger value of distary burden was not exceeded with the representative uses.

However, a fish boconcentration study is svailable for fluopyram (M-298506-01-1). The bioconcentration potential of fluopyram from the aqueous environment into Gluegill sunfish (*Lepomis* macrochirus) was determined in a continuous flow(through exposure system. The bioconcentration part of the story included a 28-da uptake period and a 14-day depuration period. The fish were dissected into edible and non-edible tissues. $\widehat{}$

The average percent linuds over the entire study period ranged from 8 to 11%, from 5 to 10%, and from 5 to 11% in the whole fish samples in the solvent control, in the low treatment, and high treatment, respectively. The overall mean percent lipid content in samples from aquaria A, B, and C on day 0 and 28 was 7.03%. The kinetic bioconcentration factors based on TRR (BCFTRR,) were 47.6 (edible tissue) and 87.9 (whole fish) for the low treatment (6.0 μ g [pyridyl-2,6-¹⁴C]fluopyram/L) and 359 (edible tissue) and 65.7 (whole fish) for the high treatment (60 µg [pyridyl- $2,6^{-14}C$ -fluopyram/L). Ő

The steady-state BCF for parent fluopyram based on whole fish (wet weight) was calculated to be 18 and the steady-state BCF for parent fluoporam normalized to 6% lipid content was 16.



¹⁰ The minimum number of supervised residue trials considers for MRL setting might not be applicable for the ecotox. We might build a residue dective curve with less than 4 residue data points. For this consideration, please do not disregard the residue data only based on the mamum number of residue trials. If the residue trials are compliant with the GAP table, ecotox experts might use them for further refinements.

¹¹ Écotox confeagues might need advice on questions such as e.g. can residue decline studies in tomato be used to refine the residues catering throughout diet of frugivorous birds when the representative use is on pome trees? And can we use residue data generated in the SEU for refinements in the NEU zone when the representative use is in whole EU?

¹² If we observe any accumulation in tissues, it might help in case that further assessment of bioaccumulation and/or biomagnification (accumulation throughout trophic chain) are necessary.



The parent compound fluopyram accounted for > 97% of the radioactivity in the profiles of all water samples after SPE and concentration. In the samples collected during the later exposure phase of fish, on the metabolite AE C656948-7-hydroxy was detected with ca. 1 - 2% of the TRR. Total radioactive residues (TRR) measured were 0.753 mg/kg in edibles (day 7), 1.533 mg/kg in edibles (day 7), 3.221 mg/kg in viscera (day 7) and 12.597 mg/kg in viscera (day 14).

The metabolic profiles for both time points were similar for edibles and viscera, respectively the edibles the major part of the residue was represented by the parent compound followed by the metabolite fluopyram-7-hydroxy. Samples of viscera exhibited significant higher proportions of conjugates compared to edibles. In viscera, the major compounds were parent compound and fluopyram-7-OH (glucuronic acid conjugate of fluopyram-7-hydroxy). Minor metabolites detected were fluopyram-8-hydroxy (edibles and viscera), fluopyram-8-OH (Glucuronic acid conjugate of fluopyram-8-OH (Glucuronic acid conjugate o

Fluopyram accumulated in bluegill sunfish with a total residue bioconcentration factor of about 65.7 to 87.9 for whole fish (sum of radio labelled compounds, fluopyram parent, metabolites and mineralization products) (see table below).

| | | | | | | C O |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Daviana atau | 6.0 μg [pyr fluopyram/ | dyl-2,6- ¹⁴ C[- L | F IS | 60 µg [pvri fluopyram/ | dyl- 2,6 - ¹⁴ C]@ L | |
| (based on TRR) | Edible | Non- Sedible O tissues | Whole Bish | Edible c | Non- Ô edible & tissue O | Ŵhole ∕fish |
| Kinetic bioconcentration factor (BCF _{TRR}) % | ¢\$7.6 O | 1506.4 | 87.9 | 35.9 | ¥21.6 | 65.7 |
| Time to reach 95 % of steady state [days] | 30. | 8.1 | 04.8 ° | | 4:60 | 7.7 |
| t _(1/2) for clearance | 47.1 5 7.1 | | 3.6 | 4.2 | v ^{1.1} | 1.8 |
| Uptake rate constant (ka) | 4.67 🖌 🐇 | 58.2 | A.Ž.Ž. 🔊 | 5.96 | 78.7 | 25.6 |
| [1/Day] | (≠00.42) 0 ³ | (±Q,0) | $\Psi(\pm 1, 0)$ | a∰ 0.5 <u>7)</u> | (± 3.62) | (± 1.59) |
| Depuration rate Of constant (ka) | 0.098 (± 0.093) | 037 (± 0.16) | 0.200 (\$ 0.08) | 0.17 (±9.06) | 0.65 (± 0.26) | 0.39 (± 0.175) |

Substance uptake and depuration constants and bioconcentration factors

The OriginTM calculated kinetic BCFTRR values for edible parts and whole fish (calculated as the ratio of uptake and depuration rate constant). For espond well with the respective bioconcentration factors (calculated as the ratio of concentration in fish and in water) 48.8 X (edible parts) and 97.2 X (whole fish) for 6.0 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L and of 41.6 X (edible parts) and 79.2 X (whole fish) for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L and of 41.6 X (edible parts) and 79.2 X (whole fish) for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L and of 41.6 X (edible parts) and 79.2 X (whole fish) for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L and of 41.6 X (edible parts) and 79.2 X (whole fish) for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L and of 41.6 X (edible parts) and 79.2 X (whole fish) for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L and of 41.6 X (edible parts) and 79.2 X (whole fish) for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L and of 41.6 X (edible parts) and 79.2 X (whole fish) for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L and of 41.6 X (edible parts) and 79.2 X (whole fish) for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L for 60 µg [pyridy]-2.6 4 C]-fluopyram/L for 60 $^$

These values correspond to the calculated total residue levels of 0.292 mg/kg edible parts and 0.581 mg/kg whole fish for 6.0 μ g [pyrid 1-2,6 C]-fluopyram/L and of 2.49 mg/kg edible parts and 4.75 mg/kg whole fish for 60 μ g [pyrid 1-2,6 C]-fluopyram/L, respectively.

Taking into account that in edible parts of the fish 24.7% of the TRR (sample day 14) were identified as parent compound and in viscer 21.9% of the TRR (sample day 14), the steady-state-BCF for parent (based on whole fish, wet weight) is 18, the steady-state-BCF for parent (normalised to 6% lipid content) is 56.

RMS comment



Question 9: Can the metabolism in animals (mammals/fish/hens) bring any information on accumulation/exposure¹³ to different metabolites in addition to those present in the plants? Is possible to observe an accumulation of residues in fatty tissues/other animal tissues considering all available metabolism studies?

Applicant response:

Based on the livestock metabolism studies, fluopyram was extensively metabolised in animals and the main metabolite was fluopyram-benzamide (M25) (49% to 99% in fat and muscle). Olefins of fluopyram (M02 and M03) were also detected. The livestock metabolism studies were performed at 2 mg/kg bw/d, corresponding to 21N for ruminant and \$3N for poulted with the regresentative uses

However, in the feeding studies, more parent was recovered compared toghe metabolists studies and the only anticipated residues in animal matrices are parent and benzamide M25. No olefing (M-02 and M03) are expected above the LOQ with the representative uses 4

There is no potential for accumulation (goat, hen). This was also the conclosion based of rat (ABME). studies (results of repeated dose study did not show accumulation).

Excerpt from DAR, Vol 3 B.7

"For laying hen and lactating goat, netabolism studies were conducted with sich [pg/idyl-26-14C] or [phenyl UL-14C] labelled fluoporam at nominal rates of 2 rog/kg bw/day. One pretabolism study was conducted with [pyridyl-2₆-¹⁴C], fluopyram in rish [see question &. All Studies were well performed and fulfilled the acceptability criteria of EC/and OECD guidelines. The metabolic pathways of fluopyram in livestock consisted of the following principal metabolic reactions that are also observed in the rat:

- Hydroxylation of the ethylene bridge of the molecule resulting in fluopyram-7- hydroxy, fluopyram-8-hydroxy, and a dinydroxylated compound,
- hydroxylation of the phenyl ring leading to fluopycam-phenol
- conjugation of the hydroxylated metabolities with gluce poinc and
- elimination of water from compounds hydrox vated in the environment bridge leading to fluopyram-Z-olefine and E@lefine (E- and Z-olefine can isomerise into each other),
- molecular cleavage of fluopyram & hydroxy to fluopyram-pyrdyl-hydroxyethyl (pyridyl label spectric) followed by either conjugation with guicurous acid or oxidation to fluopyram-pyridylacetic acid (PAA) A V K, « n
- molecular cleavage of fluop@am-&-frydrox@ to fluopyram-benzamide (phenyl label specific) and formation of fluop oam-benzamide sulfate or floopyram-benzoic acid.

Parent fluopy am is intensionly metabolised in the animal. Main metabolites in the goat and hen were fluopyram-benzamide (M25) and fluopyrang E- and Z-olefins (M02 and M03). In the goat, fluopyrand 7-OH-GA (M09; som of Komers) and Jluopyram-8-OH-GA (M20b; isomer 2) exceed



¹³ If there is information of new metabolites in the excreta, it might be relevant for the environment. Non-target organisms might be exposed to these new metabolites if there is a release in the environment after animal metabolization.



Magnitude of residues in pollen and bee products

Reference material: Technical guidelines for determining the magnitude of pesticide residues in honey and setting Maximum Residue Levels in honey (EC, 2018); Guidance on the risk assessment to plant protection products on bees (Apis mellifera, bombus spp. and solitary bees (EFSA, 2018).

Question 1: Are data on the magnitude of residues on pollen and bee products part of the tesidue section? If so, please indicate which data are available and sampling times?

Applicant response:

Residue trials were conducted aiming to determine the concentration of Fluopyram in honey. Two spray applications of 250 g Fluopyram/ha were performed in a 6-7 day interval onto full flowering *Phacelia tanacetifolia* in tunnels that contained bee colonies. Test area were located in northern and southern European zones. Honey samples were collected 2-10 days after the last application and residue analysis was performed for the amounts of fluopyram (AE 6656948) and its metabolities fluopyram-benzamide (AE F148815, FLU-benzamide), fluopyram-pyrioyl-cadboxylic-acid (AE C657188, FLU-PCA), fluopyram-pyrioyl-acetic-acid (BCS-AA 10139, CLU-PAA) and fluopyram-7-hydroxy.

No residues of fluopyram and its five metabolites (FLU-benzami@, FLU-PCA, FLU-PAA, FEU-7OH and FLU-methylsulfoxide) were found above the 400Q (EQQ = 0.01 me/kg) and any honey samples originating from treated or untreated tunnels. Detailed data on test methodology and indings from these trials are presented in section CA 6 40.1.

Residues of fluopyram and its metabolites fluopyram-pyridylacetic acid (BCS-AA10189) and fluopyram-benzamide (AE F148815) were also analysed in flowers, bee-collected nectar and bee-collected pollen as part of a honey bee semicated trial. The study involved two applications of FLU+TFS SC 500 (250+250) onto the bee-attractive crop *Bracelia tanacetifolio* at rates of 560 mL product/ha (corresponding to 140 g fluopyram/ha per application). The 1st foliar application was performed at BBCH 59-61 and the 2nd at full flowering (BBCH 64-65), while bees were actively foraging on the crop. Monitoring of residues occurred in 3 out of 6 rest item-treated tunnels. Pollen samples were collected from foraging honey bees on the day of the 2nd test item application and the following day Residues of fluopyram in pollen ranged from 3 to 30 mg/kg. Residues of FLU-PAA did not exceed 0.01 mg/kg poller while those of FLU benzamide ranged between <LOQ and 0.017 mg/kg poller (LOQ = 0.01 mg/kg). Detailed information on the methodology of sample collection, residue analysis and the findings of this study are presented in the formulation specific section CP 10.3.1 (see M-425 338-41-1 submitted in D-020806-01).



¹⁴ Residue section may contain information of residues in pollen, leaves and flowers. For residues assessment, data on nectar and pollen would be also useful for deriving a more realistic MRL/PF for nectar/honey and pollen/honey. Specific residue data can be used for refinement of higher tier studies in the risk assessment for bees if considered representative of the situation under assessment.



References

- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2009. Guidance on Risk Assessment for Birds and Maramals on request from EFSA. EFSA Journal 2009;7(12):1438. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2009.1438
- EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2013. EFSA Guidance Document mother than the risk assessment of plant protection products on bees (Apis mellifera, Bombus spp. and solitary bees). EKSA Journal 2013;11(7):3295, 268 pp. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2013.3295
- European Commission, 1997. Appendix A. Metabolism and distribution in plants. 7028/IV/95
- European Commission, 2017. Appendix D. Guidernes on comparability, Strapolation, grou tolerances and data requirements for setting MREs. 7525/VI/95 rev. 10.3
- European Commission, 2018. Technical guidelines for determining the magnitude of pesticide residues in honey and setting Maximum Residue Levels in Joney, SANTE 11956 2016 ov. 9, 14 September 2018.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2007a. Test No., 501: Metabolism in Crops, OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Guemicals, Section 5, OECD Publishing Paris. doi:10.1787/9789264061835-en 🔗
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2907b. Lest No 302 Metabolism in Rotational Crops, OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals, Section DOECD Publishing, Paris. doi:10.1787/978926 061859 en
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2907c, Test No2503: Metabolism in Livestock, OECD Gradelines for the Testing of Chemicals, Section & OECD Publishing, Paris. doi:10.1787/9789264061873 en
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2007d, Test No. 504: Residues in Rotational Grops (Limited Field Studies), OBCD Gondelines for the Testing of Chemicals, Section 5, OFCD Publishing, Parks, https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264003384-en.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2007e, Test No. 505: Residues in Livestock, OECD Guidelines for the Teching of Chemicals, Section 5, OECD Publishing, Paris. doi:101787/9789264061903-en 🖉
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2009. Test No. 509: Crop Field Trial, OECD Quidelines for the Jesting of Chemicals, Section 5, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1707/20785796@
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Do-operation and Development, 2012. Test No. 305: Bioaccumulation in Fish: Acheous and Distary Exposure, OECD Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals, Section & OEO Publishing Paris https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264185296-en.
- OECD₄(Organisation for Feonomic Co-operation and Development), 2013. Guidance document on revidues in livestock In: Series on Pesticides No 73. ENV/JM/MONO(2013)8, 04 September

Page 21 of 211 2021-07-05



Document MCP – Section 10: Ecotoxicological studies Fluopyram SC 500 (500 g/L)

| | | | | | | | | | | ٩ | ~ | Ĵ. | 201 | ¢° |
|-------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Motab | alitas saan in tha | confined | rotationa | l aron stud | N (M 240 | 707 03 1) | Appendix | 1 Of B ² | yer p | 3 2 2 2 2 0 5 | ert d | 20tillit | regine LSD1DC | 3 J.J.Os |
| Pheny | l label - metabolites | comme | 1014110114 | i crop stut | ly (<u>11-2-40</u> | <u>////-03-1</u> | , | - t ^e | 2 * V | | | | -telly | |
| Plot | Crop Part | PBI | DALA | M-04 | 1 | | PI-01 | 1 ¹ / | | AM-06 | 2 <u>2</u> 10 | | Fluopyram | / |
| | | (days) | (days) | %TRR | mg/kg a.s. equivs | Clearkg | %TRR | , mgy kg a.s. | ng/kg | A F | mg@kg a.s. Cequivs | mg/kg | * %TRR | mg/kg |
| | Lettuce | 29 | 83 | - | 6 | - 6 | 81.2 🔊 | 0.82 | 0.407 | | - * | - 0 ³ | 11.1 | 0.112 |
| | Radish Tops | 29 | 74 | - » | - " | O. | £\$.3 | A.381 | 2.170 | AN A | GIL . | <u>- er</u> | 24.5 | 1.644 |
| 20 | Radish Roots | 29 | 71 | - 5 | - 3 | , - G ¹ | 43.2 | 0.062 | 0.031 | - 0 ⁰⁴⁶ | - CIT | - WILL | 47.9 | 0.069 |
| 29 | Wheat Forage | 29 | 68 | 32,3200 | 1.619 | y0.800 | 6.75 | 0.242 | 10255 | DP- | A 0.049 | < 0.051 | 36.6 | 1.812 |
| | Wheat Grain | 29 | 93 | | | | 3.6 | 0.006 | 0.003 | 13.1 20 | 0.021 | 0.022 | 27.3 | 0.043 |
| | Wheat Straw | 29 | 93 G | 13.6000 | 1.84 | 0,990 | 3.4 1005 | 0.401 | 0.22 | 19 | <u>-</u> | - | 23.1 | 3.132 |
| | Lettuce | 133 | 216 | - 65 | 0 | Į 1 | 60.9 | 0.070 | 0.035 | ¢″_g | - | - | 26.6 | 0.031 |
| | Radish Tops | 133 | 196 | - 25 | - <u>a</u> | - E D | 77.3 | 0.186 | 0.092 | - april | - | - | 15.1 | 0.036 |
| 133 | Radish Roots | 133 | 196 | te : | | 1 ⁻ | \$4.9 | JQ.013 | 0.006 | <u>c</u> ż, | - | - | 28.2 | 0.006 |
| 155 | Wheat Forage | 133 | 281 | 28.9 | 0.065 | 0.035 | 5.1 | 0.011 | 0.006 | - | - | - | 23.3 | 0.052 |
| | Wheat Grain | 133 | 335 | 23-3 | 0.004 | 0.003 | 19.00° | 0003 | 0.003 | - | - | - | 7.0 | 0.001 |
| | Wheat Straw | 133 | Q335 | 94.6 m | 0 123 | 0.067 🔬 C | 25.5 | 0.215 | 0.107 | - | - | - | 15.5 | 0.131 |
| | Lettuce | 365 | 421 | - CUbe | | - 25 | 87.0 | 0.5390 | 0.267 | - | - | - | 2.1 | 0.013 |
| | Radish Tops | 365 | 421 | ð. 1 | | | 087.5 | M.755 | 0.869 | - | - | - | 3.8 | 0.076 |
| 365 | Radish Roots | 365 | 421 | - 10" | - 2 | -, 01 | 60.9 | 0.022 | 0.011 | - | - | - | 24.2 | 0.009 |
| 303 | Wheat Forage | 365 | 400 | 159. 5 | 515 | \$276 | Ø.8" | 0.128 | 0.063 | - | - | - | 4.8 | 0.042 |
| | Wheat Grain | 365 | 449 | 24.5 | 0.013 | 0.007 | 17.9 | 0.010 | 0.005 | - | - | - | 7.3 | 0.004 |
| | Wheat Straw | 300 | 449 | 28.0 | 00003 | 0:350 | 5.1 | 0.121 | 0.060 | - | - | - | 7.2 | 0.172 |
| | E ^{ULT} THE | QUENT. | CORAL CORAL | t pe | Prop. | he | | | | | | | | |



Page 22 of 211 <mark>2021-07-05</mark>

Document MCP – Section 10: Ecotoxicological studies Fluopyram SC 500 (500 g/L)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | a D | ġ, | | i me | 。 |
|--------|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>p</u> G | | ~ | 4 | | | <u>9"</u> | All Con |
| Pyridy | l label- met | abolites | | 1 | | | | | | | | | <u>\$</u> | | | J Jb | | <u>~</u> | <u> </u> | 0 |
| | | PRI | DALA | M-08 | | | M-05 | | | M-02 | | Barl | M-09 | ~ | jP ^{er} | M-06 | , t ^j O | r dj | Dłuopyra | m |
| Plot | Crop Part | (days) | (days) | %TRR | mg/kg a.s. equiv | mg/k g | %TRR | mg/kg a.s. equivs | mg/k g | %TRR | mgrkg a.S. equivs | mg∕k. € | %TRR | msekg ≥ a.s. equiys© | mg/k | %B | , mg/kg a.s. eqn w | ang/k g | E TKR | mg/k g |
| | Lettuce | 29 | 83 | - | - | - | 13.0 | 0.039 | 0.026 | 17 <u>4</u> | 0.053 | 0.031 | C3.3 | 0.016 | 0.008 | | - | . O ^{ID} | 35.8~ | 0.108 |
| | Radish Tops | 29 | 71 | - | - | - | 3.3 | 0.069 | 0.040 | 10.4 | 0.217 | 0,128 | 4.8 0 | 0.100 | 0.052 | dl. | - 6 | (| 5. 31.1 | 1.072 |
| | Radish Roots | 29 | 71 | - | - | - | 9.6 | 0.01 | 0.007 | 33.5 | 0.024 | 0.023 | r0* - | A. | | - ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | <u>}</u> | DDC. | 41.1 | 0.048 |
| 29 | Wheat Forage | 29 | 68 | - | - | - | 3.8 | 0.163 | 0 1098 | 43.0 | 1.844 | 1.087 | 1-350 | |)' '(| 1.4 | 8050 | 0.063 | 33.7 | 1.445 |
| | Wheat Grain | 29 | 93 | - | - | - | €13.1 | 0.34P | 0 225 | 69.6 | B809 | 1.00 | - ³ | <u>)</u> | 1. C. C. L. L. | | - | <u>_</u> | 1.8 | 0.046 |
| | Wheat Straw | 29 | 93 | - | - | J.C.C.L. | 7.7 8 | 0.544 | 0 359 | ATO C | 0.494 | 0.291 | P ^T | ð0 ^{0°°} | - 700 | | Q _{Ae} | - | 34.9 | 2.462 |
| | Lettuce | 133 | 217 | - | -200 | - 1 | Or í | O'LL | | - <u>2</u> 0 | , y | - ** | - 🔬 🛱 | - ð | ,0° | -j" | - | - | 79.9 | 0.027 |
| | Radish Tops | 133 | 197 | 6 | - , | ano. | - 5 | - * | Ω ^e | JAC | - 101 | - × | CLL - | <u>-</u> 9 | - 05 | - | - | - | 72.2 | 0.171 |
| | Radish Roots | 133 | 197 | I. R. Pr. | - | - - | 2.9 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 9.6 0 | 0.002 | Q)02 | 19.1 ^{°CD} | 0.005 | 0.003 | - | - | - | 54.9 | 0.014 |
| 133 | Wheat Forage | 133 | 282 | - | - 1 | 2 ^C | M.C.S | 0.064 | 0.042 | (\$.4 | -0.008 | 0.005 | ⁰ 10.5 | 3 9.016 | 0.008 | - | - | - | 26.2 | 0.041 |
| | Wheat Grain | 133 | 336 | - @ | BULLE | - 2 [°] | 66.6 1 | 0.064 | 0042 | 10,200 | 0.010 | 0.006 | ne | | | - | - | - | 3.2 | 0.003 |
| | Wheat Straw | 133 | 336 | 99 [©] | 0.030 | 0.019 | Ø£ . | 6064 | 0.085 | 21 | ≥0.007 | 2 0.60 4 | 21.5 | 0.075 | 0.039 | - | - | - | 25.7 | 0.089 |
| | Lettuce | 365 | 421 | » 9.0 | 0.005 | 0003 | 7.8 | 0.005 | \$ Ø.003 | E ^{11.8} | 0.00 | ³ 0.004 | 3.7 | 0.002 | 0.001 | - | - | - | 41.5 | 0.024 |
| | Radish Tops | 365 | 421 | - | _ O | | 8.1 | 0.022 | 0.015 ^C | 27.1 « | 0.114 | 0.067 | 6.0 | 0.025 | 0.013 | - | - | - | 25.2 | 0.106 |
| | Radish Roots | 365 | 421 | 9.5 8 | 0.003 | 0.002 | 5.35 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 010:0 | 0.003 | 0.002 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 55.8 | 0.018 |
| 365 | Wheat Forage | 365 | 410 | 6.3 | Stats | 0.009 | 18.3 | 0.045 | C COST | 8 2 | 0.020 | 0.012 | 9.9 | 0.024 | 0.012 | - | - | - | 27.8 | 0.068 |
| | Wheat Grain | 365 | | 1 I C | - , (| | ~Q.9 | 0 NG ¹ | 0.077 | 14.2 | 0.025 | 0.015 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.9 | 0.005 |
| | Wheat Straw | CALL . | 449 | 4.8 | 0.048 | 3 0 .028 | 14.20 | 0.143 | 0.094 | 41 | 0.042 | 0.025 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 27.5 | 0.277 |
| | E. C | , OTABE | 97 07 | | 10 ⁷¹ t | Þ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



Appendix 2

| | | Appendix 2 | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------------|---|-----|
| Summary of the re | esidue decline trials | for fluonyram tre | ated annl | es/nears | | "0" |
| Report No. | Application | Portion analysed | PHI | Res | sidues ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ |] |
| (Document No.) | | | (days) | <u> </u> | g/kg) × × × | Ĉ. |
| Trial No. | | ČA | | A\$\$.C656948 | AE C656948- | |
| Papart No. | 0.02 tra a a /ba*m | Ernit V | 0 | 0.0578 | beinzamide | |
| $RA_{-} E19RP062$ | 14 days before | Fruit of | | 0.0378 | | Ő |
| $(M_{-}757113_{-}01_{-}1)$ | harvest | Fruit | 14 | | $Q_{a,0} = Q_{a,0}$ | × |
| Trial No | nurvest | Fruit | 21 | © 0.0284 | ~ <0.01 L | 1 |
| E19RP062-01 | | Equit | 28 | 0.0223 | O \$0.01 | |
| Report No | 0.03 kg a.s./ha*m | ر Fruit 🔊 ° | ~~00 « | 9. @ #35 | ~~<0.01 | |
| RA- E19RP062 | 14 days before | Fruit | K) 7 ky | 0.0341 | <0.01 | |
| (<u>M-757113-01-1</u>) | harvest | Fruit | 140 | ~0.0279 ^{°0°} | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | |
| Trial No | | krtist | 218/ | | | |
| E19KP062-02 | 0.02 kg a /ha*m | S Fruit | | <u> </u> | <0.01 | _ |
| RA- F19RP062 | 14 days before | Fruit | | 20,0081 | | |
| (M-757113-01-1) | harvest | Frank | | | Q .01 | |
| Trial No | | Fruit | 21 | 0.0032 | 0.01 | |
| E19RP062-03 | | Pruit P | <u>م</u> 28 ک | 29 252 | <0.01 | |
| Report No | 0.03 kg a sha*m | Fruit | | 0.0647 | <0.01 | |
| RA- E19RP062 | 14 days before | Fruit ' | Z | 0.0577 | ♥ <0.01 | |
| (<u>M-757113-01-1</u>) | harvest | S Fornt O | 14 | 0:0442 | < 0.01 | |
| Trial No | N A C | Fruit | | × 40033/ × | <0.01 | |
| E19KP002-04 Report No | \$0.03 kg \$2 ha*m? | Erutty Sa | $\frac{v}{0}$ | 10.03232 V | <0.01 | |
| RA- E19RP083 | 14 days before | C Fight | p. | 0.0937 | <0.01 | |
| (M-755638-01-1) | Aharvest () | Fruit 2 | ©14 ¢ | 0,0462 | < 0.01 | |
| Trial No 🔊 | | Fruit | S 21 🏹 | .0402 | < 0.01 | |
| E19RP083-01 | | Fruit | 280 | ≪J ^v 0.0298 | < 0.01 | |
| Report No | ©0.03 k@a.s./ha*m | Frant O | | © 0.104 | < 0.01 | |
| RA- E19RP083 | 0° 14 days betore | Aruit of | | | <0.01 | |
| $(\frac{M-/55658^{\circ}01-1}{Triel Mo})$ | arvesu o | Fruit | $2 14 0^{\circ}$ | 0.0738 | < 0.01 | |
| F198-P083-02 | . U . B [~] | Frunks W | ~2Q` | 0.0019 | <0.01 | |
| Report No 👒 | 0.03 kg a.s./ba*m | O Fruit & | AŬ. | 0.173 | <0.01 | _ |
| RA- E19RP083 🔊 | 14 days botore | 🗡 " 🖉 Fruit 🔍 🦨 | 7 | 0.0932 | < 0.01 | |
| (<u>M-755638-01-1</u>) | harvest o | 🔊 Fruit 🖉 | 14 | 0.0875 | < 0.01 | |
| Trial No 🖉 | O S SO | , O″Ęr @t ″ ⊘″ | 21 | 0.0515 | < 0.01 | |
| E19RP083 03 | | Filit S | 28 | 0.0593 | <0.01 | - |
| Report No | 0.090kg a.s.(ba*m | Fruit O | 0 7 | 0.200 | <0.01 | |
| $(M_{-}75638_{-}01_{-}1)$ | sid days before | Fruit | 1/ | 0.121 | < 0.01 | |
| (<u>M-75058-01-1</u>) | | S I last | 21 | 0.0822 | <0.01 | |
| 4519RP083-04 | | o vruit | 28 | 0.0546 | < 0.01 | |
| Report No 🔬 | 0.09 kg a Sha*m | Fruit | 0 | 0.104 | < 0.01 | |
| RA- Ê19RP10 | 14 days before | É Fruit | 7 | 0.0635 | < 0.01 | |
| (<u>M-757080-04</u>) | A harvest 🗸 | 🖉 🖉 Fruit | 14 | 0.0392 | < 0.01 | |
| Trial No | | Fruit | 21 | 0.0264 | < 0.01 | |
| EI9KPf95-01 | | Fruit | 28 | 0.0492 | < 0.01 | - |
| | 0.05 Kg 0.8./na*m | Fruit | 0 7 | 0.0624 | <0.01 | |
| (M& 5708001-1) | harvest | Fruit | 14 | 0.0258 | <0.01 | |
| Trial So | 2 Anni Vest | Fruit | 21 | 0.0264 | < 0.01 | |
| E19RP+05-02 | ~~ | Fruit | 28 | 0.0230 | < 0.01 | |
| | • | • | | • | • | - |

 \cup



| Report No. | Application | Portion analysed | PHI | Res | sidues |
|--|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--|
| (Document No.) | | | (days) | (m) | g/kg) |
| Trial No. | | | | AE C656948 | AE C656948 |
| Report No | 0.03 kg a.s./ha*m | Fruit | 0 | 0.173 | <0.005 |
| RA- E19RP105 | 14 days before | Fruit | 7 | 0.110 | <0.01 |
| (<u>M-757080-01-1</u>) | harvest | Fruit | 14 | 0.0988 | ₹0.01 |
| Trial No | | Fruit | 21 | 0,0804 | |
| E19RP105-03 | 0.02 1-2 2 2 /h 2**** | Fruit | 28 | 0.0870 | |
| RA- F19RP105 | 14 days before | Fruit Arr | , 0, 7 | 0.0798 | |
| (M-757080-01-1) | harvest | Fruit | 14 | Q 0.0306 Ø | ×0.01 |
| Trial No | | Fruit 🧳 | 21 | 0.0254 | ~Q~<0.00~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ |
| E19RP105-04 | | Fruit | 28 Q | 0.0236 | <0.01 |
| Report No | 0.03 kg a.s./ha*m | Faite | | | |
| $(M_{-}757080_{-}01_{-}1)$ | 14 days before | Fruit $\&$ | 211 × | y 0,231 | |
| (<u>INI-757080-01-1</u>) Trial No | narvest | O Fruit | 21 | ~00.0617 | √ <0.01 √ <0.01 |
| E19RP106-01 | | A Frank | 2® | © 0.0672 | O ^Y 40:0 1 √ |
| Report No | 0.03 kg a.s./ha*m | Provit N | ~ ⁰ | A0∂¥7 | ©0.01 |
| RA- E19RP106 | 14 days before | Fruit V | ~7. ô | 0,252 | ≪ <0.01 [°] |
| (M-/5/080-01-1) Trial No | harvest | Fruit C | | 0.205 | |
| E19RP106-02 | A . | © Fright | 38 | 0.105 | x ≤0.01 |
| Report No | 0.03 kg a.s./ha m | b Øruit O | | | ∞√<0.01 |
| RA- Ê19RP106 | 14 days b@fore 🔍 🐇 | ÖFruit S | Ũ 7 Ô | 0 .0984 | <u>الارمى</u> <0.01 |
| (<u>M-757080-01-1</u>) | harvest | Fruit | / 14 ⊘ ∛ | 0.0752 | ◎″ <0.01 |
| Trial No E10PD106_02 | | C' Fruit O | 2¥ 29 ≈ | ~ 0.0399 | <0.01 |
| Report No | 0 0 Xkg a su/ha*m | Fruit | $\overset{20}{\otimes}$ | × 000412 × × | <0.01 |
| RA- E19RP106 | 14 days before Ø | O Fruit . | 7% | 0.1200 | <0.01 |
| (<u>M-757080-01-1</u>) | A hatovest | , Fron V | 1¢ | 0.0751 | < 0.01 |
| Trial No | | Fruit S | \mathbb{Q}^{21} | 0.0133 | < 0.01 |
| E19RP106-04 | | Fruit, Y | | 0.01 | <0.01 |
| ~O~ | | | . S ^Q | stor " | |
| O, | | | Õ , | Ø | |
| , Q | | Y S'A Or | o õ | J | |
| × C ⁴ | | | × × | | |
| | | | ۶ ۲ | | |
| | 9' 4' <u>5</u> 7 7 | | | | |
| Č. | | |)) | | |
| <i>Q</i> ₁ | | Ô.Ô Ô | , | | |
| ~Ç | | | | | |
| A | ° S' A | X 6 . 0 | | | |
| Q" | | | | | |
| , ~~ · | | \$~~\$' | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | × O. | | | |
| L | | -Q [*] | | | |
| | | Ø | | | |
| | | <u> </u> | | | |
| | | | | | |
| S & | à s | | | | |
| S N i | F N | | | | |
| | L' | | | | |
| Č ^O | | | | | |
| - | | | | | |



Assessment of other residue studies of potential relevance for birds and wild mammals

In MCA section 8.9, studies are submitted and summarised which provide information on residue decline in matrices relevant for bird and mammal risk assessment:

- **Residue decline in arthropods: 5 experimental studies** and 2 kinetic evaluation reports providing 12 DT₅₀ values for foliage dwelling arthropods (3 DT₅₀s in vines, 3 DT₅₀s in OSR and 6 DT₅₀s in apple orchards), 9 DT₅₀ values for flying insects (3 DT₅₀s in vines, FDT₅₀ in OSR and 5 DT₅₀s in apple) and ground dwelling arthropods (1 DT₅₀ extended lab, 6 DT₆₅ in apple). Ø
- **Residue decline in foliage: 143 trials** and 6 kinetic evaluation reports providing D_{50} values for various types of vegetables (surrogates for pon-grass weeds: 118 DT₅₀s) and young cereals (surrogates for grass and cereals: 25 DT₅₀s). Due to the size of the kinetic svaluation reports, these DT₅₀s are reported in 4 reports for the vegetables and 2 reports for the coreals. \sim

The arthropod residue studies in this evaluation were especially conducted for the purpose to inform the bird and mammal risk assessment. Ø

The plant residue trials for this evaluation have been compiled from all potentially relevant residue decline trials conducted with fluopyram in the EU (e.g., irrespective of the applied formplated product).

However, only trials were selected where the sampled matrix corresponds with the EFSA bird and mammal food categories "grass & cereals" and non-grass words", and where the type of plant matrix and growth stage matched those behind the RUDs for these matrices in the EFSAGED 2009 App. F (e.g., cereals only up to BBCH 30 at application m

It should be noted that the data set of shrrogates for non-grass weeds also includes onions and leek, which are monocots. However, onion and leek are not grosses (do not belong to the botanical order Poales which includes both grasses and cereals), and were conducted under conditions more similar to the other vegetables for these reasons it is proposed to include onions and leek with the other vegetables into the group of sprroga@s for non-grass weeds. S

In the summaries for these studies, an attempt is wade to visualize and assess the influence of rainfall on the residue time ourse according to the recommendations of EFSA 2019. For that purpose, the DT₅₀ , Ç values from the trials have been assigned to 3 categories:

Category 1: no discernable in Maence of presipitation

Category 2: influence possible /

Category 3: marked influence

Influence of rainfall on arthropod residue decline

1

The evaluation of the arthropod residue decline trials demonstrated that rainfall occurred in the majority of trials. Thus, rainfall (and/or insignation) is a prical element for exposure assessment in realistic bird and wild mammakscenarios under EFSA GD 2009. However, there was hardly any discernible impact of rainfall on the insect residue decone, so that nearly all trials can be assigned to rainfall category 1. The difference between the geomean $D\mathfrak{D}_{50}$ for category 1 trials and for both category 1 & 2 trials is negligible $\langle \xi \rangle$ 5%. Therefore, it is proposed to pool all trials per foliage dwelling arthropods (n= 12), flying insects ($n^{(2)}$ 9) or groun Odwelling arthropods (n= 7), respectively.

DT30 of floopyram in arthropods

The geometric mean DT_{50} for foliage dwellers is 3.10 days (n= 12), for flying insects it is 3.03 days (n= 9) and for ground dwellers it is 6.39 days (n= 7).



| Group | Crop | Zone | Kinetic | DT50 | Cat | Rainfall | Source |
|--------------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Plot | | | model | | | | DT |
| Edition no. | | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| Ground dweller | Bare | na | HS slow | 5.58 | 1 | none | |
| Extended lab | soil | | phase | | | | <u>545010-</u> |
| <u>M-545010-02-1</u> | . | | 2016 | | | | |
| Foliage dweller | Vines | Ν | FOMC | 5.94 ^{a)} | | No discernible influence of | EnSa- |
| plot l | | | $DT_{90}/3.32$ | | | rainfall op residue time course | [¥5-093 4 , [∞]] |
| <u>M-453376-01-2</u> | | | 97.0 | d | | | |
| Foliage dweller | Vines | Ν | SFO | 5.57 | * 1 | No discernible influence of Q | Enga- |
| plot 2 | | | | Ä | | raintall on residue tume course | 19-0934 |
| <u>M-453376-01-2</u> | Vince | NT | FOMO | - 297 | 2 | | |
| Foliage dweller | vines | IN | FUMC | 2.37 |]₀∠ 2) ¢ | orequent early minimized without | EnSav 15 0024 |
| piol 5 | | | D190/3.32 |) [*] _@` | | reconsistent correlation with the | 15-0934 |
| <u>M-453376-01-2</u> | Vinag | N | SEO 🗳 | - 97 | | Nationarith to in Street of Street | |
| Flying insects | vines | IN | SFO | 2,32 | | No ² discernible instruence of | EnSa- |
| M 452276 01 2 | | | an s | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | annau on residue time course | 13-09-34 |
| Fluing insects | Vince | N | | 1 0.5W | | Nedimorrillo interno de | EnSo |
| nlot 2 | vines | IN | | | N. | rainfall ar resident time any | 15_0934 |
| M 453376 01 2 | | d | | a ? | × . | | 13-0934 |
| Flying insects | Vines | N Ø | | 0 2 20 A | | Eracoant apper rainter witkout | EnSo |
| riying insects | VIIICS | | | 3.39% | -4 | application with the | 15 0034 |
| M 453376 01 2 | | N | D190/ 3.5 | Ly . | and a start | residuation course | 13-0934 |
| Foliage dweller | Oilcoat | N (| SECO | 00 685 r | 1 | No discornition influence of | EnSo |
| nlot 1 | rane | TA. | | | | raightall on residue tone course | 16-0035 |
| $M_{-}544190_{-}01_{-}1$ | Tape | S ⁴ | 19 O | <u> </u> | | | 10-0055 |
| Foliage dweller | Officeed | N 2 | Sus @ | 40078 | \$ Y | No discernible influence of | EnSa- |
| nlot 2 | Agine | | | | | rainfall on readue time course | 16-0035 |
| M-544190-01-1 (| | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | Ì | | 10 0055 |
| Foliage dweller | Oilseed | ĸ | OS & | 1.594 | ð | No discernible influence of | EnSa- |
| plot 3 | rape | ĸĭ " | $DT_{00}/3.32$ | | Ş | rainfall on residue time course | 16-0035 |
| M-544190-01-1 | | s. | | \$~ "(| , C | | |
| Flying insects | Oilseed | NS | SEO . | 2.15 | 1 | Verv little rain | EnSa- |
| plots 1+2+3 | rape | | | | | | 16-0035 |
| M-544190-01-1 | \$ ' | V s | | | ۲. | | |
| Foliage dweller | Apple 1 | N | SEO « | 4.1 | 10 | No discernible influence of | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 1 | orchard | Ň | | S. | | rainfall on residue time course | 644049- |
| M-644049-00 | õ | | $\sim \sim$ | × • | | | 01-1 |
| Foliage dweller | Apple Ĉ | VN 🔊 | FOM | 2.7 | 1 | No discernible influence of | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 2 | orchærd | , ST | D 0/3.32 | | | rainfall on residue time course | <u>644049-</u> |
| <u>M-644699-01-1</u> | | ~~~ | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | <u>01-1</u> |
| Foliage dweller | Apple | | ∲FOM © ″ | 53 | 2 | Slight influence of rainfall | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 8 | orchard | | DT998.32 | | | from day 8 | <u>644049-</u> |
| M-644049-01-1 | \$ \$ | L. | O Á | 2 | | - | <u>01-1</u> |
| Flying insects | Apple | Ľ | ÅFÖMC [™] | 2.4 | 1 | No discernible influence of | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 1 | onchard | | DT ₉₀ 8.32 | | | rainfall on residue time course | <u>644049-</u> |
| <u>M-64404901-1</u> | | | ~~ | | | | <u>01-1</u> |
| Flying insects | Apple | NO | SFO | 2.2 | 1 | No discernible influence of | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 🖓 🖉 | orchard | | | | | rainfall on residue time course | <u>644049-</u> |
| <u>M-644049-@-1</u> | Ĩ. | v | | | | | <u>01-1</u> |
| Figing insects | Ăpple ⁴ | Ν | SFO | 1.9 | 1 | No discernible influence of | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 3 O | orchard | | | | | rainfall on residue time course | <u>644049-</u> |
| <u>M-644049-01-1</u> | | | | | | | <u>01-1</u> |
| Ground dweller | Apple | N | Pseudo | 8.3 | 1 | No discernible influence of | EnSa- |
| plot 1 | orchard | | SFO DT ₅₀ | | | rainfall on residue time course | 20-0891 |

Table 10.1- 3:DT50 of fluopyram in arthropods per stratum and rainfall category



| Group | Crop | Zone | Kinetic | DT ₅₀ | Cat | Rainfall | Source |
|----------------------|---------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Plot | Стор | Zone | model | D 1 50 | Cat | Kaiman | DT ₅₀ ° |
| Edition no. | | | mouer | | | | |
| M-644049-01-1 | | | | | | | S S |
| Ground dweller | Apple | Ν | Pseudo | 4.4 | 1 | No discernible influence of | Ensa- |
| plot 2 | orchard | | SFO DT ₅₀ | | | rainfall on residue time course | ~20-089 ⁵ |
| <u>M-644049-01-1</u> | | | | | | | |
| Ground dweller | Apple | Ν | Pseudo | 9.4 | 1 | No discernible influence of O^* | Ensa- |
| plot 3 | orchard | | SFO DT ₅₀ | | ĈĄ | rainfall on tesidue time course | 20-0891 |
| <u>M-644049-01-1</u> | | | | | - T | | |
| Foliage dweller | Apple | S | SFO | 6.1 | 1 | No discornible influence of | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 1 | orchard | | | ¢۵ | 1 | rainfall on residue time course | <u>644048-</u> |
| <u>M-644048-01-1</u> | | | | | | | <u>01-1</u> |
| Foliage dweller | Apple | S | FOMC | 5R\$ | 1 | No discernible influence of | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 2 | orchard | | DT ₉₀ /3.32 « | k, Ò | ° | Fainfall on residue time course | <u>644048-</u> |
| <u>M-644048-01-1</u> | | | C |)″ <u>_</u> @` | | | <u>04-1</u> |
| Foliage dweller | Apple | S | SFO 🔬 | 4.4 | | Nodiscernible influence of | M <u>-</u> 4 |
| plot 3 | orchard | | ×" | | | rainfall on residue time course " | <u>644048-</u> |
| <u>M-644048-01-1</u> | | | ay y | | × 4 | | <u>01 3</u> |
| Flying insects | Apple | S | SFQ | 4.9 👟 | 1,7 | No discernible influence of | M |
| plot 1 | orchard | | 2 8 | | Ś | rainfall on residue time course | <u>©44048-</u> |
| <u>M-644048-01-1</u> | | d | | m ? | > | | <u>01-1</u> |
| Flying insects | Apple | S 🥡 | SFQ | 3.8 | 1 | No discernible influence of | <u>M-</u> |
| plot 3 | orchard | ~9 | °N an | 107 | Š | rainfall on residue time course | <u>644048-</u> |
| <u>M-644048-01-1</u> | | ×Q | K O ^V | - Sy | | | <u>01-1</u> |
| Ground dweller | Apple | ₿S (| Pseudo | ₽!1 | 1 | No discornible influence of | EnSa- |
| plot 1 | orchard | í A. | SFO DT 50 | × . 67 | Ś | rainfall on residue time course | 20-0890 |
| <u>M-644048-01-1</u> | Ś | S, | <u> </u> | Ď | | | |
| Ground dweller | Apple | Š ^{Or} | Pseud | 55 | Ø, | Moderato rainfalls on days 4 | EnSa- |
| plot 2 | @chard | ¢ "Č | SFO DT ₅₀ | , aô | p a | and 5 coincide with a visible | 20-0890 |
| <u>M-644048-01-1</u> | | Ľ, | | t sy' | S. | dropon residures, influence | |
| ^O | | | × | J. | | likely 📎 | |
| Ground dwell | Apple . | S. | ₽seudð | 5 \$\$, | J. | No discornible influence of | EnSa- |
| plot 3 🔊 | orchard | | SFQQT50 🖗 | 57 | ř n | rainfall on residue time course | 20-0890 |
| M-644048-01-1 | | | LO | | | \sim | |

(a it is proposed to use FOMC as the best fit (instead of OFOP as selected in EnSa-15-0934) because the visual fit

rating is identical but the χ^2 -error is lower ^(b): it is proposed to use HS as the loss fit for flying insects on plot 2 (instead of DFOP as selected in EnSa-15-0934) because the visual fit rating is identical but the χ^2 error is lower ^(c): it is proposed to use DFOP is the best fit for flying insects on plot 2 (instead of SFO as selected in EnSa-15-0934) because the visual fit rating is identical but the χ^2 error is lower ^(c): it is proposed to use DFOP is the best fit for flying insects on plot 2 (instead of SFO as selected in EnSa-15-0024).

0934) because the visual fit string is identicable the χ^2 -error is lower (d it is proposed to use the pseudo-SPO DTs of 5.5 days instead of the FOMC DT₉₀/3.32 of 7.9 days as suggested in the original report. Justification both the pseudo-SFO of 5.5 days and the FOMC DT₉₀/3.32 of 7.9 days are used here as surrogate for the real best fit kinetic with the FOMC parameter alpha = 1.6093 and beta = 3.4342 (which is difficult to apply without a suitable calculator like TREC, Ebeling & Hammel 2020). However, the surrogate SFO-DT₅₀ calculated as FOMC DT₆₀/3.32 of 7.9 mays is an overestimation as it results in a 21-d f_{TWA} much larger than the 21d- f_{TWA} calculated with the FOMC parameter alpha and beta. The 21-d f_{TWA} calculation with the pseudo SFO-DT₅₀ of 55th days stull overestimates the 21-d f_{TWA} but is much closer to the best fit 21-d f_{TWA} with the FOMC parameter alpha and beta: R

| Appresch | , Calculated with | Parameter values | Resulting 21-d f _{TWA} |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|--|
| FOMC-DT 3.32 | Surrogate SFO DT ₅₀ | 7.9 days | 0.46 |
| Pseudo SFG-DT50 | Surrogate SFO DT ₅₀ | 5.5 days | 0.35 |
| Best fit parameter | FOMC alpha & beta | 1.0693 & 3.4342 | 0.30 |

Therefore, the pseudo SFO- $DT_{50} = 5.5$ days can be considered as a more accurate kinetic parameter than the FOMC-DT₉₀/3.32 = 7.9 days, which is still conservative compared with the best fit FOMC kinetic.



Ò

O

Ô

Influence of rainfall on foliage residue decline

The evaluation of the foliage residue decline trials demonstrated that rainfall occurred in the majority of trials (in vegetables often supplemented by irrigation). Thus, rainfall (and/or Grigation) is @ typical element for exposure assessment in realistic bird and wild mammal scenario under EFSA GD 2009. The comparison of $DT_{50}s$ for the 3 rainfall categories indicate slower residue dissipation of $ategory 1_{0}$ than in categories 2 or 3, which is not surprising since rainfall may influence residue decline by various mechanisms beside wash-off (e.g., allowing dilution by plant growth, promoting metabolic activity of microflora on leaf surfaces).

| Table 10.1- 4: | Summary of DT508 in | plant foliage | per rainfat | category | and feed | sategory J |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------|-------------|----------|----------|------------|
| | | la | 100 | SK / | | UT Ão |

| Categ | gory 1 | Categ | gory 2 | Ote | gor V3 N N N N A |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| young cereals | non- grass herbs | young cereals | non- grass herbs @ | young % Gereals | onon- grassy hetos |
| 4.60 d | 3.39 d | 3.58 d | 3.22 d6 ♥ | 2.50 đ | 276 d geomean DEs |
| 11 | 34 | 6 | 36 | 80 | 48 number of trials 5 |
| 44% | 29% | 24% | 31% * | 32% | 410% % of trials % |
| | | | S Y | ~~~~ | |

| Table 10.1- 5: | Overview on | foliage | residue | decline D1 | [50 sorted] | per rainf | all inflorence | categories |
|----------------|-------------|---------|---------|------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|------------|
| | | | | | | | | |

2

Ro

 \bigcap

| Trial | Crop | Zone - | Kinetic | DT50 | Cat | Inforence kain and/or | Source |
|----------------------|--------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|----------------------------------|----------|
| Edition no. | Û, | | model | mod | Š | irrigation 🔗 | DT50 |
| R 2006 0655/9 | Beans O | N S | SFQ | ~ 2 ,729.,* | Q1 | bate rain, no influence | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-290825-01-1</u> | | s, | «. ^ | ý Ç | * « | | 8029 |
| R 2006 0722/9 | Beaus | ÔN | OŠFO ⟨⟨ [′] O [®] | 13,88 | 10 | vers little rain, no influence | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-291180-01-1</u> | Or K | | 4 | | S | | 8029 |
| R 2006 0723/7 | Beans | NŚ | SFO | © .636 | 1 | Vate rafo, no influence | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-291</u> | | | ¢, | | Ĵ | | 8029 |
| 08-2096-01 T1 | Beans | ∖S″ - ≼ | SFO | 2.969 | ¢1 | irrigation d5 and d11, no | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-365542-01-1</u> | \$° 4 | S S | ~~ | | Ň. | discernible influence | 8029 |
| R 2006 0378/9 | Beans | S | SFØ .s | 8.872 | 1 | pho rain, no influence | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-290827-01-1</u> | Å. | Ň | ê ô | | ð | | 8029 |
| R 2006 06575 | Beans | S 🛴 | HS N | 0.883 | Å, | no rain, no influence | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-290827-01-1</u> | Ö | ~0" | <u>A</u> | Ğ, | ÿ | | 8029 |
| R 2006 0658/3 | Beans | Sa | SEO X | ≫3.548≪ | 1 | no rain, late irrigation, no | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-290827-01-1</u> | Š, | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | | influence | 8029 |
| R 2007 0550/6 | Beans | S 🔊 🖉 | "SFO@" | 07695 | 1 | no rainfall, no influence | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-297564-01-1</u> | ð | Č, | ~~ | 0 [°] | | | 8030 |
| R 2007 0551/4 | [®] Beans | SÇ . | STO A | ¥8.169 | 1 | no rainfall, no influence | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-297564-01</u> | A`. | | y 'Y | | | | 8030 |
| R 2007 05522 | Beans S | S . | DFO | 11.166 | 1 | nearly no rainfall (1.2mm day | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-297564 01-1</u> | | Š | | | | 7), no influence | 8030 |
| R 2007 0599/9 | Cabbage | Ň | SFO | 1.979 | 1 | marked decline, unlikely to be | EnSa- |
| <u>M-30%101-016</u> | | | | | | influenced by very little early | 20-0832 |
| | Ø X | - | | | | rainfall | |
| R\$006 05\$4/7 | Cabbage | S | FOMC | 3.148 | 1 | Little rainfall until day 14, no | EnSa- |
| <u>M-2931@2-01-1</u> | | | | | | influence discernible | 20-0832 |
| R 2006 0605/2 | Lettuce | Ν | HS | 3.587 | 1 | very little rain, no influence | Ensa-20- |
| <u>M-292048-01-1</u> | | | | | | | 8029 |



| Trial | Crop | Zone | Kinetic | DT ₅₀ | Cat | Influence rain and/or | Source | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|-------------|--|-------------------|--------|
| Edition no. | - | | model | mod | | irrigation | DT50 ° | ~ |
| R 2007 0244/2 M-304280-01-1 | Lettuce | N | SFO | 3.09 | 1 | late rain, no marked influence | Ensa 20- 8030 | |
| R 2007 0540/9 M-304280-01-1 | Lettuce | N | SFO | 1.368 | 1 | late rain, no discernibe | Fasa-20, | |
| 14-2029-02 | Lettuce | N | SFO | 2.892 | 1 | little rainfall, irrigation without | Ensa-20- | ~ |
| <u>M-534202-01-1</u> | | | | | ĈĄ | discernible impact. Influence O | 8031 × | |
| 14-2029-04 M-534202-01-1 | Lettuce | N | SFO | 2.034 | 18 | no rainfall until day 6, without |) Ensa-20- 803 | |
| 111 00 1202 01 1 | | | | a C | | unlikely 0 9 | | × |
| 18-2086-01-T1 M-675005-01-1 | Lettuce | S | SFO | 8.248 | 1 | nearly no rate, no influence | Ensa-20 8029 | r I |
| 18-2086-01-T2 M-675005-01-1 | Lettuce | S | SFO | Ø.754 | ġ° | pearly no rain, no influence | Ensa+20- 8029 | |
| 18-2086-02-T1 M-675005-01-1 | Lettuce | S | SFO | 3.419 | | neady no ram, no influenco | @nsa-26# 8029 | |
| 18-2086-02-T2 M 675005-01-1 | Lettuce | S | SFO | ×4,04 | | spearly no rain, no influence | Ensa-20- | |
| 18-2086-03-T1 M-675005-01-1 | Lettuce | S | SFO o | 4.378 | 1 | nøran, normfluente | Ensa-20- | |
| 18-2086-03-T2 | Lettuce | S @ | SĘÔ | A:339 4 | <u>R</u> | pho rain no influence 0 (| Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-675005-01-1</u> | | ~~ | × ~ | Ô | 4 | | 8029 | |
| 18-2086-04-T1 | Lettuce | Š | SFO O | 1.1&6 | l⊘″ | nearly no roin untit d7, no | Ensa-20- | |
| 18-2086-04-T2 | Lettuce | SA | SFO | ¥.174 @ | 1 | Shearly no rainfuntil da no | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-675005-01-1</u> | ~ | ST. | Q (| P & | | influence 🔬 🚀 | 8029 | |
| R 2006 0376/2 M-292050-01-1 | Letruce | , s , | SFO Ø | 1.50° | | little rain, Date irrigation, no | Ensa-20- 8029 | |
| R 2006 0608/7 | Letture | S | SFŎ ^ | 2.57 | 1 | very lettle rand no influence | Ensa-20- 8029 | |
| R 2006 0610/9 | Lottuce « | JS 🔊 | SFO SFO | 3.529 | A, | late rain, so influence | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-292050-01-1</u> | | <u> </u> | | ð. | 1 1 1 | | 8029 | |
| R 2006 06/1/7 <u>M-292650-01-1</u> | Lettuce | 87 | SPO C | 3.02 | | r late ram, no influence | Ensa-20- 8029 | |
| 14-2030-01 M-534595-01-1 | A Ottuce 4 | Ś | SFOO | 44804 0 | Ø, | Wirtually no rain, no influence | Ensa-20- 8031 | |
| 14-2030-02 M-534595-01 | Lettroe | S ^R . | | 5.522 | 1 | no rain, no influence | Ensa-20- 8031 | |
| 14-2185-02 M-536963-01-1 | Lettuce | S | SFQ | 40578 | <u>à</u> r | virtually no rain, no influence | Ensa-20- 8031 | |
| 14-218503 M-536963-01-1 | Lettuce | SQ ^ | SFO | 4.78 | 1 | no rain until day 9, no influence | Ensa-20- 8031 | |
| R 2007 0568/9 M-302325-01-1 | Onion | S | SFQ | 203 | 1 | No rainfall and no influence from irrigation day 10 | EnSa- 20-0832 | |
| 18-2951-02 M-678413-0 | Young | | SFO Q | 3.214 | 1 | very little rain, no influence | EnSa- 20-0834 | |
| 18-2951-03 M-67841&-01-1 | Young cereals | N & | SFQ | 3.523 | 1 | no rain, no influence | EnSa- 20-0834 | |
| E19RP102-01 | Young | J.S. | SFO | 6.419 | 1 | no rain, no influence | EnSa- 20-0834 | |
| E49RP10202 | Young | N | SFO | 8.185 | 1 | no rain, no influence | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-/38824-01-1</u> 15-2952 01 | Voung | N | SEO | 3 37 | 1 | rain only late no influence | 20-0834 EnSa- | |
| <u>M-566830-01-1</u> | cereals | 14 | 510 | 5.57 | 1 | | 17-0484 | |



| Trial Edition no | Сгор | Zone | Kinetic | DT ₅₀ | Cat | Influence rain and/or | Source | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|----------|------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 15 2052 02 | Voung | N | SEO | 7.50 | 1 | no rain, no influence | EnSco | ð |
| M-566830-01-1 | cereals | IN | 560 | 1.39 | 1 | no ram, no influence | 17,0484 | S |
| 18-2954-03 | Young | S | SFO | 3 607 | 1 | no rain no influence | E208a- 4 | 0 |
| M-675129-02-1 | cereals | 5 | 510 | 5.007 | 1 | | 20-083 | |
| E19RP087-01 | Young | S | SFO | 10.18 | 1 | no rain, no influence | EnSa | 1. |
| M-758649-01-1 | cereals | | | | | | 2000834 | Ô, |
| E19RP087-02 | Young | S | SFO | 1.782 | 1 🕅 | rain d4 and d5 but no | ÉMSa- 🖉 | |
| <u>M-758649-01-1</u> | cereals | | | | - T | discernible fluence 🖉 ୶ | 20-0834 | \$. 2 |
| 15-2952-04 | Young | S | SFO | 4.19 | <u>l</u> | very little rain, no influence 🔊 | EnSa | , 0 [×] |
| <u>M-566830-01-1</u> | cereals | | | 4 | V | | 17-0484 | × |
| 15-2953-03 | Young | S | SFO | 4.64 | 1 | no rain, no italuenço | EnSa- 🖉 | |
| <u>M-566828-01-1</u> | cereals | | | - Rộ | 0 | | 17-04-54 | |
| R 2006 0377/0 | Beans | Ν | SFO | 4.674 | ¢2° | Date rain influence possible 🥎 | Ensa/20- | |
| <u>M-290825-01-1</u> | _ | | ~ ~ ~ | | Ĉ | | <u>80</u> 29 | _ |
| R 2006 0656/7 | Beans | Ν | SFO | 2.84 | 20 | frequent rainfall, slight O | Ø£ńsa-20≁ | |
| <u>M-290825-01-1</u> | D | 27 | | | γ | matluence possible * | 8029 | - |
| R 2007 0546/8 | Beans | Ν | SFO | \$2,969 (| ₽2 _{``} | trequent but little rain onfluence | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-29/562-01-1</u> D 2007 0547/(| Deces | NI | | | | possible | 8030 | |
| K 2007 0547/6 | Beans | N | SFO P | 2.144 | 2% | late infigation and cannial | ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-29/302-01-1</u> D 2007 0549/4 | Doong | N - | | \$20 (| ĝ- | Possibly Signi lanuence | 8030 Emai: 20 | - |
| K 2007 0348/4 M-297562-01-1 | Deans | | °∼ °∼ | 109.039 × | 12 (| 6 nowarked influence | Elisa-20- 8030 | |
| R 2006 03/7/9 | Cabbage | × c | нс 🔊 | 1720 | 20 · V | fromular rainfall but in small | EnSa | - |
| $M_2 2000 034779$ $M_2 292103_01_1$ | Cabbage | | | | 40% | amounts which are unlikely to | 20_0832 | |
| <u>IVI-272105-01-1</u> | | 4 | Ŵ. | S / | | Chave marked winfluesced | 20-0052 | |
| | ×. | | Ô (| 5 8 | | residive levels | | |
| R 2006 0543/9 | Cabbage | N ac | SFO Ø | 5.78 | 2 | Little rainfall until day 8, no | EnSa- | |
| M-292103-01-1 | | . 0 | <u> </u> | | n de la comencia de l | Miluence discernible | 20-0832 | |
| R 2006 0348/7 | Cabbage | S | FOMC & | 3.693 | 2 🐔 | Little@ainfall@ntil day 8, no | EnSa- | 1 |
| <u>M-293182-01</u> | <u></u> | | \$ 1.0 | | | influence discernible | 20-0832 | |
| R 2007 0079/2 | Cabbage | ля " | FOMC | 4.084 | Į, | n@rked deeline until 2nd | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-302044-@1-1</u> | | \$ Q | A | 8 | O' | sampling but little early rain | 20-0832 | |
| | Ő | | | S | ~~ | until day 7 (influence | | |
| K, v | <u> </u> | | | | N) | questionable) | | |
| R 2007 0600/6 | @bbage{ | S 🔊 | SFQO | 3.981 | \$Z/ | Moderate early rainfall but no | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-302044-01-1</u> | à A | Ľ | ×, | | | marked decline (influence | 20-0832 | |
| | | S. | | | - S | ' unlikely) | | _ |
| 10-2099-01 | Eporve | ON » | SFO U | 2.252 | 2.0 | trequent heavy rainfall, | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-423901-0121</u> | ð | ~0 | <u>R</u> | 8 | | influence not discernible but | 8029 | |
| D 2006 604216 | Lasl | N N | | Vo jon . | 2 | likely | EnSc | - |
| K 2006 0943/6 | Leek | _ [₽] ¥∕ | SFU SFU | 8.282% | 2 | net seem to have any | Ensa- | |
| <u>NI-292101-02-1</u> | | ۵ <u>،</u> ۱ | ľ "Q" | | | discernible influence on residue | 20-0852 | |
| ~ | , P | S. | - R | 0× | | dissipation | | |
| R 2006 0466/1 | Leek | A A | SFO Ó | 5 836 | 2 | frequent rainfall after day 7 did | EnSa- | |
| M-292101-02 | | | | , 5.050 | 2 | not seem to have any | 20-0832 | |
| | | x 1 | | | | discernible influence | | |
| R 2006 0468/8 | Leek | N | SFO | 8.99 | 2 | Frequent late rainfall and heavy | EnSa- | 1 |
| M-292 91-02 | 3 0 | | | | | irrigation coincide with a | 20-0832 | |
| | , ⁽ | J ^v | | | | moderate drop of residue levels | | |
| <u></u> | 10 JY | | | | | on day 15 | | |
| R 2006 \$44/4 | Leek | S | SFO | 6.01 | 2 | rainfall on day 6 and 7 may | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-292082-01-1</u> | | | | | | have slightly influenced residue | 20-0832 | |
| | | | | | _ | dissipation | | 4 |
| R 2006 0469/6 | Leek | S | SFO | 7.054 | 2 | frequent irrigation and | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-292082-01-1</u> | | | | 1 | | occasional rainfall may have | 20-0832 | 1 |



| Trial | Crop | Zone | Kinetic | DT ₅₀ | Cat | Influence rain and/or | Source | |
|---------------------------------------|------------|------|--|------------------|--|---|-------------------|--|
| Edition no. | | | model | mod | | irrigation | DT50 ° | <u>s.</u> |
| | | | | | | markedly influenced residue | . 4 | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ |
| | | | | | | dissipation, although this is not | S I | 0 ⁷ |
| D 2006 0604/4 | T |) T | (TEO) | 1 400 | 2 | discernible in the dechne pattern | | |
| R 2006 0604/4 M-292048-01-1 | Lettuce | N | SFO | 1.409 | 2 | at most slight influence | \$2029 8029 | |
| R 2006 0606/0 | Lettuce | Ν | SFO | 2.452 | 2 | some rain after and sampling \bigcirc | Enosa-20- | Q. |
| <u>M-292048-01-1</u> | | | | | Ĉŝ | but no visible influence | 80029 🔊 | |
| R 2007 0011/3 | Lettuce | Ν | SFO | 1.048 | 27 | little rain during first days | DEnsa-20- | Ś |
| <u>M-304280-01-1</u> | _ | | | | L. | influencopossible | 8030 | 0 |
| R 2007 0537/9 | Lettuce | Ν | FOMC | 1.949 | 92 | Little but early rain, utiluence | Easa-20- | У Г |
| <u>M-304280-01-1</u> D 2007 0520/5 | Latterna | N | / DFOP | 2.000 | 2 | Volume Variatell Variation | <u>8030 y</u> | |
| K 2007 0539/5 M-304280-01-1 | Lettuce | IN | SFU | 2.1%2/9 | 2 | decompile | *Ensa 20- | |
| 14-2029-01 | Lettuce | N | SEO | 0 2021 | | frequent irrightion and tainfall | Binsa_20_ | |
| M-534202-01-1 | Lettuce | 11 | 510 | | | Slight influence possible | $\frac{1}{2031}$ | |
| 14-2029-03 | Lettuce | Ν | SFO | 1.682 | 27 | little rainfall until day 6 (8 mm). | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-534202-01-1</u> | | | a la | | Ø. | Slight influence possible. | 803 | |
| 14-2029-05 | Lettuce | Ν | SQO 6 | M.8 🚕 | 2 | several rainfalls without | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-534202-01-1</u> | | 6 | ζ $\hat{\varphi}$ | | Ś | discernible impact Slight & | \$8 031 | |
| | | Ą | i în | - Ch | ð | influence cannot be excluded | | |
| 14-2184-02 | Lettuce | N | SEO | A :71 4 | 2 | grainfall coincides with light | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-536965-01-1</u> | | ŝ, | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | , [.] 0 | ~ | dropor residue levels. Influence | 8031 | |
| 14 2184 02 | I attuaa | | SEON | 2866 | | possible. | Emap 20 | |
| 14-2184-05 M 536965-01-1 | | | ъгぬ⊚ | 4900 | <u>,</u> | Aron of residve levels Opfluence | Elisa-20- 8031 | |
| <u>IVI-550905-01-1</u> | ×., | A A | 6 | \sim | | possible | 8031 | |
| R 2006 0609/5 | Lettuce | S a | SFO @ | 0.844 | 25 | little rain during first days, but | Ensa-20- | |
| M-292050-01-1 | S S | . 6 | <u>^</u> | | n de la companya de l | Affluence possible | 8029 | |
| R 2007 0012/1 | Letture | S | SFO A | Y.813 | 2 🐔 | no raid but daily irrigation. | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-304278-01-0</u> | | | × 40 | | ~ | Influence likely. | 8030 | |
| R 2007 0245/0 | Lettuce | уS 🔊 | SFO 📎 | 1.204 | £, | li de but very early rain after | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-304278-01-1</u> | - <i>k</i> | - KJ | | °, | 0° | application, influence possible | 8030 | |
| R 2007 0541/7 | Lettuce | 85 | Sto (| 5.797 | | request but little rain, influence | Ensa-20- | |
| 14_2030_03 | Jathuce of | | SEOO | 2/13/2 | <u>د</u> | Frequent rainfall and regular | 6030 Ensa_20_ | |
| M-534595-01-1 | | S ôS | | | Ď, | sprinkler irrigation Marked | 8031 | |
| <u> </u> | | | . Ø % | | , C | influence not discernible but | 0051 | |
| <u>U</u> | , O¥ | õ » | 0,00 | | O, | slight impact likely | | |
| 14-2185-04 | Lettuce | S N | SFQ | 20403 | ð | Several rainfalls around 2nd | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-536963-01-1</u> | ~ | J. | all s | | Ø | sampling, no influence | 8031 | |
| | | -Q | | | - | discernible | | |
| R 2006 0339/8 | O to on | S ô | SFO S | 4:438 | 2 | Irrigation coincides with a | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-292098-01-1</u> | | , A | -Q | O'S | | moderate drop of residue levels, | 20-0832 | |
| D 2007 0555/7 Ø | Baas. | | | 5 169 | 2 | Only little rainfall but | Enco 20 | |
| M_298639_0101 | Peas | | | , 3.408 | 2 | coinciding with residue decline | Elisa-20- 8030 | |
| <u>111 270037-0161</u> | N' Å | st n | | | | Influence possible | 0050 | |
| R 2007 0556/5 | Peas C | N | SFO | 7.032 | 2 | many days with little rainfall. | Ensa-20- | |
| M-298699-01 | 1 | | | | | Influence possible | 8030 | |
| R 2007 0557 3 | Peas . | Ś | SFO | 3.275 | 2 | early irrigation and rainfall, | Ensa-20- | 1 |
| <u>M-297487001-1</u> | "0" Å | | | | | influence possible | 8030 | |
| E19RP162-03 | Young | Ν | SFO | 7.01 | 2 | moderate rain d4, slight | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-75</u> 824-01-1 | cereals | | | | | influence | 20-0834 | |
| E19RP102-04 | Young | Ν | FOMC | 4.319 | 2 | moderate rain d2, slight | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-/58824-01-1</u> | cereals | | | | | influence | 20-0834 |] |



| Trial | Crop | Zone | Kinetic | DT ₅₀ | Cat | Influence rain and/or | Source | |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|--|---|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|--------|
| Edition no. | _ | | model | mod | | irrigation | DT50 ° | |
| 13-2950-01 | Young | Ν | SFO | 1.95 | 2 | little early rainfall, very little | EnSa | Ö |
| <u>M-471216-01-1</u> | cereals | | | | | impact on DT50 | 17 0484 | ð, |
| 15-2953-02 | Young | Ν | SFO | 4.23 | 2 | heavy rain day 5, vist le but | Ensa- | - |
| <u>M-566828-01-1</u> | cereals | | | | | slight influence | ¥7-0484 | |
| E19RP087-04 | Young | S | SFO | 2.956 | 2 | "moderate rain d3, d4; slight | EnSa | Ro |
| <u>M-758649-01-1</u> | cereals | | | | | influence" | 2060834 | |
| 15-2952-03 | Young | S | SFO | 2.86 | 2_3 | no rain before day 5, only slight | EnSa- 🖓 | a |
| <u>M-566830-01-1</u> | cereals | | | | - V | influence O a | 017-0484 | Ś |
| 08-2034-01 T1 | Beans | Ν | SFO | 4.053 | Ş | moderatorain d3, d5, marked | Ense-20- | O. |
| <u>M-365530-01-1</u> | D | N | CEO. | 2007 | | Influence V V | 8029 | ν , |
| 08-2034-02 12 M 265520 01 1 | Beans | IN | SFO | 3.99 | 3 | moderate rate d3, do marked | Ensa-20 | |
| <u>NI-303330-01-1</u> D 2006 0280/0 | Doong | N | SEO | 47.22 | ¢2° | huldence | ×8029 | |
| K 2006 0380/0 M 201180 01 1 | Deans | IN | 560 | Q1.32 | | | EIISS#20- 8020 | |
| R 2006 0654/0 | Reans | N | SEO « | 0.7187 | 3 | marted influence by early | QU27 ° | |
| $M_{2000} = 0.0000000000000000000000000000000$ | Dealls | 11 | | | | heavy rain | 8020 | |
| R 2007 0014/8 | Beans | N | SEG | \$2,733 | 7. 7. | Heavy and on days around 2nd | Enes-20- | |
| M-297562-01-1 | Dealls | 1 | | | | sampling influence likely | 8030 | |
| R 2007 0549/2 | Beans | N | rSFO 🔊 | 3 172 | 3 | marked inthence of rainfall | Ensa-20- | |
| M-297562-01-1 | Domis | , C | , | ên li de la companya | <u>~</u> | days 3 and 4 likely | 8030 | |
| 08-2096-02 T2 | Beans | S @ | SFO | B.648 4 | 3 | virigation d5 and d11 Garked | Ensa-20- | |
| M-365542-01-1 | | ~~~~ | × | l o | - A | influence | 8029 | |
| R 2006 0620/6 | Beans | Ϋ́ ś | SFO 🖒 | 0.7254 | 3 | marked influence of early | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-290827-01-1</u> | | | | | r 🔍 | rainfall fixely | 8029 | |
| R 2007 0035/0 | Beans 🏸 | SA | ŞFŐ | 3.176 🖉 | ¥3 é | Marge rainfall days 4 and 5, | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-297564-01-1</u> | ~ | S" | | | °∼y | influence likely | 8030 | |
| R 2007 0078/4 | Cabbage | N A | SFO Ø | 2.062 | 20 | early rainfall coincides with | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-302101-01-1</u> | Š, Š | | w. | | Ĵ, | marked drop (influence | 20-0832 | |
| 10-2099-02 | Endove | N | FOMCO | 2.659 | 3 | earty rainfall marked decline | Ensa-20- | |
| M-423901-01- | | O' | o on So | | | induence@kelv | 8029 | |
| 10-2099-03 | Endive | N | SFÓ. | 228 | 0ž | rearly raunfall, marked decline, | Ensa-20- | |
| M-423901-01-1 | Ö | | la l | | ~C | influence likely | 8029 | |
| 10-2099+04 | Endive « | Ŵ, | SFO R | 1.48 | 3 🖤 | early rainfall, marked decline, | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-423901-01-1</u> | \sim \checkmark | | | de la companya de la comp | ×, | influence likely | 8029 | |
| 11-2029-01 | Leek J | N | S₽Ø , | 2.279 | ∪ _{3 (} | Heavy rainfall coincides with a | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-442996-01-1</u> | ŶŹŸ | J. | | r S | Ş | marked drop of residue levels, | 20-0832 | |
| ~ | | Õ 🍾 | \checkmark \sim | \sim | ·0· | influence likely | | |
| 11-2029-02 | Leek 🗞 | N N | SF@ | 2957 | Qr | Heavy rainfall coincides with a | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-442996-01-1</u> | Ĉ | Ň | Ø ? | ¥ W | | marked drop of residue levels, | 20-0832 | |
| 11.0000.00 | | | | | 2 | Influence likely | E C | |
| 11-2029-03 | Leek | א [ַ] ר ∿ | "SFO | 29620 | 3 | Early rainfall coincides with a | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-442996-01-1</u> | - P | j. | - Q | Õ ^y | | influence likely | 20-0832 | |
| 11 2020 04 | Lash | | | 2 5 4 2 | 2 | Early rainfall agingidag with a | EnSo | |
| M 442006 010 | Leek | | STO ~ | , 2.343 | 3 | marked drop of residue levels | EliSa- | |
| <u>1v1-++2770-0(G1</u> | j j | × | | | | influence likely | 20-0032 | |
| R 2006 0265/3 | VI eek O | NÔ | SEO | 2 346 | 3 | Frequent early rainfall coincides | EnSa- | |
| M-292 M1-02 | | | 510 | 2.340 | 5 | with a marked drop of residue | 20-0832 | |
| Â. 07 | \$. × | J. | | | | levels, influence likely | | |
| R/2007 00\$\$6/3 | Leek A | Ν | DFOP | 4.184 | 3 | Early rainfall coincided with a | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-304288-01-1</u> | ~ | | | | | moderate drop (influence | 20-0832 | |
| Č | | | | | | likely). | | |
| R 2007 0249/3 | Leek | N | HS | 3.392 | 3 | early rainfall coincides with | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-304276-01-1</u> | | | | | | marked drop (influence likely) | 20-0832 | |



| Trial | Crop | Zone | Kinetic | DT ₅₀ | Cat | Influence rain and/or | Source |] |
|--|--------------|--|--------------------|------------------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------|--------|
| Edition no. | | | model | mod | | irrigation | DT50 _ • | |
| R 2007 0569/7 | Leek | Ν | FOMC | 3.551 | 3 | early rainfall coincides with | EnSa | Ĩ, |
| <u>M-304288-01-1</u> | | | | | | marked drop (influence likely) | 20-0832 | Ì |
| R 2007 0570/0 | Leek | Ν | FOMC | 3.675 | 3 | early rainfall coincides with | En Sa- | - - |
| <u>M-304288-01-1</u> | | | | | | marked drop (influence likely) | 20-082 | |
| R 2007 0571/9 | Leek | Ν | SFO | 2.557 | 3 | early rainfall coincides with | EnSa | in a |
| <u>M-304288-01-1</u> | | | | | | marked drop (influence likely) | 2060832 | |
| R 2007 0573/5 | Leek | Ν | SFO | 3.321 | 3 🖏 | early rainfall coincides with | ÊnSa- 🔊 | |
| <u>M-304276-01-1</u> | | | | | - V | marked drop (influence likely) | 20-0832 | , L |
| R 2007 0574/3 | Leek | Ν | SFO | 2.916 | ³ | early raio all coincides with | EnSa | 0 |
| <u>M-304276-01-1</u> | | ~ | | 4 | <i>C</i> . | marked drop (influence likely) | 20-0832 | 1 1 |
| R 2007 0057/1 | Leek | S | FOMC | 5.24 | 3 | early irrigation coincides with | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-302775-01-1</u> | T 1 | G | 110 | | . ° ° | marked drop (influence likely | 20-0832 | - |
| R 2007 0250/7 | Leek | S | HS | Q1.434 | ¢, | Carly in gation coincides with | Ensa- | |
| <u>M-302/80-01-1</u> | T 1 | C | CEO 4 | | Č | moderate dropo(influence likely) | <u>20</u> -0832 | |
| R 2007 0572/7 | Leek | 8 | SFO | 1.932 | 3 | early irrigation coincides with | ornsa- | |
| <u>M-302//5-01-1</u> D 2006 0275/4 | T | N | | | | marked offop (intence likely) | * 20-0692 | - |
| K 2006 03/3/4 | Lettuce | IN | HSQ (| 198 (Ka | ₽3 _{°¢} | Virginitian marked in Wones | Ensa-20- | |
| P 2006 0607/0 | Lattuca | N | | 1 120 | 24 | mar ad inflyance to sprint or | 0029 Ænsa 20 | |
| $M_2 2000 000779$ | Lenuce | | 510 10 | 1.129 | ∾ | intration | 8020 | |
| R 2007 0538/7 | Lettuce | Na | SEO | A 7255 | S. | apparked influence of early | Ensa-20- | - |
| M-304280-01-1 | Lettuce | | | 10.1233 T | L L | rainfall | 8030 | |
| 14-2184-01 | Lettuce | Ň « | SFO | 1 0 4 5 | 3 | Earthy rainfall coincides with | Ensa-20- | |
| M-536965-01-1 | Dettade Ø | Ô | | <u> </u> | -102 | marked from of sesidue/levels | 8031 | |
| | °∼y" | 1 | Q | | | Sinfluence likely 25 | | |
| 14-2184-04 | Letture | N [°] | ∫\$FO ⁽ | 1.592 | 3 % | frequent early rainfall may have | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-536965-01-1</u> | | 10° ~ | | J. | Ľ | markedly Difluenced residue | 8031 | |
| | S A | | | | õ | Revels 0 | | |
| R 2007 0246/9 | Lettuce | S | SFŎ & | 0.8952 | r 3 🐔 | Fearly Cain and Prrigation, | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-304278-01</u> | | 0 | o [×] «? | L.Y | ð | influence likely | 8030 | |
| 14-2030-04 | Leftuce « | JS | FOMC | 1.928 | <u>B</u> | Early heavy rainfall, marked | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-534595-01-1</u> | X | 45 | | ð. | 0 | influence likely | 8031 | |
| 14-2030-05 | Lettuce | 89 | Sto (| 3.779 | 3 ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | Heavy rainfall before 3rd | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-534595-01-1</u> | | ∀ ∡ | | .~ | 6 | sampling, marked influence | 8031 | |
| 14 2195 01 | | | | 1 0057 | | Meety | E 20 | |
| 14-2185-01 M 526062 01 1 | Pelluce | 2 | | § 9.05 / | -3 . | marked influence likely | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>NI-330903-01-1</u> P 2006 0227/1 | OnQn | à l | Ê | 7.10 | 20 | Indiked influence likely. | 8031 EnSo | |
| M_202006_0121 | A CARDIN &C | \sim | ALOW C | 1.3107 | S, I | with a moderate drop of residue | 20-0832 | |
| <u>111-272790-01-1</u> | Ŭ, | \$° | AN . | Ğ, | Ũ | levels influence likely | 20-0052 | |
| R 2006 0 04/8 | Onion | NO. | SFO & | 4.91 | 3 | Irrigation coincides with | EnSa- | 1 |
| M-292996-01-1 | | | ¥ 49 | | - | moderate drops of residue | 20-0832 | |
| | w Ç | Þ 、_0 | | | | levels, influence likely. | | |
| R 2007 0567/0 | Onion | NO | SFO . | 2.992 | 3 | early rainfall coincides with | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-302330-01-1</u> | 4 8 | Ő : | Ç Q | | | marked drop (influence likely) | 20-0832 | |
| R 2006 05050 | Quion (| S S | SFO | 3.282 | 3 | Irrigation coincides with | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-292098 01-1</u> | Ľ, Č | s and a second s | ~Õ | | | moderate drops of residue | 20-0832 | |
| | r O | ² | | | | levels, influence likely. | | |
| R 2007 0043/15 | Onion | 19 | FOMC | 4.584 | 3 | Likely marked influence from | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-362325-01-1</u> | | ٧ | | | - | irrigation at day 3 | 20-0832 | |
| R/2007 0096/9 | Peas 🔊 | Ν | SFO | 5.287 | 3 | large rainfall days 4 and 5, | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-298639-01-1</u> | | 21 | 110 | 0.401 | 2 | Influence likely | 8030 | - |
| R 200 0553/0 | Peas | N | HS | 3.401 | 3 | Kain on day 2, influence likely | Ensa-20- | |
| <u>M-298639-01-1</u> | | 1 | | | | | 8030 | 1 |



| Trial | Crop | Zone | Kinetic | DT ₅₀ | Cat | Influence rain and/or | Source | |
|----------------------|-----------|--|---------|--------------------|--------|--|----------------|-----|
| Edition no. | _ | | model | mod | | irrigation | DT50 ° | |
| R 2007 0554/9 | Peas | Ν | FOMC | 9.837 | 3 | Large rainfall on days 2 and 3, | Ensa 0- | Ö |
| <u>M-298639-01-1</u> | | | | | | influence likely | 80.30 | F |
| 15-2030-01 | Peas | Ν | SFO | 3.346 | 3 | Heavy rainfall coincides with a | Ensa-20 | - |
| <u>M-566823-03-1</u> | | | | | | marked drop in residue levels, | 8031 | |
| | | | | | | impact likely | | \$ |
| R 2007 0037/7 | Peas | S | SFO | 3.329 | 3 | Large rainfall on day 3, $\mathbb{O}^{\mathbb{V}}$ | Enosa-20- | 2 |
| <u>M-297487-01-1</u> | | | | | Ĉs | influence likely. | 8030 📿 | 0 |
| 15-2030-04 | Peas | S | SFO | 2.928 | 37 | Rainfall op days 3 and 4 🖉 🔌 | DEnsa-20- | Ľ |
| <u>M-566823-03-1</u> | | | | | L | coincides with a drop in residue | 803 | 0'' |
| | | | | 4 | y" | levels milluence likel | | 1 |
| 18-2951-01 | Young | Ν | SFO | 2.74 | 3 | early rain, marked decline | EnSa- 🗸 | |
| <u>M-678413-01-1</u> | cereals | | | - Qi | | | 20-0834 | |
| 13-2950-02 | Young | Ν | HS | Q .03 | 63° | fornfall day0, marked deline 🥎 | En Sa - | |
| <u>M-471216-01-1</u> | cereals | | | 0″,@ | | | 17-0484 | |
| 13-2950-03 | Young | Ν | HS 🔬 | 1.2 | 3 @ | earl@rainfall, marked decline | EnSa- 🐓 | |
| <u>M-471216-01-1</u> | cereals | | st v | Ň | \sim | $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ | 17-0484 | |
| 13-2950-04 | Young | Ν | SFO | ×1,25 (| ZŽ | farly rainfall, marked decline | Ensa- | |
| <u>M-471216-01-1</u> | cereals | | Q V | v 🔬 | | | 17-0484 | |
| 15-2953-01 | Young | N | CHŚ 🔊 | 3.48 | 3≪∛ | early rain marked decline | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-566828-01-1</u> | cereals | - Q | | <i>R</i> a | \gg | | 17-0484 | |
| 18-2954-01 | Young | S | SEO | A .201 (| 3 | heavy thin d4, marked decline | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-675129-02-1</u> | cereals | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | , ⁻ '0' | Ś | | 20-0834 | |
| 18-2954-02 | Young | °S (| SFO O | 3.599 | 3 | heavy rain d4, mated decline | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-675129-02-1</u> | cereals 🖉 | | | | ~ | | 20-0834 | |
| E19RP087-03 | Young | SA | SFŐ | 3 .415 🍙 | ¥3 / | Sheavy rain d3, marked decline | EnSa- | |
| <u>M-758649-01-1</u> | cereals | S" | | | N N | | 20-0834 | |

E19RP08/-03 Young × SA SFO 3'.415 73 Meavy rain d3/añarke



Influence of the residue zone on foliage DT₅₀

A comparison of the DT_{50} values from trials conducted in the Northern EU residue zone with the DT_{50} values from trials conducted in the Southern EU residue zone shows comparability within each of the rainfall categories.



| 0 | | | |
|--------------|--------------------|---|------------------------|
| A | Residue definition | AT O U | Reference |
| Easd of Sont | Monitoring Q | fluopycam (parent only) | EFSA Scientific Report |
| origin | Pier assessment | fluopyram and fluopyram-benzamide (M25) | EFSA Journal |
| OIIgins | KISK assessment | expressed as fluopyram | 2013;11(4):3052 |
| | | | |



However, the comparison of the foliage DT_{50} of fluopyram alone with the foliage DT_{50} of the combined residues of fluopyram and its benzamide-metabolite shows that this metabolite contributes very little to the potential exposure of herbivorous birds and mammals (typically less than 5%) which may be considered negligible. It is therefore proposed that the definition of the residue for herbivorous birds and mammals can be limited to fluopyram alone.




Applicant assessment on effects on biodiversity

According to Regulation 1107/2009 potential effects on biodiversity and ecosystems shall be considered in the renewal process for an active substance. However, at present EU-agreed guidance is lacking or how to address this topic and there is no technical assessment scheme available on how to perform any assessment. Therefore, to formally address these topics the following information is provided by the applicant.

The risk assessments for bird and mammals result in acceptable outcomes at screening, level refinement data was only needed based on measured data for secondar poisoning.

The risk assessment for aquatic organisms is acceptable when considering FOCUS step 20 ECso?

The risk assessment for bees does not indicate a new for higher tier assessment for mitigation measures.

The non-target-arthropod in-field and off-field risk assessments resulted in a Gepta de outcomes at fier 1 t t t Ô Ś level, without the need for risk mitigation. \bigcirc

The risk assessment for soil organisms resulted in acceptable outcomes with large margins of safets

The non-target-terrestrial-plant off-field fisk assessments resulted of acceptable surcomes considering

when we applied to a certain the presented of a Therefore, the applicant concludes that the use of the representative lead formulation FLU SC 500 (500 g/L) has low potential to cause unacceptable effects on prodiversity and the crosystem via trophic interactions. To the best of out knowledge and with the presented safety profile of the octive substance fluopyram and the representative lead formulation, the applicant does not foresee any effects on



CP 10.1 Effects on birds and other terrestrial vertebrates

The risk assessment has been performed according to "European Food Safety Authority; Guidance Document on Risk Assessment for Birds & Mammals on request from EFSA" (EFSA Journal 2009; 7(12):1438. doi:10.2903/j.efsa.2009.1438), referred to in the following as "EFSA GD 2000" GD 2009".

S S

Effects on birds **CP 10.1.1**

| T . 4 | | 1 | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|----------------------------|--|---|
| Test substance | Test design | Test species | | Andpoint o | Reference |
| | Acute oral toxicity | Bobwhite quail (Colinus virginianus) | | > 2000 mg a.s./kg/w | 2011) <u>M-26049-041</u> KCA 8.1.14/01 |
| | Acute oral | Sebra foch ØTaenitsygia | | >2,000 mg/ass./kg/5 | 2008) M-30771-02-1 KGX 8.1.1.1/02 Extrapolated |
| | toxicity | guttata)-g | | = 3036 mg a.s./kg bw ^ | 2.1.2 of EFSA Journal 2009; 7(12):1438 |
| | Acute Stal toxic ity | Charlen O Gallus Omestjents) | | > 5000 mga.s./kgbw | (2011) <u>M-446344-01-1</u> KCA 8.1.1.1/03 |
| Č | Obietary (shor@term) | Bobwhite quait (Blinue virginianus) | | > 500 mg a 5/kg feed > 1845.4 mg a.s./kg b0/d | (2007) <u>M-264902-02-1</u> KCA 8.1.1.2/01 |
| Fluopyram tech. | Dietar toxiyy (shypterm) | Malled duck (Anas S ployrhynchos) | OLC 50 2 CLD 10 50 | >.500 mg a.s./kg feed ≥.1643 mg a.s./kg bw/d | (2005) <u>M-262710-01-1</u> KCA 8.1.1.2/02 |
| 4 | 29-weeks feed Og chronic, o reproduction | Boby Hie quart Golines Figiniques | NOED NOED | < 250 mg a.s./kg feed < 23 mg a.s./kg bw/d | (2008) <u>M-299245-02-1</u> KCA 8.1.1.3/01 |
| | 22-wasks feeding chronic. | Bobyhite offail | NOAEC OIOAED | 80 mg a.s./kg feed 7.2 mg a.s./kg bw/d | (2008) <u>M-298723-01-1</u> |
| v | repsoduction | ovirginianus) O | NOEC NOED | 50 mg a.s./kg feed 4.5 mg a.s./kg bw/d | KCA 8.1.1.3/02 |
| | 19 yeeks | MallaroQuck | NOEC NOED | 40 mg a.s./kg bw/d | (2008) <u>M-299277-01-1</u> K C A 8 1 1 2/02 |
| | Sveproduction | y platyrhynchos) | NOEC NOED | 200 mg a.s./kg kg feed 18 mg a.s./kg bw/d | DAR |
| | Chronic, reproduction: EC ₁₀ calculation | Bobwhite quail (Colinus virginianus) – both chronic studies combined | Lowest EC ₁₀ | 7.8 mg a.s./kg bw/d (14-day survivors per eggs set) | (2019) <u>M-667209-01-1</u> KCA 8.1.1.3/04 |

Table 10.1.1-1: Studies for fluopyram and endpoints used in th



| Test substance | Test design | Test species | | Endpoint | Reference |
|-------------------|--|--|------------------|---|---|
| | Chronic, reproduction: EC ₁₀ calculation | Mallard duck (Anas platyrhynchos) | EC10 | 78.6 mg a.s./kg bw/d (eggs laid per hen) | (2019) <u>M-66723 201-1</u> KCA & 1.1.3/65 |
| FLU SC 500 | Acute oral toxicity | Bobwhite quail (Colinus virginianus) | LD ₅₀ | > 2000 mg ptod./kg bw | (2008) <u>Ar-326987-02-1</u> KCR 10.401.1/01 Extrapolated acc. to chapter 2.1.2 of EFS Journal 2009, 7(12):1438 |

Note:

Studies referring to KCA are filed in the dossier for the active substance Studies written in grey type are referring to studies in the corresponding B studies in black studies of the Supplemental dossier ndiverbals and mortality)

- a.s. = active substance, prod. = product
- a.s. = active substance, prod. = product
- ^B Factor 1.888 for 10 birds/dose level for no mortality Ô

Relevant indicator species for & creening risk assessment Table 10.1.1- 2:

Ľ,

| | Shortout va | alue (SV) |
|------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Crop & Indicator species & D | ed on RUD90 | Long-term RA based on RUD _m |
| Orchards Opples | A6.8 | 18.2 |
| | Ŵ. | |

ACUTE DIETARY

| Table 10.1.1- 3: | Screening | acute | risk asse | ssinent | for | birds |
|------------------|-----------|-------|-----------|--------------|-----|-------|
| | | S | . ° ° | ² | £ | , C |

| Crop | Indicator species Structure (kg/a.s./hat/ | MAF90 | DDD | LD50 [mg a.s./ kg bw] | TERA | Trigger |
|----------------------|--|-------|------|-----------------------------|-------|---------|
| Orchards (apples) | Small insectivorous 0.07 \$6.8 | 1.0 | 3.51 | > 2000 | > 570 | 10 |
| 1 | | | | | | |

is above the trigger of 10, Therefore, a Tier 1 risk assessment is not required. The TERA value ~Ć

Acute risk assessment for birds drinking contaminated water from pools in leaf whorls

For the use in the Gop under assessment in this evaluation (apples) the leaf scenario is not considered relevant according to the EFSA GD 2009.

Ĉ



Acute risk assessment for birds drinking contaminated water from puddles

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 (in g/ha) to relevant endpoint (in mg/kg bw/d) does not exceed 50 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).

With a K(f)oc of 232.1 L/kg, fluopyram belongs to the group of less sorphive substances

| | | | and a s | | L. O' | * |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------|----|
| Table 10.1.1-4: | Evaluation of potential con | ncern for@exposure | e of birds from | drinking wat | er (acute. | a. |
| | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | | | |
| | escape clause) | m ^v | · | | | J. |

| | |) | Ŵ | \sim | , O` | ₩ NO | Ö Ü |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------|---|----------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| Сгор | Compound | Koc [L/kg] | AReff (Appl@rate × (MAFm) fgra.s./hay | LDsv [mg &s./ kg ww] | Ratio CAReffor LD ₅₀) | "Escape * clause" No concorn if ratio | Conclusion ^o |
| Orchards (apples) | Fluopyram | 232.1 2 | | > 2000 | \$0.038 ⁴ | \$50 \$ | No Soncern |
| A K _{OC} value | given in MCP 9.2.4 | 1.1 (Table | 9.2.40°1) | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | N S | S. |
| | | R. | <i>b b</i> | ð R | ,0 [°] .0 |) Ó ' | \sim |

According to the EFSA GD 2009 "no specific calculations of exposure and TER are necessary when the ratio of effective application rate (in gha) to relevant endpoint (in mg/kg bw) does not exceed 50 in the case of less sorptive substances (Koe < 5($0^{\circ}L/kg$)," This is the case for fluopyram. Therefore, the acute risk for birds from drinking water that may contain residues from fluopyram is acceptable.

LONG-TERM REPRODUCTIVE RISK ASSESSMENT

Screening long-term reproductive risk assessment for birds Table 10.1.1- 5

| Crop | Indicator & | Appl. rate (kg a.ş.Ma] | DDD SV m | MAF _m from | Ø Ø DDD | NOEL [mg a.s./kg bw/d] | TER _{LT} | Trigger |
|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Orchards (apples) | Small insectivorous | 0.075 | 18.2 | 1.05 0.53 | 0.723 | 4.5 | 6.22 | 5 |
| Å | | | Å. 4 | <u> </u> | | | | |

The TERLT value calculated in the chronic risk assessment on screening level exceed the trigger of 5.





Long-term risk assessment for birds drinking contaminated water from puddles

| Table 10.1.1- 6: | Evaluation of escape claus | Evaluation of potential concern for exposure of birds from drinking water (le escape clause) | | | | ter (long-term | , ⁶ | |
|------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|----------------|----------------|---|
| | | | | | | 0ľ | | Л |

| Сгор | Compound | Koc [L/kg] | AR _{eff} (Appl. rate × MAF _m) [g a.s./ha] | NO(A)EL [mg a.s./ kg bw/d] 《為 | Ratio (AR _{eff} / NOEL) | Vescape Clause" No concerno if ratio |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Orchards (apples) | Fluopyram | 232.1 ^A | 75 | 4.5 | 169.7 | Su No concern |
| • K _{OC} value gi | iven in MCP 9.2.4 | .1 (Table 9 | 9.2.4-1) | la l | | |

According to the EFSA GD 2009 "no specific calculations of exposure and TER are necessary when the ratio of effective application rate (in g/ha) to selevant endpoint (in mg/kg bw/d) does not exceed does not exceed 50 in the case of less sorptive substances (Koc < 500 L/kg) of 3000 in the case of hore sorptive substances (Koc > 500 L/kg)." This is the case for fluopyram. Therefore, the long-term task for birds from drinking water that may contain residues from fluopyram is acceptable.

RISK ASSESSMENT OF SECONDARY POISONING

According to the EFSA GD 2009, substances with a log $P_{ow} > 3$ have potential for bioaccumulation and should be assessed for the risk of biomagnification in aquatic and terrostrial food chains. at , a

| Table 10.1.1- 7: | Log Pow value | of fluop ram S | | \$ " |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Substa | nače v ^{ot} "(* | Log Pox 🗡 | Compartment 🔿 | Reference |
| Fluepy | лана С | 3.3 (20*C), 4 | Soll, surface water | <u>M-280089-01-1</u> MCA, 2.7 |
| L.S. | | | | |

The log Pow value of fluopyram is 3.3 and thus effects on secondary poisoning have been assessed. Table 10.1.1-8. Avian generic focal species for the Ter 1 risk assessment of secondary poisoning

| Generic avian indicator species | Body weight (g) | Example | FIR/bw |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------|--------|
| Earthworm eater | 100 | Thrush | 1.05 |
| Fish earer E | O 1000 | Heron | 0.159 |
| | y | | |



Long-term DDD and TER calculation for earthworm-eating birds

Important remark by the applicant: The PEC_{soil} and TER values as presented below are intering values and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant intends to provide final PEC_{soil} values and revised TER calculations latest by end of March 2022.

| | 8 | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | Floopyram L C |
| | | Tier 1 Refinement |
| Kow | | |
| Koc [mL/g] | | |
| foc | | |
| BCFworm | | 3 3 3 5 5 1 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 |
| PECsoil, accu (mg/kg) | | 0° 0.15° 0.15° 0.15° |
| PEC _{worm} (mg/kg) | e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e | 0 4 4 0.864 5 6 5 5 5 0.18 6 |
| FIR/bw | Q. | |
| DDD (mg/kg bw/d) | Ŵ | 0.140 0° 0.900 0° 0° 0° 0° 0° |
| NO(A)EL (mg/kg bw/d) | | 1^{A} 4.5 4.5 4.5 4.5 |
| TER _{LT} | | 4.96 (4.96) (4.96 (4.96) |
| Trigger | N .A | |
| | ICD 0 2 4 1 (T.I | |

Table 10.1.1-9: Tier 1 long-term DDD and TER calculation for earthworm-eating birds in

Koc value given in MCP 9.2 A (Table 9.2.4 75 g @s./ha); 21-day TWA of 0.035 mg a.s./kg + В PECsoil, accu value given in MCP 9.13, Table 9.1.3-3-Capples 1

plateau concentration (5 cm) of 0422 mg as./kg

С Measured BCF resulting from a bioaccurrulation study in earthworms e refer to MCA 8.1.3

Ò Long-term DDD and TER calculation for fist eating birds

Important remark by the applicant: The PEC, and RER values as presented below are interim values and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant intends to provide that PEC_{sw} values and revised TER calculations latest by end of March 2022.

Tier I long-term DDD and TER alculation for fish-eating birds in apples Table 10 T.1

| | Fluopyram |
|--|----------------------|
| BCFfish | 16 ^A |
| FOCUS Step 2 PECsw (twa, 22 d) (mg/L) | 0.00626 ^B |
| PEC _{fish} (mg/kg) | 0.100 |
| FIR/bw the second secon | 0.159 |
| DDD (mg/kg bw@l) | 0.016 |
| NO(A) (Mg kg bw/d) | 4.5 |
| TERAY O O Y | 283 |
| Trigger 🖉 🦉 | 5 |

A

Measured BCF resulting from a bioconcentration study in fish, please refer to MCA 8.2.2.3 \mathbb{A}^2 d twa PEC_{sw} value given in MCP 9.2.5, Table 9.2.5- 6 (apples, 1 × 75 g a.s./ha), FOCUS Step 2, Northern Europe, в autumn application as worst case



The TER values for fluopyram are above the trigger of concern of 5, indicating no risk from secondary poisoning for earthworm- and fish-eating birds.

CP 10.1.1.1 Acute oral toxicity

| poisoning for cartimorni- | |
|----------------------------|--|
| CP 10.1.1.1 Acute | e oral toxicity |
| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.1/01 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Acute oral toxicity for bobwhite quail (Colinus virginianus) with the est subtance Fluopyram SC 500 G |
| Report No: | BAR/LD 097 |
| Document No: | <u>M-326987-02-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EPA Pesticide Assessment Guidelines § 71-4, Subdausion E. (October 1982) with |
| study: | consideration of the recommendation of: |
| | EPA Ecological Effects Guidelines OPPTS 850,2100 Astan Acute Oral Foxicity |
| | Test (April 1996). |
| Deviations from current | Current Guidenne: QECD 223 (2016) Current Guidenne: QECD 223 (2016) |
| test guideline: | Deviations The photoperiod was 19 hour Chight, above the 8 hours light as |
| | recommended. No information on medication pror to test start was given in the |
| | report. The space available for each bird in the pen was about 950 cm2, and thus |
| | slightly below the 1000 cm2. Weighing of buds was not performed on day 3 as |
| | recommended by the guideline. Observation for regurgitation was performed |
| | continuously for the first hour not for the recommended two hours. |
| 2 | These deviations are not expected to have an impact of the study results. All |
| | validity criteria were met. |
| Previous evaluation: | Nochot previously submitted in the second se |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Opticially recognized testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes & A AY AY AY |
| | |

Ő Note: this study was conducted in order to regulatory requirements in countries outside of the EU.

Executive Summary

FLU SC 500 was administered scally to bo white quails (5 males and 5 females) at dose levels of 0, 100@and 2000 mg product kg b@. Birds were held at a temperature of 19 to 25 °C with a relative humidity of 27 to 62 % and 10 hours light per day. The birds were observed for 14 days for mortality and sublethal symptoms. Body weight and average feed consumption were measured for each dosage 1 and control group, Ô

The study fulfiled all validits criteria of OBCD 223 guideline.

Signs of impairment of the digestive tract were seen in all test groups, mainly soft excrement, diarrhoea and excretion of uric and. These effects occurred also occasionally in the control. They were most abundant in the days after the application while towards the end of the study the birds behaved normally or showed only a slight effect. No pathological changes were found at necropsy of the survivors and no mortality was observed. There were no treatment related effects on body weight compared to the control.

Ó



The acute oral LD₅₀ for bobwhite quail was > 2000 mg product/kg bw and the LOED was > 2000 mg product/kg bw.

I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

<u>Test item</u>: FLU SC 500, specification No.: 102000018148; Batch ID. 2007-011657; Sample identification: TOX 08109-00; analysed a.s. content: 42.2 % w/w (501 g/L).

<u>Test design</u>: Bobwhite quail (6 months old) were orally desed with FLU SC 500 at $0^{-1}1000$ and 2000 mg product/kg bw. The test substance was placed in capsules based or treatment level and body weight and administered to the birds. Control birds received empty gelatine capsules. Each cosage group comprised 10 birds (5 female and 5 male birds) which were housed individually. Each cage had floor space that measured approximately 38×25 cm with a ceiling of 23 cm

Birds were acclimatized for approximately 15 days pror to being randomized into test groups. At the start of acclimation, the quail were well developed and similar to birds from wild population. Only birds that appeared healthy were used for the study. Water, and feed were provided ad libitim during acclimation and during the test, except during periods of fasting priot to testing. Birds were started for 16 hours prior to oral administration, birds were held at a temperature of 19 to 25 °C with a relative humidity of 27 to 62 %. The photoperiod was 10 hours of light per day during acclimation and throughout the test.

Observations for mortality and signs of intoxication including requirgitation were made continuously during the first hour and hourly on the day of dosing during the exposure period and a least once a day throughout the 14 days observation period. Bod weights were recorded prior to test initiation (day -1), on day 7 and at test termination (day 14). Food consumption was determined by pen for each dosage group and control group for days 0-3/3-7 and 7-14 Gross pecropsies were carried out on all survivors.

<u>Statistics</u>: Since no bird died, it was not possible to cabulate the LD₅₀, slope and confidence interval. Initially the data were analysed on homogeneous distribution Kolmogorroff-Smirnov test, p < 0.05). In case the data were homogeneously distributed, they were subjected to an analysis of equal variances (Bartlett's test): In case of equal variances, subsequent analyses were conducted using parametric techniques (Dunnett's test); otherwise the t-Test for inhomogeneous variances (Bonferroni Test) was used.

Dates of experimental work September 29 to October 28th 2008.

C. RESULTS OND DISCUSSION

Validity criteria

Table 109.1.1-1: Validity criteria (according to OPCD 223, adopted 26 July 2016)

| Vafielity criteria | Required | Obtained |
|--------------------|--------------|----------|
| Control mortality | $\leq 10 \%$ | 0 % |
| Observations: | | |

Mortanty and clinical observations:

Signs of mpairment of the digestive tract were seen in all treatment groups, mainly soft excrement, diarrhoea and excretion of uric acid. These effects occurred also occasionally in the control. They were most abundant in the days after the application while towards the end of the study the birds behaved normally or showed only a slight effect.



13.7

13.7

13.4

No mortalities were observed.

Controf

1000

2000 2000

-C

A.

Ö

15.5

13.3

9.0

| Table 10.1.1.1- 2 | : Summ | ary of mortalities a | nd clinica | al symptor | ns | ð | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|------------------|
| Treatment level Overall morta | | Overall mortali | ty | Number | | Chipical symp | otoms , S |
| mg product/ | ct/kg bw] (females and males) | | dosed | | (type) | da da | |
| Control | | 0 | | 10 | Ř | sti excrement, v | Farrhoea |
| 1000 | | 0 | | Ŷõ | excretio di | on of uric actor, s arrhoea, fluffed | soft excrement, |
| 2000 | | 0 | 1 | 10 | Stoft ex | crement diarrh | oea, exerction |
| Gross pathology: | | | | | | | |
| No pathological | changes v | were found at neer | ŏpsy∞of t | he surviv | ors. | . Ô ^y 4, | |
| Body weight an | d feed cor | sumption | | | | | |
| There were no | statistical | ly significant diffe | erences | for body | weight dev | opment betv | veen treatment |
| groups and com | 101. | | > | r 45 | jõ ^v jõj | | 1 |
| | | | | <i>o</i> | | | |
| Table 10.1.1.1- 3 | : Mean | body meight of surv | ising bit | dis S | | | |
| Treatment | <u>j</u> | | Mean | body weig | ght ± S. | S. | |
| [mg product/ | | Females | × °/ | | | Males | |
| kg bw] | Day- 1 | | Day | 14 | Day -1 🔍 | Day 7 | Day 14 |
| 0 (control) O | 1756±1 | 509 190.8 ± 13.6 | 178.4 ± | = 122 11 | 0.6 ± 1 ,7 | 184.2 ± 15.9 | 190.6 ± 6.2 |
| 1000 | 184.0 ± (1 | 5.5 185.6 39.9 | Or88.2 | ±9.5 Ø18 | 33.0 £28.1 | 189.0 ± 19.6 | 195.2 ± 18.7 |
| 2000 | 197.4 1 | 6.6 177.0 10.5 | 192 | 13.2 18 | $38@ \pm 18.6$ | 188.8 ± 8.4 | 185.0 ± 13.8 |
| S.D.: Standard de | viation | | | | | | |
| Food consumpt | ion was r | edweed between a | ay 0-39w | /ithin [®] the | treatment g | roups (reduct | ion of 15 % a |
| 1000 mg prod./k | g bw and | 42 % at 2000 pog p | rod kg b | WO: From | day 3 on, th | e treatment gro | oups consumed |
| similar amounts | ot tood a | s the control | | Ĭ | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Table 10 1 1 1- 4 | ي Mean | Food consumption | ŝ | | | | |
| | U A A | | <u> </u> | Maan fr | d | | |
| Treatmen | levet | | 8 | Iviean 100 | u consumpti /bird/d1 | 011 | |
| [mg product | /kg bw] | Davs 0 - 3 | ; | <u>ig</u> Da | vs 3 - 7 | Day | vs 7 - 14 |
| | 43.4 C n | | | 20 | | 24 | |

15.4

15.9

15.1



Biological findings:

| Table 10.1.1.1- 5: Acute oral toxicity to Bobwhite Quail | |
|--|--|
| Test substance | FLU SC 500 🇞 |
| Test object | Bobwhite Quail (male, female) |
| LD ₅₀ [mg product/kg bw] | > 2000 |
| Lowest observed effect dose (LOED) [mg product/kg bw] | |
| | |
| III. Concersion | |
| > 2000 mg product/kg bw. The LOED was > 2000 mg product/kg bw. The LOED was > 2000 mg product/kg bw. | to FLGSC 560 was determined to be |
| Assessment and conclusion by applicant: | |
| The study and its data are considered & acceptable and reliable | foouse in risk assessment |
| The endpoint is: | |
| $LD_{50} > 2000 \text{ mg product/kg bw.}$ Based on zero mortalities metrapolated to 3776 mg a.s./kg bw. | nong 10 dosed birds, the D_{50} can be |
| | |



CP 10.1.1.2 Higher tier data on birds

Insect and foliage residue decline studies and kinetic evaluations to generate a DT_{50} for higher tier $\hat{J}sk$ assessment on birds and mammals are in the MCA point 8.9.

| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/01 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Attractiveness of tomato fields for Perbivorous monimals and birds, field |
| | monitoring in Lombardia |
| Report No: | C042278 |
| Document No: | <u>M-232304-01-1</u> A Q o A A |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Pesticides and Wildlife Peld Testings Recommendations of a O |
| study: | international workshop on terrestrial field testing of posicide |
| | attached to Pesticide Meets of Terrestrial Wildlife Smervare & |
| | Walker (ed.), Taylor & Frakers, Locaton 1900 |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline not applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted 2 2 2 2 2 2 0 |
| | in DAR (2004) 4 5 5 6 6 |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognise diestine facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yest y y y y |
| | |

The document above was only included for transformercy reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information retevant for the surrent active substance renewal process.

| Data Point: |
|--|
| Report Author: |
| Report Kenr: 2018 & S S |
| Report Mtle: Coneric field study on the foraging behaviour of Yellow Wagtails in tomato fields |
| S The Italy (2013) L L L |
| Report No: A P120 -3 A C |
| Document No: <u>M-07754/91-1</u> 7 6 |
| Guideline(s) follower Begulation (ECN o 1107/2009, EFSA Guidance Document on Risk Assessment |
| study: for Birds and Ammal (2009) |
| Deviation from current Current Guionine: not applicable |
| test gui Arine: |
| Previous evaluation: 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
| n the Addendian No to the DAR (rev 2017) |
| GLP/Officially Yest conduted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised test by Δ |
| facilities: |
| Acceptability/Relignility: PNo 关 |
| |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/03 | |
|----------------------------|--|---------------|
| Report Author: | | |
| Report Year: | 2009 | Ö |
| Report Title: | Generic field monitoring of birds in vegetable fields in Spain | 5 |
| Report No: | R07-199 | |
| Document No: | M-347259-01-1 | |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Council Directive 91/414/EEC | 80 |
| study: | | <i>Q</i> ' |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable 🖉 | C |
| test guideline: | | Å |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted $\sqrt{2}$ | Oʻ |
| | in the DAR (2011) | ¥ |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLI Officially recognised sting bilities | |
| recognised testing | | |
| facilities: | | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes O' V A A | |
| | A P V Q A A O A A | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons once it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance reneval process.

Ô

Ĉn

| KC 10.4.1.2/04 2 4 2 6 |
|--|
| |
| |
| Letter of actors for generit ehavioural ectogy data - Such report Syngenta |
| Lifflited Cumer NA_13468 - Crouping. Veg obles, fost emergence (foliar |
| stages 0 2 2 a a |
| <u>M-347417-01-1</u> X X X X |
| <u>M-347417291-1</u> 0 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 |
| |
| |
| Current Guideline: not applicable 🗸 🔗 |
| |
| Ko, not previouOy submitted & |
| |
| not Splical Control of the second |
| |
| |
| Yes y y y |
| |
| |

The document above was only bicluded for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance renewal process.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/05 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2008 |
| Report Title: | An ecological study of the use of vineyards by birds in Southern France |
| Report No: | <u>M-304340-01-2</u> |
| Document No: | <u>M-304340-01-2</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | |
| study: | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable 🚱 |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted $\sqrt{2}$ |
| | in the DAR (2011) |
| GLP/Officially | not applicable |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | No O U E A Q Q L A |
| | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance reneval process.

| Data Point: | KC 10.4.1.2/06 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2007 <u>4</u> 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
| Report Title: | Theorse of Oneyard by bios in Southern Stance. An ecological study to refine |
| Ś | the risk assessment for insecticide use |
| Report No: | \$R-07-\$\$CB-27\$ |
| Document No: | <u>M-427241-01-1</u> ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |
| Guideline(s) folowed io | SANČO/4 245/2000 2 5 |
| study: O' | |
| Deviations com current | Curren GuideAne: n Sapplicatie |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | ye Devaluated and accepted |
| | the Addendur No. 200 the BAR (2012) |
| GLP/Officially | No, n@condegred up@r GLI Officeally recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | |
| | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information selevant for the current active substance renewal process.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/07 | |
|---|---|----|
| Report Author: | | ~ |
| Report Year: | 2012 | Ö |
| Report Title: | Letter of access for generic behavioural ecology data - Study report ER-07-KZB- 277 from DAS - The use of vinevards by birds in southern grance: An ecological | F |
| | study to refine the risk assessment for insecticide use | |
| Report No: | <u>M-427251-01-1</u> | »_ |
| Document No: | <u>M-427251-01-1</u> | 2 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | SANCO/4145/2000 | 6 |
| study: | | Ľ |
| Deviations from current test guideline: | Current Guideline: not applicable | 0' |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted | |
| GLP/Officially | not applicable & & X & X & X | |
| recognised testing | | |
| facilities: | | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes which a A O A | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance renewal process.

| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/8 5 2 2 2 |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Foragin behavour of the black redstate in vineyards in Germany |
| Report No: | |
| Document No: O | <u>M-487359 M-1</u> 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Rot specified ' |
| study: | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable 🗸 |
| test gutseine: | |
| Previous evaluation of | Ages, evaluated and accepted a |
| | in the Oddengum No. O to the DAR sev 2017) |
| GLP/Officially | No soft conforcted water GOP/Off Gally recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testorg | |
| Accounted bible / Delightliter | |
| Acceptablety/Reliability: | |
| | |





| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/09 |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2006 |
| Report Title: | Feeding ecology of the relevant insectivorous bird species in strawberry field in |
| Donort No. | Germany O' |
| Document No ⁻ | M-342897-01-1 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | not applicable; the test was especially designed for the purpose of the study |
| study: | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | in the DAR (2011) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GP /Officially resignised testing facilities |
| recognised testing facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes A & Q Q & O Q A |
| | |
| | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance renewal process. n Ø , Å

| Data Point: | 6 CP 100.1.2/10 Q |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Lefter of a cess for genetic behavioural ecology data - Study report R-20183 - |
| | Grouping strawerry (foliar stages) - Cuthor, year: Moosmayer P, 2006 |
| Report No: | <u>M-347237-01-1</u> X X X X |
| Document No: | <u>M-347237-101-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed m | |
| study: 🖉 | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable 🔿 🥎 |
| test guiligine: | |
| Previous evaluation ? | Ko, not peviou Dy subwitted K |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | not pplical a s |
| recognised test dg | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes y y |
| | |
| | |

The document above was only docluded for pansparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance renewal process.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/11 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2016 |
| Report Title: | Determination of residues of fluopyram in Poecilus cupreus (coleoptera: |
| | carabidae) using an extended laboratory test |
| Report No: | CW15/045 |
| Document No: | <u>M-545010-01-2</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Heimbach et al. (2000) modified |
| study: | US EPA OCSPP Guideline No. 8 CSUPP |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted |
| | in the Addendum No. 4 to the DAR (rev. 2017) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GDP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | No A R Q Q A O D A |

The document above was included here in this section for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It contains information relevant for the current acrive substance renewal process. The full study summary is presented under MGA 8.901 following the latest reporting and evaluation criteria. The location MCA was chosen for presenting the detailed study data to acilitate an easier and consistent review of all refinement data in one place, since the endpoints derived are relevant for several MCPs.

| Data Point: | KCP 49.1.1.242 ~ ~ ~ ~ |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Residue decline of flux yram for arthropods after spray application in vines in |
| × × | Germany of O O |
| Report S. | <u>M-33376-61-2</u> |
| Document No: | <u>MA53376-01-2</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Regulzion (EC) No 1107/2006 EFSA Guidance Document on Risk Assessment |
| study: | for Bods and Mamraas (2009) |
| e õ | USEPA QCSPP Grideling No. 867. SUPP |
| Deviations from curr ot | Offrent Odidelfing. not applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous or aluation: | yes Valuat@ and accepted |
| | in the Addendum of 6.4 to the DAR (rev 2017) |
| GLP Officially | Ass, conducted under GPP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/seliability: | |
| | Si w S |
| | |

The document above was included here in this section for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It contains information relevant for the current active substance renewal process. The full study summary is presented under MCA 8.9/02 following the latest reporting and evaluation criteria. The location MCA was chosen for presenting the detailed study data to facilitate an easier and consistent review of all refinement data in one place, since the endpoints derived are relevant for several MCPs.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/13 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2016 |
| Report Title: | Kinetic evaluation of fluopyram residues in foliage dwelle and flying in out in the |
| | vines - Fluopyram (AE C656948) |
| Report No: | EnSa-15-0934 |
| Document No: | <u>M-544286-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | not applicable |
| study: | V O O O S |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and acceptor \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} |
| | in the Addendum No. 4 to the DAR (reg 2017) |
| GLP/Officially | No, not conducted unker GLP@fficiatly recognised testing facilities V |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | $Yes \qquad \qquad$ |
| | |
| | |

The document above was included here in this section for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It contains information relevant for the current active substance renewal process. The full study summary is presented under MCA 80/03 following the latest reporting and evaluation criteria. The location MCA was chosen for presenting the detailed study datago facilitate an easier and consistent review of all reference data in one place, since the endpoints derived are relevant for several MCPs.

| Data Point: | KCP¥0.1.&2/14 X & X & X |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author | |
| Report Year: | 2015 |
| Report Title. | Resider declare of fluepyram and premiocofficial on arthropods after spray |
| | appreation oilseed rappreads in Weston Germany |
| Report No: | PAN067 42 47 4 47 |
| Document No: | M-544 90-01 M |
| Guideline(s) folloged in | Regration (CC) No $4107/2009$, |
| study: | EEA Guionce Documer on Rig Assessment for Birds and Mammals (2009) |
| Deviations from currout | Ourrent Guideling, not inplicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous @aluation: | yes Valuat @ and accepted |
| | in the Addendum to . 4 whe DAR (rev 2017) |
| GLP Officially | thes, conducted under GPP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Keliability: | |
| | |
| | |

The document above was included here in this section for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It contains information relevant for the current active substance renewal process. The full study summary is presented under MCA 8.9/04 following the latest reporting and evaluation criteria. The location MCA was chosen for presenting the detailed study data to facilitate an easier and consistent review of all refinement data in one place, since the endpoints derived are relevant for several MCPs.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/15 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2016 |
| Report Title: | Kinetic evaluation of fluopyram residues in foliage dwelle and flying in out in the |
| | oilseed rape |
| Report No: | EnSa-16-0035 |
| Document No: | <u>M-545077-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | none O A A A S |
| study: | V Q Q Q V V |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accept of a grad acce |
| | in the Addendum No. 4 to the DAR (rep 2017) |
| GLP/Officially | No, not conducted unker GLP@fficiatly recognised testing facilities * |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | $Yes \qquad \qquad$ |
| | |
| | |

The document above was included here in this section for transparence reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It contains information relevant for the current active substance renewal process. The full study summary is presented under MCA 80/05 following the latest reporting and evaluation criteria. The location MCA was chosen for presenting the detailed study datago facilitate an easier and consistent review of all referement data in one place, since the endpoints derived are relevant for several MCPs.

| Š | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Data Point: | KCP¥0.1.&2/16 × L × × K |
| Report Author | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title. | Fluor am - Fluor - Fluopyram - |
| | OE O-Join Review/ EU-Syrkstor pruefing zur Aufnahme von Wirkstoffen in |
| | Annang Lder Ric Minie 99/414/EWG |
| Report No: | <u>M-40999-01</u> |
| Document No: | <u>M-400909-011</u> × |
| Guideline(s) followed | nor pecification of or |
| study: 🔊 🖉 | |
| Deviations from current | Curre OGuid dive: no applico le |
| test guideone: | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, Evaluated and acceptor |
| | |
| GLP Officially | not applicable of other |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptabilite Reliability: | Sies |
| A S C | |
| | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance renewal process.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.1.2/17 |
|---|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2012 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram - Peer review of new active substance - Request for additional information - Ecotoxicology - EFSA Letter Ref D(2012) Ho/JS/al/620027, dated January 24, 2012 |
| Report No: | M-428668-01-1 |
| Document No: | M-428668-01-1 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Data Directive 91/414/EEC |
| study: | Bee Studies, not yet Peer Reviewed |
| Deviations from current test guideline: | Current Guideline: not applicable |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepter y |
| GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities: | not applicable |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes V X X A A O X |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance renewal process.

| CP 10.1.2 | Effects of | n terrest | rial verte | Dirates 4 | wher the | n birds 👡 |
|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|--|------------|-----------|
| | Ő, | o za | Å Å | Ş 4 | <i>a</i> , | 0° 4″ |
| | | | J. N | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | |

| Test | Test design Fest species Endpoint | Reference |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| substance | | |
| R.J. | Active oral 4 4 7 10° 4° 2000 mg a.s./kg bw | (2005) M-259398-01-1 KCA 5.2.1/01 |
| Fluopyram | generation Rate Rate A NOAEL = 14.5 mg a.s./kg bw/ | d (2008) |
| A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A | | <u>M-299334-01-1</u> KCA 5.6.1/02 |

| Table 10.1.2 ² 2: Relevant ind | icator species for screening risk as | ssessment | |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | | Shortcut | value (SV) |
| The Prop of the second | Indicator species | Acute RA based on RUD90 | Long-term RA based on RUD _m |
| | | Subta on http:// | Susta on Hees |

Small herbivorous mammal

136.4

72.3

Orchards (apples)



 $\overline{}$

ACUTE DIETARY RISK ASSESSMENT

| Table 10.1.2- 3: | Screening acute ris | k assessmen | t for ma | mmals | | | | | Ş |
|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|------|----------------------|-------|---------|--------|
| | Indicator | | DDD | | | L2050 | .e | | 0* |
| Сгор | species | Appl. rate [kg a.s./ha] | SV90 | MAF ₉₀ | DDD | [ung a.s./ kg bw] | | Trigger | Ĉa |
| Orchards (apples) | Small herbivorous mammal | 0.075 | 136.4 | ئچ 1.0 | 10.2 | > 2000 | ¥ 196 | 9 10 S | ,* |

The TERA value is above the trigger of 10. Therefore, a Tier 1 risk assessment is not required

Acute risk assessment for mammals drinking confaminated water from puddles

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 (in g/ha) to relevant endpoint (in mg/kg bw/d) does not exceed 50 in the case of less sorptive substances (Koc 500 J/kg) or 3000 in the case of more sorptive substances (Koc 500 J/kg).

With a K(f)oc of 232.1 L/kg, floopyram belongs to the group of less sorptive substances,

 Table 10.1.2- 4:
 Evaluation of potential concern for exposure of mammals from trinking water (acute, escape clarge)

| | | | ~ . a | | s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s | | (" ″ | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|------------|
| | Crop | | Koc | ÁReff (Appl. rate | | Ratio | [©] "Escape clause" | Conclusion |
| | | ç v | ¶≰/kg] | × MAFm) [g a&/ha] | Akg bw | | No concern if ratio | Conclusion |
| | Orchards (apples) | Fluopyrato | 232 A | ⁷⁵ | > 2000 * | ØK 0.038 | ≤ 50 | No concern |
| A | Ko Value given i | n MCP 9.2. 1 (T | ab 🕅 9.2.4 | - 1) Ö | N NO |) | | |

According to the EFSA GD 2009 "no specific calculations of exposure and TER are necessary when the ratio of effective application rate (in g/tal) to relevant and point (in mg/kg bw) does not exceed 50 in the case of less sorptive substances (Kog < 500 L/kg) > This is the case for fluopyram. Therefore, the acute risk for mammals from dipking water that may contain residues from fluopyram is acceptable.

LONG-TERM RÉPROPUCTIVE ASSESSMENT

Table 10.1.2- 51 Screening ong-tecm reproductive risk assessment for mammals

| Indicator | ~Ŷ | DDD | | | | NOAEL | | | |
|---|----------------------------|------|------|------|------|----------------------|-------------------|---------|--|
| Crop species | Appl. rate [kg a.s./ha] | SVm | MAFm | fтwa | DDD | [mg a.s./kg bw/d] | TER _{LT} | Trigger | |
| Orchards(rapples) Sinall herbivorous mammal | 0.075 | 72.3 | 1.0 | 0.53 | 2.87 | 14.5 | 5.05 | 5 | |



The TER_{LT} value calculated in the chronic risk assessment on screening level exceeds the trigger of 5. Therefore, the long-term risk to mammals can be considered as acceptable.

Long-term risk assessment for mammals drinking contaminated water from puddles

| Long-term risk | assessment for mammals drinking contaminated water from puddle | s and an |
|------------------|--|--------------|
| Table 10.1.2- 6: | Evaluation of potential concern for exposure of mammals from drinking term, escape clause) | water (tong- |

| Сгор | Compound | Koc [L/kg] | AReff (Appl. rate × MAFm) [g a.s./hap | NOAEL () fing a.s./ , kg bw/d] | Ratio (AReff/ NOAEL)° | "Escape clause" No concerp | Conclusion | |
|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|--|
| Orchards (apples) | Fluopyram | 232.1 ^A | 75 | o14.5 | 5.17 | © ≤ 3 0 | No concern | |
| A K _{OC} value give | n in MCP 9.2.4.1 | (Table 9. | 2.4-1) | Ŭ N | 4 .0 | | 4 | |

According to the EFSA GD 2009 "no specific calculations of exposure and TER are necessare when the ratio of effective application rate (in g/ha) to relevant endpoint (in mg/kg &w/d) does not exceed does not exceed 50 in the case of less sorphive substances (Koc 500 4 Rg) or 3000 in the case of more sorptive substances (Koc > 500 L/kg)." This is the case for fluopyran Therefore, the long term risk for mammals from drinking water that may contain residues from fluopyram Bacceptable

RISK ASSESSMENT OF SECONDARY POSONING

According to the EFSAGD 2009, substances with the Pow > 3 have potential to bioaccumulation and should be assessed for the risk of the magnification in actuatic and terrestrial food chains.

| | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | . Oʻ | \sim | v vQ | |
|------------------|--|------|---------|-------------------|-----|
| Table 10.1.2- 7: | ک ^۲ Log | Row | value (| of <i>f</i> luopy | ram |

| Subst | ance | OLog Row | Compartment | Reference |
|-------|------|-------------|--------------------|--|
| Fluop | yram | 3 50(20 °C) | Soil surface water | (2006) <u>M-280089-01-1</u> MCA, 2.7 |
| -0 | | | Y & A | |

The log Pow value of floopyran is 3 mand thus effects on secondary poisoning have been assessed.

Mammalian generic focal species for the Tier 1 risk assessment of secondary Table 10.122-8: poisoning

| Generic mammalian indicator species | Body weight (g) | Example | FIR/bw |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------|
| Earthworm eater | لم 100 | Common shrew | 1.28 |
| K Fish cater 0 S | V 1000 | Otter | 0.142 |
| | | | |



Long-term DDD and TER calculation for earthworm-eating mammals

Important remark by the applicant: The PEC_{soil} and TER values as presented below are interimed alues and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant intends to provide final PEC_{soil} values and revised TER calculations latest by end of March 2022.

| | | | | ~ | | () ¥ | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|------------|---------------------|----------|--|--------------------------|--------------|
| | | | A | Fhuspy | ræm° / | 4 4 | |
| | | | Arier 1 | \sim . | <u>0 </u> | Refinement | à <u>c</u> í |
| Kow | | 0 | 2060° | | | 2060~ | d' |
| K _{OC} [mL/g] | | C |) 232 4 A | | × Č | 232 J A | A co |
| foc | | 4 | <u></u> ∞.02 ~ | Ŭ Q | | 0.02 | |
| BCFworm | | | ∽√5.5 | | | _≪0.85 [°] C, | |
| PECsoil, accu (mg/kg) | | | , 0.№7 ^B | | | Ø 0.15 | 0 |
| PECworm (mg/kg) | | | ×9.864 × |) ~ * | Ĵ, Ĵ | [°] Q\$33 | ļ. |
| FIR/bw | Ą | i bi | © 1.2℃ | R d | | رْبْ 1.28 كَمْ | ŷ |
| DDD (mg/kg bw/d) | | 22 | | | Ô° 4 | ≥ ⁰ 0.1\$\$\$ | |
| NO(A)EL (mg/kg bw/d) | | | £14.5 | | s S | 14.5 | |
| TER _{LT} | Ŷ Ó | | ¢ 13.1 | | | 84.9 | |
| Trigger | A | | S S | | K . | S 5 | |
| A K voluo givon in M | $CD \cap \gamma 4^{1}$ (T | ab CO 24 W | Or v | | la va | ~// | |

Tier 1 long-term DDD and TER calculation for earthworm-eating mampials in apple Table 10.1.2-9:

В

С





Long-term DDD and TER calculation for fish-eating mammals

Important remark by the applicant: The PEC_{sw} and TER values as presented below are interine values and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant intends to provide final PECsw values and revised TER calculations latest by end of March 2022.

| Table 10.1.2- 10: | Tier 1 long-term DDD and TER | calculation for | fishcating | mammals in apple | es |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------|------------------|----|
| | | 11/1 0 | 05.0 | | |

| | 1 | Q^{\prime} | Fluopyram | ' Č ,Ø |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|---|----------|
| BCF _{fish} | or " | | ⁷ KQ ^A O ^V | is and |
| FOCUS Step 2 PECsw (twa, 21 d) (mg/L) | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | 0%90626% ^B | |
| PEC _{fish} (mg/kg) | | | 0.100 | |
| FIR/bw | | | > 0.142 | |
| DDD (mg/kg bw/d) | | | \$ 014 | |
| NO(A)EL (mg/kg bw/d) | | | × 14.5 | |
| TERLT | | | × 10 20 × | y O |
| Trigger | | | | <i>b</i> |

A Measured BCF resulting from a bjoconcentration study in fish, please refer to MCA 802.3 21 d twa PECsw value given in MCP 9.2 @Table @2.5- 6 @pples. 07 75 gas./ha) @CUS Step 2, Northern Europe, В autumn application as worst case O

M The TER values for fluopycam are above the trigger of concern of 5, indicating neursk from secondary poisoning for earthworm- and fish-eating marina

Ne orak toxicity to mamma **CP 10.1.2.1** P

Mammalian of ticity data of the formulated product FLU SC 500 Table 10.1.2 11:

| Test substance | Test design | Species Endpoint | Reference |
|----------------|-------------|--|--|
| FLU SC 500 | Acute | Rat LD ₅₀ 2000 mg prod./kg bw | (2008) <u>M-298203-01-1</u> KCA 7.1.1/02 |
| | | | |
| AY AY | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |



CP 10.1.2.2 Higher tier data on mammals

Insect and foliage residue decline studies and kinetic evaluations to generate a DT_{50} for higher tier $\hat{J}sk$ assessment on birds and mammals are in the MCA point 8.9.

| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.2.2/01 |
|---|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Attractiveness of tomato fields for erbivorous monimals and birds, field |
| Report No: | C042278 |
| Document No: | <u>M-232304-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in study: | Pesticides and Wildlife – Celd Testings Recommendations of a C international workshop of terrestrial figure testing of projecides attached to Pesticide Friedrics of Terrestrial Wildlife Somervare & Walker (ed.), Taylor & Francis, Locion 1200 |
| Deviations from current test guideline: | Current Guideling not applicable |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
| GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities: | Yes, constructed under GLP/Officially recognise@testing.facilites |
| Acceptability/Keliability: | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It does not contain information retevant for the current active substance renewal process.

| <u>~~</u> ~ | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Data Point: | KCP 10,1.2.2/02 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Var: | |
| Report Title: | AS C656948 502 SC - Mygnitude of the vesidue in/on grass forage, fodder, and |
| | hay (creat group, 17) and grass for seed |
| Report No: | RACTP044 C |
| Document No: | <u>MAY073501-1</u> N N N |
| Guideline(s) Qilowed n | 6 A Ret. OPPTS 860, 500, Goop Field Trials |
| study: | |
| Deviation from current of | Current Gui@line: (1/1 applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation | tes, evaluated 201 accepted |
| · ¥ | In the AR (2011) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes conduced under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Religibility: | Yes 2 |
| J Z A | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It is considered superseded by the trials from EU countries submitted and analysed in the MCA point 89.



 \bigcirc

| Data Point: | KCP 10.1.2.2/03 | |
|----------------------------|--|----|
| Report Author: | | ~ |
| Report Year: | 2008 | Ô, |
| Report Title: | Foliar half-life calculation for AE C656948 in grass forage and hay | ř |
| Report No: | EBGMP158 | |
| Document No: | M-300703-01-1 | |
| Guideline(s) followed in | 850.SUPP | |
| study: | | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable 🚱 | a |
| test guideline: | | Ç |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted $\sqrt{2}$ |) |
| | in the DAR (2011) | |
| GLP/Officially | No, not conducted under AP/Officially recognis a testing facilities | |
| recognised testing | | |
| facilities: | | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes O' Y Y Y Y Y A A | |
| | A $\tilde{\sigma}$ $\tilde{\sigma}$ \tilde{Q} \tilde{Q} $\tilde{\sigma}$ $\tilde{\sigma}$ $\tilde{\sigma}$ | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. It is considered superseded by the trials from EU countries submitted and analysed in the MCA point 8.9.

| Data Point: | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Report Author | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Statement on resource disspation of fluopyram intreated foliage of dicotyledonous |
| | Mants: Phetice Valuation 0 |
| Report No: | $EnSay 12-0.018$ \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim |
| Document Nos | <u>Mod 2693 202-1 60 50 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60 60</u> |
| Guideline(s) followe@in | Kot applicable |
| study: | |
| Deviation from current O | Current Guerrant applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation | Ses, evaluated and accepted (1) |
| CL D/Officially | In ingendersom Ng. 2 to the DAR (2012) |
| recognised temps | No for conducted tailer of granny recognised testing facilities |
| facilities | |
| Acceptability, Reliability; | Yes N 67 % w |
| | |
| | A O Y |
| The document above wa | Sonly included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing |
| process. It is considered s | uperseded by the trails from EU countries submitted and analysed in the MCA |
| point 8 9 | |
| | |
| | |
| 29 D A | |
| | |
| | |
| × Å | |
| Ű | |
| | |



ñ

Ì

CP 10.1.3 Effects on other terrestrial vertebrate wildlife (reptiles and amphibians)

Information on effects of fluopyram on reptiles or amphibians is not available. No guidelines for studies with terrestrial amphibian life stages and reptiles are available and no risk assessments schemes are stablished so far. Therefore, no further studies can be suggested for these groups of organisms

CP 10.2 Effects on aquatic organisms

The risk assessment is based on the current guidance: EFSA PPR Panel EFSA Panel Plan Protection Products and their Residues), 2013. Guidance on tiered risk assessment for plant protection products for aquatic organisms in edge-of-field surface waters. EFSA Journal 2013;11(7):3290.

D

Ĉĥ

| 1 able 10.2- 1: | aquatic organisms | | | |
|-------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Test substance | Test species | Time scate/ Study | | Reference |
| | Fish, acute Oncorhynchus mykiss | 96 h | $L_{50} > 236 \text{ mg pod./L (nom)}$ (~>100 mg a,s./L) ^A | (2013) <u>M6467867-01-1</u> KCP 10.2.1/05 |
| | Fish, acuto Cyprinus carpto | © 96 h (static | LC50 > 200 mg prod./L (nom) | (2010) <u>M-366324-01-1</u> KCP 10.2.1/06 |
| | Invertebrate, acute Daphnia nagna | 48 h Å | EC $= 141 \text{ mg prod./L (nom)}$ ($= 59.2 \text{ mg a.s./L}$) | (2010) <u>M-366819-01-1</u> KCP 10.2.1/07 |
| | Green algae Pseudokirchneriefta subcapitata | ¢° ; 0 -72 h/ | $E_rC_{p} = 16.1 \text{ mg prod./L (nom)}$ (~ = 6.79 mg a.s./D) | (2008) <u>M-299910-01-1</u> KCP 10.2.1/08 Recalculation by |
| FLU SC 500 | (currently known as Raphidocetis subcapitata) | stafic | $E_y = 8.39$ mg prod./L (nom) $E_y = 8.39$ mg prod./L (nom) | (2020) <u>M-757704-01-1</u> KCP 10.2.1/09 |
| | Green algae | 0 - 78 h / | E _n C ₀ = 14.6 mg prod./L (nom) | (2010) <u>M-367124-03-1</u> KCP 10.2.1/10 Recalculation by |
| | (currently known as Raphidocetis subcapilata) | static .~ | $E_r C_{10} = 6.89 \text{ mg prod./L (nom)}$ $E_b C_{50} = 8.82 \text{ mg prod./L (nom)}$ $E_y C_{50} = 9.00 \text{ mg prod./L (nom)}$ | (2020) M-757717-01-1 KCP 10 2 1/11 |
| | Aquatic macrophyte | √0 ⁰ 7 d / static | $E_rC_{50} = 16.2 \text{ mg prod./L (nom)}$ (~ = 6.80 mg a.s./L) $E_rC_{10} = 4.78 \text{ mg prod./L (nom)}$ $E_vC_{50} = 11.9 \text{ mg prod./L (nom)}$ | (2020) <u>M-758230-01-1</u> KCP 10 2 1/12 |
| Eluony St | Fig., acuse Oncorhynchus mykiss | 96 h / static | $LC_{50} > 1.89 \text{ mg a.s./L (nom)}$ | (2008) <u>M-277770-02-1</u> KCA 8.2.1/01 |
| tech. | Fish, acute Lepomis macrochirus | 96 h / static | $LC_{50} > 5.68 \text{ mg a.s./L (nom)}$ | (2008) <u>M-278441-02-1</u> KCA 8.2.1/02 |
| 1 | Fish acute | 96 h / | $LC_{50} > 4.95 \text{ mg a s}/L \text{ (mm)}^{B}$ | |



| Test substance | Test species | Time scale/ Study type | Endpoint | Reference 0° |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | Pimephales promelas | static | | (2008) <u>M-298958-01-1</u> KCA&2.1/03 |
| | Fish, acute <i>Cyprinus carpio</i> | 96 h / static | $LC_{50} = 80.5 \text{ mg a.s./L (fmm)}^{C}$ | (2007) <u>M-280108-01-1</u> ©CA <u>80</u> 1/04 |
| | Fish, acute Cyprinodon variegatus | 96 h / static | $L_{50} > 0.98 \text{ mg} \text{ Q}_{5/L} \text{ (mm)}$ | (200%) M279167-01-1 RCA 82.1/05 |
| | Fish, acute Geometric mean | 96 h 🕵 stati | Geometric orean 5 $L_{50} = 4.37$ mg a.s./L 5 | |
| | Fish, chronic (ELS) Pimephales promela | C 33 g 75 fl&v- thorugh | VOEC = 0.135 sog a.s. (mm) $VC_{10} = 0.162 \text{ sog a.s.} (mm)$ | $\begin{array}{c} & & & & & \\ & & & &$ |
| | Fish, BCF Jow- | 26 d ex Ossure depursio n / flow- | BCF whole fish, we weight $=$ 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 | KCA 8.2.2.1/02 (2008) M-298506-01-1 KCA 8.2.2.3/01 |
| | Biertebolie, achte Dapht in magnd | 48 h staffc | $EV_{50} > 2Omg a QL (nors)$ | (2006) <u>M-278709-01-1</u> <u>KCA 8.2.4.1/01</u> |
| | Seminent weller sub-chronic Leptocovirus plum Hosus (50 ed sedament) | 10 d | $I_{C_{50}} > 10^{\circ} \text{mg} \sqrt{2} \text{kg (mm)}$ OEC 100 rQ a.s./kg (mm) | (2008) <u>M-297751-01-1</u> <u>KCA 8.2.4.2/01</u> |
| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | Invertorate, Sute Crassostrea Girginica | 96 fr fow- through | C ₅₀ > G44 mg a.s./L (mm) (shell deposition and mortality) | (2006) M-282691-01-1 KCA 8.2.4.2/02 |
| | Invertebrate, Qute Am Cicam Sis bahig | 9657 Kw- Grough | QLC ₅₀ > 0.50 mg a.s./L (mm) | (2007) M-282839-01-2 KCA 8.2.4.2/03 |
| Ś | Invertebrate, acute Geometric nean | Q. | Geometric mean $EC_{50} = 1.638 \text{ mg a.s./L}$ | |
| | Invertebrate Onronic Definia mogna | 21 d / static- renewal | NOEC = 1.25 mg a.s./L (nom) EC ₁₀ : not determined ^D | (2008) <u>M-282102-02-1</u> KCA 8.2.5.1/01 Recalculation by (2020) <u>M-758376-01-1</u> KCA 8.2.5.1/02 |
| | Sediment dweller, chronic (54 d, Life cycle) | 54 d / static- renewal | NOEC = 26 mg a.s./kg (mm) EC ₁₀ : not determined ^D | (2008) <u>M-298809-01-1</u> KCA 8.2.5.3/01 |



| Test | | Time | | |
|--|--|--------------------|---|--|
| substance | Test species | scale/ Study | Endpoint | Reference $@^\circ$ |
| | Chironomus tentans | type | - - - | Recalculation by |
| | (spiked sediment) | | a start and a start a s | (2020) |
| | | | 4 | KCA08.2.5.2.02 |
| | Sediment dweller, | | NOFC 21 39 mg as / nom) | |
| | chronic (28 d Life Cuele) | 28 d / | $EC_{10} = 0.54 \text{ mg a.s.}(\text{nom})$ | |
| | <i>Chironomus riparius</i> | static | EC = 1.37 mg a (nom) | KCA8.2.5 Q01 |
| | (spiked water) | | $E_{50} > 32 \text{ mg a QL (nom)}^{-1}$ | |
| | Sediment dweller, | 29.44 | | |
| | Leptocheirus | Statio | NCQC = 32 mg as.kg(nHq) | M _≠ 298810+02-1 |
| | plumulosus | renewal | $\mathcal{L}_{50} > \mathcal{G}_{50}$ mg a \mathcal{G}_{50} (1851) " \mathcal{G}_{50} | 6 A 8.25 .4/02 & |
| | (spiked sediment) | | | |
| | | | | (257) |
| | Green algae | | F.C. 50 S 9 mora s / (2000) | 28-286561-01-1 |
| | subcapitata ^E | &- 72 hz | $E_r = 7.1$ $Rg a.s. O(mm)$ | KCA 8.2.6.1/01 Recalculation by |
| | (currently know as | 🗸 stati@ | $E_{50} = 3$ $\%$ / mg $\%$ /L (n $\%$) | Recalculation by |
| | subcapitata) | ð í | $E_yC_{50} = 4.20$ mg/a.s./Lation) | (2020) |
| | | | | <u>M-757659-01-1</u> KCA 8 2 6 1/03 |
| | | - O | | |
| | | | | (2007) M 280800 01 1 |
| | S. O. N | | $E_{\mu}Q_{0} = 9.05 \text{ mg a } \epsilon/L \text{ (mQ)}$ | <u>M-289899-01-1</u> KCA 8.2.6.2/01 |
| | Breshwater diatom | 0 - An / | $\mathcal{L}_{10} = \mathcal{L}_{23} \text{ mg}(\mathcal{L}_{10}, \mathcal{L}_{10}, \mathcal{L}_{10})$ | Recalculation by |
| Ő | | | $E_yC_{\varphi} = 5.64$ G_{y} a.s. \mathcal{U} (mm) | (2020) |
| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | \$ \$ \$ | | | M-757699-01-1 |
| Ê, | | | | KCA 8.2.6.2/04 |
| | | | | (2007) |
| | Q A & | | | <u>M-287289-01-1</u> |
| | Marie diation | Q-Q2h/ | $PE_{r}C_{10}$ $PI.13 mg a.s./L (mm)$ | KCA 8.2.6.2/03 |
| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | Skeletonega costarim | Static & | $E_b C > 1.13 \text{ mg a.s./L (mm)}$ | Recalculation by |
| J. | | F | $E_{V} = 50^{-50} > 1.13 \text{ mg a.s./L (mm)}$ | (2020) |
| | | | \mathcal{P}^{*} | $\frac{M-757680-01-1}{VCA}$ |
| Ly S → | | \$ | $E_r C_{50} = 2.51 \text{ mg a.s./L (nom)}$ | (2021) |
| | Aquatic macropayte, | solic | $E_r C_{10} = 1.58 \text{ mg a.s./L (nom)}$ | <u>M-283647-02-1</u> |
| Ó | | () | $E_yC_{50} = 2.12 \text{ mg a.s./L (nom)}$ | KCA 8.2.7/01 |
| , A | Invertebrate, acute | @ - 48 h / | EC50 > 88.7 mg p m./L (nom) | <u>M-759029-01-1</u> |
| | peraphnika maguar Angla angla ang | static | | KCA 8.2.4.1/02 |
| Fluenvram-@ | Green algae | 0 -72 h / | $E_rC_{50} = 20.9 \text{ mg p m./L (nom)}$ $E_rC_{10} = 20.2 \text{ mg n m /L (nom)}$ | |
| hydroxy | Pseudokachneriella | static | $E_yC_{50} = 13.0 \text{ mg p m./L (nom)}$ | (2020) |
| Č ^O ^v | (currently known as | 0.0(1.) | $E_r C_{50} = 21.1 \text{ mg p m./L (nom)}$ | <u>M-758708-01-1</u> KCA 8.2 (1/07 |
| _ | Raphidocelis | 0-96 h / static | $E_r C_{10} = 20.4 \text{ mg p m./L (nom)}$ $E_v C_{50} = 13.7 \text{ mg p m./L (nom)}$ | KCA 8.2.0.1/05 |
| | subcapitata) | Suite | $E_bC_{50} = 12.6 \text{ mg p m./L (nom)}$ | |



| Test substance | Test species | Time scale/ Study type | Endpoint | Reference |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | Aquatic macrophyte Lemna gibba | 7 d / static | $E_rC_{50} = 9.2 \text{ mg p m./L (mm)}$ $E_rC_{10} = 5.2 \text{ mg p m./L (mm)}$ $E_yC_{50} = 7.1 \text{ mg p m./L (mm)}$ | (2020) <u>M-759050-01-1</u> KCA_8-2.7/02 |
| | Fish, acute Brachydanio rerio | 96 h / static | LC ₅₀ > 1200 mg p m./L (room Na- TEA) 1008 mg p m./L (nom TFA) ^F | (1992) ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ |
| | Invertebrate, acute Daphnia magna | 0 - 48 h / static 《 | EC:0 > 1200 mg sm./L (nom Na TFA) > 1008 mg p m./L (nom TFA) | (1992) M-247,890-01 KCA \$.2.4.1403 |
| | Invertebrate, chronic Daphnia magna | 21 d / Semi- * | NOEC \leq 30 mg p.m./L (nom Na \leq FA) \geq 25.2 mg p.m./L (nom TEA) F TEA) F FO ₁₀ : nor determined P | (2010) M-615126-0451 KCX 8.2.5 03 |
| | | | $F_rCs_0 \gtrsim 1.2 \text{ mgp.m./L (nom Na-TFA) > 1.09 \text{ mg pm./L (nom)}TFA) F = 1.09 mg pm./L (nom)TFA) F = 1.2 mgp m./L (nom)$ | |
| | Green algae Pseudokinchneriella subcapitata ^E (currently known as Rashidocalis | 0 -7©h / | TFA) F > 1.04 mg p.m./L (nom TFA) ^F $E_bC_{56} > 1.2$ mg p m./5 (nom Na- \sim TFA) α | (1993) <u>M-247818-02-1</u> KCA 8.2.6.1/06 Re-evaluation by (2021) |
| Trifluoro- acetic acid (TFA) | | | > 1.67 mg p.m./L.(nom f_{x} TFA) ^F $E_{y}C_{z} = 1.2$ and p m/L (nom Na- f_{y} TFA) | M-762268-02-1 KCA 8.2.6.1/07 |
| ÊĞ | | | $ \begin{array}{c} \hline Frc_{A} & F \\ \hline Frc_{A} & F \\ \hline Frc_{A} & = 160 \text{ mg p m./L (nom Na-} \\ \hline Frc_{A} & = 194.4 \text{ mg p.m./L (nom Na-} \\ \hline Frc_{A} & F $ | |
| | Green algae Pseudopirchnertella | 0.42 h /~ | \bigcirc * | (1992) <u>M-247820-01-1</u> KCA 8.2.6.1/08 Re-evaluation by |
| | Raphidocelis | | $\begin{array}{c} \text{TFA} \\ > 4.03 \text{ mg p} \text{ ms } D \text{ (nom 1 cl} \\ \text{TFA} \text{)} \\ \\ \text{F} \\ \text{E}_{y}\text{C}_{50} = 4.190 \text{ mg p} \text{ m./L (nom Na-TFA)} \end{array}$ | (2021) <u>M-762208-02-1</u> KCA 8.2.6.1/09 |
| | Green algae Pseudokirchneriella | | = 3.52 mg p.m./L (nom TFA) ^F E _r C ₅₀ = 237.07 mg p.m./L (nom) = 241.95 mg p.m./L (mm) | (2017) |
| Ċ ^{Ov} | subcapitata (currently known as Raphidocelis subcapitata) | 0 -72 h / Static | $ \begin{array}{l} E_r C_{10} = 5.59 \text{ mg p.m./L (nom)} \\ = 5.80 \text{ mg p.m./L (mm)} \\ E_b C_{50} = 26.866 \text{ mg p.m./L (mm)} \\ E_y C_{50} = 18.956 \text{ mg p m./L (mm)} \end{array} $ | <u>M-615180-01-1</u> KCA 8.2.6.1/12 Re-evaluation by (2021) |



L.

| Test substance | Test species | Time scale/ Study type | Endpoint | Reference ذ |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | M-762267 01-1 KCA 8.2,6.1/12 |
| | Aquatic macrophyte Lemna gibba | 7 d / static | $E_{y}C_{50} = 1100 \text{ mg p.m./L (nom Na-TFA)} = 024 \text{ mg p m./L (nom TFA)}^{F}$ $E_{r}C_{50} = >2016 \text{ mg p m./L (nom TFA)}^{F}$ $TFA)^{F}$ $C_{r}C = 252 \text{ mg p m./L (nom TFA)}^{F}$ $E_{r}C_{50} = 308 \text{ mg p m./L (nom TFA)}^{F}$ | Vet al. (1993) M-247960-01-1 CCA \$2.7/03 Endpoint recalculation by (2021) M-768038-07-1 KCA 8.2.2006 |

Note:

Studies referring to KCA are filed in the dossier for the active substance Studies written in grey type are referring to studies in the corresponding Baseline-tossier, whereas chadies in black type are

studies of the Supplemental dossier

Bold values used in risk assessment

- A Justification on relevance of endpoint available for doc J OP FLUC 5000 M-758955-029
- B Practical limit of water solubility
- In all test levels precipitations were observable so the LC₅₀ icelearly above the water solubility of the test item.
- ^D Not determined due to nighematical reasons
- E Formerly known as Selenastrum capricornutum
- F As the study was conducted with sodium trifluoroacetare which B the sodium salt of trifluoroacetic acid, the endpoint was converted to Turfluoroacetic acid/with factor 0.84

Metabolites

Metabolites For and Trifluor acetic acid (FA) are relevant for the aquatic risk assessment No metabolite is relevant for sediment risk assessment

The EFS CAGD (2013) stepwise approach was used for all metabolites to be addressed in the risk assessment:

- Step 1: Are the studies with the active substance adequate for assessing the potential effect of the metabolity?
- Step 3: Step 3: Step 3: Step 4: Step 4
- Step 4: Identify the species or taxonomic group determining the lowest tier 1 RAC_{sw,ac} for the parent compound. Is the acutemetabolite $L(E)C_{50} > 10$ times the a.s. $L(E)C_{50}$ (on a molar basis)?

Studies on green algae are available for Fluopyram and its metabolites Fluopyram-7-hydroxy and Trifluoroacetic acid, (IFA), they are used for the comparison (see table below).



| Substance name | e | Fluopyram | Fluopyram- 7-hydroxy | TFA | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Endpoint (mg/L) |) | 8.9 ^A | 20.9 | >1.01 | | | |
| Molecular Weight (g | /mol) | 396.7 | 412.7 嶡 | 114.00 | | | |
| Parent endpoint recalculated on a r | molar basis (mg/L) | | | | | | |
| $10 \frac{M_{met}}{M_{ai}} LC_{50a}$ | ii a | NA Č | 92 ³ 59 | | | | |
| A The bound value for green algae is costatum is not a direct comparison requirement. Therefore, the more di | used for this assessment it to the green algae studies irect comparison and more | The unbound va available for the discreet value | tue of >1.13 mg e metabolites an is used. | a's./L trom Skeletonema d is not an EU data | | | |
| The green algae endpoints for TFA endpoint recalculated on a molar ba | and Fluopŷram J ^e hyd isis ⇔ Step 5, 7 | droxy is muc | h gréater than | 10 times the parent | | | |
| For TFA and Fluopyram 7-hydroxy | . <u>O</u> NO. Go to step | | | | | | |
| For metabolites TFA and Fluopyr | n 7-hydroxy: | | | | | | |
| Step 5: Identify the spectres of a.s. Is RACswige > PEC | or taxonomic group d sw and RACsw; ch > | etermini@g ti PECsw? ~ | he Jowest tier | 1 KACsw;ch of the | | | |
| For the metabolites TFA and Fluop on fish as the most consitive organ available, the parent end oint drive | stram 7-hydroxy, a ris sm, using the geometric ed by 10 is used: | KassesSmen Tic mean. Wh | t fs performed len metabolite | d with available data e endpoints were not | | | |
| Table 10.22Summary of the | metabolite endpoints | use@in risk@ | ssessment | | | | |
| | | [©] Endpoint | s [mg/L] | | | | |
| Species | - Fluopyram-7-1 | ydroxy | Trifluoro | oacetic acid (TFA) | | | |
| Acute fish | 2 LC 50 2 0.43 | 7.5 | L | C ₅₀ > 1008 | | | |
| Acute invertebrates | γ \sim $E_{10} > 88.$ | P | E | $C_{50} > 1008$ | | | |
| Chronic figh O 🔬 | NOEC = 001 | 35 * | NOI | EC = 0.0135 * | | | |
| Chronic wertebrates 2 | © | 25 * | N | OEC ≥ 25.2 | | | |
| Algae A | $F_{1} = 20$ | .9 | Е | $_{\rm r}C_{50} > 1.01$ | | | |
| Macrophyte $\mathcal{C}_{s0} = 9.2$ $E_y C_{s0} = 924$ $\mathcal{C}_{s0} = 9.2$ $E_r C_{s0} > 2016$ | | | | | | | |
| * 1 st tier prent endpoint divided to Selection of endpoints - Tier 1 | y 10 € ≪Ç | | | | | | |

Selection of endpoints – Ten

The acute toxicity of fluopyram to fish has been investigated in total with five different fish species. The 96 h LC_{50} values observed for the different fish species, including freshwater and marine as well as cold water and warm water species, differed by a factor of 30 (LC_{50} values ranged from >0.98 mg a.s./L to



30.5 mg a.s./L, whereas the standard test organism used for its known high sensitivity, the trout, resulted in a 96 h LC₅₀ of >1.98 mg a.s./L.

As acute toxicity data are available for five different fish species a geometric mean endpoint was derived, according to the Tier 2A approach of the Aquatic Guidance Document (EFSA PPR Panel Guidance, 2013; 11(7):3290). Therefore, a Tier 2A Geomean-LC₅₀ of 4.37 mg a.s./L was calculated and used for the fish acute risk assessment in connection with an assessment factor of 100.

| Table 10.2- 3:Summary of acute | endpoints for fish | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Test species | Test system | R g° Endpo | int C |
| Fish, acute Oncorhynchus mykiss | 96 hJ C ₅₀ | 29.89 mg a.s. | /Ł (nom) |
| Fish, acute Pimephales promelas | A Month LCC | \sim > 4.95 mg a.S. | |
| Fish, acute Lepomis macrochirus | 9640 LC 50°-4 | 5.68 mg a.s. | ¢ (nom |
| Fish, acute Cyprinus carpio | 96 h & C ₅₀ | 7 30.5 mga.s./l | (m) ^B |
| Marine fish, acute | 96 h LC ₅₀ | | /L (mm) |
| Geometric mean | 96 5LC 50 5 | 4.5° mg : | n.s./L |

^a Practical limit of water solubility ^b In all test levels, decipitations were observable so the LC₅₀ by clearly above the water solubility of the test item.

One of the metabolities (Toifluor acetic acid FFA) was acutely, tested using Zebra fish. The Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) had a $4C_{50}$ value >1008 mg p.m./L. This metabolite is far less toxic than the parent motivule to the Sheepshead minimum by >1029-fold

The existing acute fish study investigating the toxicity of the Huopyram metabolite revealed clearly lower fish toxicity of metabolites compared to the active substance fluopyram.

Chronic toxicity to fish

According to the AGD, EG_{10} values are preferred over NOEC and should be used for risk assessment, when robust values are available. In the fish ELS study, the NOEC is 0.135 mg/L based on length and morphological and behavioural effects, the fowest EC_{10} is 0.162 mg a.s./L based on fry survival. It is proposed to use the NOEC for risk assessment (refer to MCA for further explanations).

Acute toxicity to invertebrates

The acute to Ocity of fluororam to invertebrates has been investigated on Daphnids as well as on the estuarine species Mysid Orimp and Eastern Oyster. In addition, subchronic tests with spiked sediment have been conducted on two sediment dwelling organisms: *Chironomus tentans* and *Leptocheirus plumufosus*. Guronic testing was done with Daphnids and *Chironomus riparius*.

The \mathbb{PC}_{50} for the standard species *Daphnia magna* was > 20 mg a.s./L. The LC₅₀ for the mysid shrimp *Americarrysis bahia* was > 0.50 mg a.s./L. The test on the Eastern Oyster (*C. virginica*) resulted in an LC₅₀ > 0.44 mg a.s./L for mortality (i.e. no effects on mortality up to the highest test concentration) and shell deposition.



As acute toxicity data are available for three different aquatic invertebrate species a geometric mean endpoint was derived according to the Tier 2A approach of the Aquatic Guidance Document (EESA PPR Panel Guidance, 2013; 11(7):3290). Therefore, a Tier 2A Geomean-EC₅₀ of 1.638 mg a.s./ Kwas calculated and used for the aquatic invertebrate acute risk assessment in connection with an assessment factor of 100.

The subchronic tests with sediment dwellers C. tentans and L. plumulosus showed a very low to society of fluopyram towards these species with NOEC values of 26 and 38 mg a_{s} kg, respectively.

The metabolites fluopyram-7-hydroxy and trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) were of low acute toxicity invertebrates with EC₅₀ values of >88.7 mg p.m./L and to >1008 mg pm./L, respectively

Chronic toxicity to invertebrates

Chronic testing on Daphnia magna resulted in a NOEC of \$25 mg/a.s./b. The life cycle test with *Chironomus tentans* revealed a NOEC of 1.39 mg a.s. and an EC to of 0.54 mg a.s. L that is considered for use in the risk assessment.

Primary producers

Toxicity to algae

Following current state of science, the test guidelines OECD & 201, the U-Method C3, the Regulation for Classification and Laberring (Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008), the PPR Opinion (EFSA Journal 461, 1-44; 2007), the EFSA supporting publication 2015 (EN-92@published 22@December 2015) and also the EFSA Aquatic Guidance Document (AGB, 2013, noted by SCFCAD on July 10-11th, 2014), list growth rate as the relevant endpoint of the algoe and the Lenna growth inhibition test. Therefore, the risk assessment is based on the E_rC_5 when available.

Extensive testing bas been done on green algae, blue green algae, freshwater algae and marine diatoms. In total four studies on a gae/diatoms are available for the parent compound fluopyram with $E_r C_{50}$ values ranging from 1.13 mg a spL to 908 mg a.s./ The prost sensitive species was the marine diatom Skeletonema costatum.

The greed algae were tested with the two metabolites the pyram-7-hydroxy and trifluoroacetic acid (TFA). Comparison of the 72-hour ErCs values demonstrates that only trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) showed a similar forcicity to the parent only in one study with a 72-hour E_rC_{50} of >1.01 mg p.m./L; however, the 72-hour E e_{50} values ranged up to 237,07 mg pm./L. The metabolite fluopyram-7-hydroxy showed lower toxicity than the pareful with 32-how $E_r C_{50}$ alue of 20.9 mg p.m./L.

Toxicity to aquatic macrophyte

The aquatic plant Lenna gibba showed a comparable toxicity as for algae for the parent with a 7-day E_yC_{50} value of 2.12 mg a.s. and an E_rC_y value of 2.51 mg a.s./L.

The aquatic plant Lemita gibba was also vested with two metabolites (fluopyram-7-hydroxy and trifluoroacetic acid (TFA)). Consistent with metabolite testing in algae, the metabolites (fluopyram-7hydroxy and wifluor acetic acid (TFA)) were far less toxic than the parent (by a factor of ca. 3.3 to 475 or 3.7 to 803).

The 7 day E_{∞} values of the metabolites were 7.1 mg p.m./L (fluopyram-7-hydroxy) and >1008 mg p.m L (trithuoroacetic acid (TFA)) and the 7-day ErC₅₀ values of the metabolites were 9.2 mg.pjm./L (Huopy@m-7-bydroxy) and >2016 mg p.m./L (trifluoroacetic acid (TFA)).



Uncertainty factors for isomer composition of metabolites

The metabolite Fluopyram-7-hydroxy has a chiral center. Ecotoxicological testing was performed with the racemic mixture. Therefore, for this metabolite an additional uncertainty factor of 2 will be applied to the RAC of the Daphnia magna acute and of the algae and aquatic plant studies in consideration of enantiomers.

Predicted environmental concentrations used in the risk assessment

...e agater Predicted environmental concentrations of fluopyram and its metabolites in surface calculated according to FOCUS Steps 1-2 for the use in apples.

Important remark by the applicant: The PECs values as presented below are interim values and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant intends to provide final PEC_{sw} values latest by end of March 2022

Application in apples, 1 x 75 g a.s./ha

Single application in apples Initial max P@Csw.values - POCUS Steps Cand 2 Table 10.2- 4: (autumn and summer, 1, 7, 75 g a.s./ha) Ô

| Compound FOCUS Scenario Centario Scenario Scenario Scenario Scenario Scenario Scenario Step 1 Apples - Summer (Jun Sep.) I×75 g a.s./ha, BBCH 71-89 Fluopyram STEP 1 23.0 STEP 2 5.90 STEP 2 5.90 STEP 2 0.093 STEP 2 0.139 Trifluoroacetic actd (TFA) STEP 2 STEP 2 0.186 O.149 0.111 | | <u> </u> | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| Compound FOCES Apples - Apples - Scenario Arrunn (Oct Feb.) 1×75 g a.s./ha, BBCH 71-89 1×75 g a.s./ha, BBCH 71-89 Fluopyram STEP 1 23.0 23.0 Fluopyram STEP 2 North 656 4.57 STEP 2 South 5.90 5.24 Fluopyram STEP 2 South 0.232 0.093 STEP 2 South 0.132 1.33 Fluopyram-7-hydroxy STEP 2 South 0.166 Trifluoroacetic acid STEP 2 South 0.166 Trifluoroacetic acid STEP 2 South 0.149 Bold values used in risk assessment 0.149 0.111 | | | PLCsw, max [ugAL] | | | |
| Scenario Antumn (Oct Feb.) Summer (Jun Sep.) 1×35 g a.s./fra, BBCH 71-89 1×75 g a.s./ha, BBCH 71-89 1×75 g a.s./ha, BBCH 71-89 Fluopyram STEP 1 4 430 StEP 2 - North 6:56 4.57 STEP 2 South 5.90, 5.24 Fluopyram-7-hydroxy STEP 2 - North 0.232 STEP 2 South 0.033 STEP 2 South 0.139 STEP 2 South 0.139 STEP 2 South 0.149 O 1.06 Trifluoroacetic acid STEP 2 South STEP 2 South 0.149 Bold values used in risk assessment 0.149 | Commound | FOCUS | O O Apples - V 4 | Apples – | | |
| Ix75 g a.s./fa, BBCH 71-89 Ix75 g a.s./fa, BBCH 71-89 Fluopyram STEP 1 23.0 23.0 STEP 2 North 65.6 4.57 STEP 2 South 5.90 5.24 STEP 2 STEP 2 0.093 STEP 2 STEP 2 North 0.232 0.093 STEP 2 STEP 2 0.093 STEP 2 Fluopyram STEP 2 North 0.232 0.093 STEP 2 StEP 2 North 0.232 0.093 STEP 2 South 0.186 0.139 Trifluoroacetic acid STEP 2 North 0.486 0.074 TFP 2 South 0.149 0.111 0.111 | Compound | Scenario | 🖉 Autumn Oct Feb.) 🔿 | Summer (Jun Sep.) | | |
| Fluopyram STEP 1 33.0 23.0 StEP 2 North 65.6 4.57 STEP 2 South 5.90 5.24 Fluopyram STEP 2 North 0.23.0 STEP 2 South 5.90 5.24 STEP 2 South 0.232 0.093 STEP 2 StEP 2 North 0.232 0.093 STEP 2 South 0.139 1.33 1.33 Trifluoroacetic acrd STEP 2 North 0.232 0.093 Trifluoroacetic acrd STEP 2 North 0.486 0.139 Trifluoroacetic acrd STEP 2 North 0.496 0.074 STEP 2 South 0.149 0.111 0.111 Step 2 South 0.149 0.111 | | A . 0 . 5 | 1×75°g a.s. Ma, | <i>ℚ</i> 1×75 g a.s./ha, | | |
| Fluopyram STEP 1 23.0 23.0 STEP 2 - North SSEP 2 - North 0.232 0.093 Fluopyram-7-hydroxy SSEP 2 - North 0.232 0.093 SVEP 2 - North 0.232 0.093 Trifluoroacetic actd STEP 2 - North 0.236 0.139 STEP 2 - North 0.06 1.06 Trifluoroacetic actd STEP 2 - North 0.0486 0.139 1.06 1.06 STEP 2 - North 0.0486 0.074 1.06 1.06 1.06 Trifluoroacetic actd STEP 2 - North 0.149 0.111 0.111 Bold values used in risk assessment 0.149 0.111 0.111 | | | BBCH 7 89 0 | BBCH 71-89 | | |
| Fluopyram SateP 2 - North G:56 4.57 STEP,2 South 5.90, 5.24 Fluopyram-7-hydroxy STEP,2 0.093 SFEP 2 South 0.232 0.093 SFEP 2 South 0.139 Trifluoroacetic acrd STEP,2 North 0.232 Trifluoroacetic acrd STEP,2 North 0.486 STEP,2 North 0.486 0.074 Trifluoroacetic acrd STEP,2 South 0.149 Bold values used in risk assessment 0.149 0.111 | | STEP 1 | <u>, 6 , 1 23,0 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 </u> | 23.0 | | |
| STEP 2 South 0 5.24 Fluopyram-7-hydroxy STEP 1 1.33 1.33 STEP 2 SUBP 2 0.093 0.139 Trifluoroacetic actd STEP 2 0.186 0.139 Trifluoroacetic actd STEP 2 0.0486 0.074 STEP 2 North 0.486 0.111 Bold values used in risk assessment 0 0 0 | Fluopyram 🖉 👸 | STEP 2 – North | <u> </u> | 4.57 | | |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy STEP: 1.33 STEP: 0.232 0.093 STEP: 0.186 0.139 Trifluoroacetic acid STEP: 1.00 Trifluoroacetic acid STEP: 1.00 STEP: 0.093 STEP: 0.093 STEP: 0.186 O.100 1.06 STEP: 0.0986 O.074 STEP: STEP: 0.149 Bold values used in risk assessment 0.149 | | STEP 2 South | 5.90 ₀₁ | 5.24 | | |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy STEP 2 - North 0.232 0.093 Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) STEP 2 - North 0.186 0.139 Bold values used in risk assessment 0.486 0.074 | | STER | | 1.33 | | |
| SPEP 2 South Oligon Trifluoroacetic acid STEP (TFA) STEP Bold values used in risk assessment 0.149 | Fluopyram-7-hydroxy | STEP 2 – North | 0.232 | 0.093 | | |
| Trifluoroacetic acid STEP 2 1.00 1.06 (TFA) STEP 2 South 0.486 0.074 Bold values used in risk assessment 0.149 0.111 | <u> </u> | SPEP 2 South | 9.186 A | 0.139 | | |
| THILloroacetic acid C STEP2 – North C 0.086 0.074 (TFA) 0.149 0.111 Bold values used in risk assessment C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C | Trifference | ASTEP V | | 1.06 | | |
| Bold values used in risk assessment | (TEA) | STEP 2 - North | × 5 [×] 0.486 | 0.074 | | |
| Bold values used in risk assessment | | STEP 2~ South | × × × × 20.149 | 0.111 | | |
| | Bold values used in risk asse | ssment 🚫 🛒 | | | | |
| | Q" | | | | | |
| | | | \mathcal{A} | | | |
| | | S' N Q | | | | |
| | | | Å. | | | |
| | × 4 | | -Qj | | | |
| | | | D | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Ó | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Č ^O | | | | | | |
| | Ċ | | | | | |
| | - | | | | | |



Table 10.2- 5:Initial max PECsed values – FOCUS Steps 1 and 2 – Single application in apples
(autumn and summer, 1 x 75 g a.s./ha)

| | | PECs | ed, max |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--|
| Compound | | [µ; | g/kg] |
| | FOCUS | Apples - | Apples 2 |
| | Scenario | Autumn (Oct Feb.) | Summer (Jun Sep.) |
| | | 1×75 g a.s./ha, | |
| | | BBCH_71-89 | [∞] BBC₩71-89. [∞] |
| Fluopyram | STEP 1 | 5, 5, 2 | × ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |
| | STEP 2 – North | 14.6 | <i>∞</i> 10.05 <i>∞</i> |
| | STEP 2 - South | مَ ² /13.1 م | |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy | STEP 1 | 1.33 | ° ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |
| | STEP 2 – North | 0.233 N . C | (° (° (° (° (° (° (° (° (° (° (° (° (° (|
| | STEP 2 - South | 0.186 v | JO 0.140 J |
| Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) | STEP 1 | | © ~ < 0.001 |
| | STEP 2 – North | ∠ ~ <0@01 Q | |
| | STEP 2 - South | | <u> </u> |

Bold values used in risk assessment

Risk assessment for aquatic organisms

According to the Aquatic Guidance Document (FFSA PPR Panel Guidance 2013) the risk to aquatic organisms is evaluated based on the derivation of Regulatory Acceptable Concentrations (RACs) as follows:

Acute risk assessment:

 $RAC_{sw, ac} = L$ or $E_{wo} / 100$ or $E_{wo} / 200$ The risk is considered acceptable of the $RAC_{wac} \ge PEC_{sw, max}$.

Chronic risk assessment:

 $RAC_{sw, ch} = NOE @ or E @$

 $RAC_{sw, ch} = E_{0.50} / 10^{\circ}$

The risk is considered acceptable, if the $RAC_{sw, ch} \ge PCC_{sw, max}$

To summarise, these abbreviations are used in subscript following the term PEC or RAC: ac: acute, ch: claonic, sw: surface water, max. maximum.

ACUTE RISE ASSESSMENT FOR AQUATIC ORGANISMS

Important remark by the applicant: The PEC_{sw} and TER values as presented below are interim values and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant intends to provide final PEC_{sw} values and revised TER calculations latest by end of March 2022.



Application in apples, 1 x 75 g a.s./ha

| Application in a | pples, 1 x 75 g a.s./ha | | e S |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| | | ð | |
| Table 10.2- 6: | Acute risk assessment based on FOCUS | Step 2 for the application in app | les (1 × , 5 |
| | 75 g a.s./ha) | 4 | \$ \$ 0 |

| Compound | Species | Endpoint | RAC | PECswmax | RAC≥ | Ø1 |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|------------------------------|------|---------|
| - | · · | | μg/L] | | PEC | ,0 1 |
| | Autur | nn application $\sqrt{2}$ | 5 | | | |
| FLU SC 500 | Fish, acute <i>Cyprinus carpio</i> | LC >84000 | \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ | | Yes | |
| | Invertebrate, acute & Daphnia magna O | EC ₅₀ 59200 57 | 592 ¢ | | Yes | |
| Fluopyram tech. | Fish, acute Geometric mean | 12050 A4370 A | , 425 ⁷ | 0. 2 8 6 % 6 | Yes | |
| | Invertebrate, acute | EC TO 1608 | Č16.38 | | Yes | |
| Fluopyram-7- hydroxy | Fish, acute | DC ₅₀ 0437 0 | 209 ^в | 0%32 | Yes | |
| | Invertebrate, acute Daphnia magnat | EC 50 ~88700 ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | Ф>44355 ^В | Ö Ø | Yes | |
| Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) | Fish cute Oncorhynctius mykiss | LC ₅₀ >1008000 | £00805 | 0.186 | Yes | |
| | hwertebfate, acute | EE 50 5 1008000 C | >10080 | 0.180 | Yes | |
| | Suman | ner application | CZ. | | | |
| FLUSC 500 | Cyprinus carpio | ₽€ ₅₀ ~84000 ~ ~ | >840 | 5.24 | Yes | |
| FLU SC 3004 | Invertebrate, acute | EC 5 59200 | 592 | 3.24 | Yes | |
| Fluopyram tech. | Fish, abate Solution Control of C | LC ₅₀ 0 4370 | 43.7 | 5.24 | Yes | |
| | Invertebrate, acuto | EQ.0 1038 | 16.38 | 5.24 | Yes | |
| Fluopyrad 7- hydroxy | Fish, acute | LC 516 437 A | 2.19 ^B | 0.130 | Yes | |
| | Daphand magga | ₩ BC ₅₀ >88700 | >443.5 ^B | 0.159 | Yes | |
| Trifluoroacetic seid (TFA) | Fish, acuter Qricorhy Wehus frykiss | LC ₅₀ >1008000 | >10080 | 0.111 | Yes | |
| | Invertorate, acute | EC ₅₀ >1008000 | >10080 | 0.111 | Yes | |

А

A per parent endpoint divided by 10 For the rotabolite Buopyran-7-hydroxy the RAC has been corrected in addition according to an uncertainty factor of 2 in consideration of two enantiomers. В

For the application in apples (autumn and summer application) at 75 g a.s./ha the acute trigger is met for all aquatic species for fluopyram and its metabolites as well as for the formulation.


CHRONIC RISK ASSESSMENT FOR AQUATIC ORGANISMS

Important remark by the applicant: The PEC_{sw} and TER values as presented below are interim values **Important remark by the applicant:** The PEC_{sw} and TER values as presented below are referint values and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant intends to provide final PEC_{sw} values and revised TER calculations latest by end of March 2022. Application in apples, 1 x 75 g a.s./ha

| Table 10.2- 7: | Chronic risk assessment based | on FOCUS | Step 2 for th | ie appticat | ion m appt | es (1 × |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| | 75 g a.s./ha) | | | | y w | A CONTRACTOR |
| Compound | Species | Endpoint [µg/L] | | ₿AC [µg/LD | PEG.max [µgL] | RAC≥ ₽ECsw |
| | Q QAutuma | application | | × . | Č > | |
| ELUSC 500 | Algae | ErC ₅₀ | 6120 | 613 , | Ö Å6 56 | Yes |
| FLU SC 500 | Aquatic macrophyte | Ercs | ×6800 × | £80 5 | * 0.30 r | Yes |
| | Fish chronic Piulephales promas ~ | NOEC | | 135 | | Yes |
| ~C | havertebrate, chronic | NOEC ~ | 1250 | \$ 125 | | Yes |
| Fluopyram tech. | Investebrate chronic | EC | 540 % | 54 | 6.56 | Yes |
| | Algae Skeletonema costatum | ErC ₅₀ | >1930 | >113 | | Yes |
| | Agnatic macrophyte | ErC ₅₀ | ×2510 | 251 | | Yes |
| | Fish Chronic Pimephale prometas | NOEC | 13.5 ^A | 0.675 ^B | | Yes |
| Fluopyran-7- | Invertebrate, chronic | NOEC | 125 ^A | 6.25 ^в | 0 232 | Yes |
| hydroxy | Alge Pseudokijehnerieta subcapitat | E _r C ₅₀ | 20900 | 1045 ^B | 0.232 | Yes |
| | Aquatic macrophyte | ErC ₅₀ | 9200 | 460 ^в | | Yes |
| Trifluoroacette acta (TFA) | Fish, chronic 🔬 🖓 | NOEC | 13.5 ^A | 1.35 | | Yes |
| | Invertebrate, chronic Daphnia magna | NOEC | ≥25200 | ≥2520 | 0 196 | Yes |
| | Algae <i>Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata</i> | E_rC_{50} | >1010 | >101 | 0.100 | Yes |
| | Aquatic macrophyte Lemna gibba | <mark>E_yC₅₀ ErC₅₀</mark> | <mark>924000</mark> >2016000 | <mark>92400</mark> ≥201600 | | Yes |



| Compound | Species | Endpoint [µg/L] | RAC [µg/L] | PECsw.max [µg/L] | RAC≥ PEC _{sw@} ° |
|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Summe | r application | | | |
| FLU SC 500 | Algae Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata | E _r C ₅₀ 6130 | 613 | 5.24 | Yes O |
| | Aquatic macrophyte <i>Lemna gibba</i> | E _r C ₅₀ 6800 | \$80 | 3.24 \$ | Ses . |
| | Fish, chronic Pimephales promelas | NOEC 135 | 13.5 | | Yes |
| | Invertebrate, chronic Daphnia magna | NGEC 1250 | • 125 ¢ | | OYes @ |
| Fluopyram tech. | Invertebrate, chronic | | × 54 | 5.24 | <u>x</u> s |
| | Algae O Skeletonema costatum | 50 >1,00 | | | Yes, |
| | Aquatic macrophyte | ErCa 2510 | 251 | | Fes |
| | Fish, chronic | NOEC 1355 A | 0.679 ^B | ² UM 1'+ | Yes |
| Fluopyram-7- | Invertebrate, chronic & T Daphnia magna | NOEC 125 | 0.25 ₽ | | Yes |
| hydroxy | Algae Pseudokirchneriella subcopitata | E _r C ₅₀ 20900 | 1045 в | 0.139 | Yes |
| | Aquatic macrophyte | 9200 9200 (| \$ 460 B | 7 | Yes |
| Trifluoroacețic acid (TFA) | Fish, chrohic | NOSC \$13.5 4 | Q1.35 | | Yes |
| | Invertebrate chronic 400 | NOEC - S200 | ≥2520 | 0.111 | Yes |
| | Algae 🦀 🗳 🖗 Pseudokirchnekiella subcapitata | $E_{1} = \frac{1000}{2} = 1000$ | >101 | 0.111 | Yes |
| | Aquatic macrophyte | <mark>€_yC₄ E_rC⊊ <u>\$24000</u> E_rC⊋ <u>>201600</u></mark> | 0 <mark>92400</mark> 0 >201600 | | Yes |

В





Chronic risk assessment for sediment organisms based on FOCUS Step 2 for the Table 10.2-8: annlication in annles $(1 \times 75 \sigma a s / ha)$

| Compound | Species | Endpoint [µg/kg] | RAC PEC _{sed.r} [µg/kg] | na RAČŽ | |
|--------------------|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | Autumn application | 4 <u>(</u> | | |
| Fluopyram tech. | Sediment dweller, Chironomus tentans | NOEC 26000 | 2600 14,8 | Yes 5 | |
| Summer application | | | | | |
| Fluopyram tech. | Sediment dweller, Chironomus tentans | NOE 26000 | | Yes (| |
| | | | | N ^A NA | |

For the application in apples (autumn and summer application) at 05 g as ha the chronic trigger is met for all aquatic species for fluopyram and its metabolites as well as for the formulation.

| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| Data Point: ACP 10.2/01 Q S A Q X X X | |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: S 2001 S a S S O S | |
| Report Title: Eluopy in - Equation of OED join view dossier - WNL 6656 - Fluopyram | - |
| $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O}$ | |
| Anhang I der Richt nie 91/914/EWG | |
| Report No: 🕉 🖉 <u>M</u> Q40990901-1 🗸 🖉 🖉 🦉 | |
| Document 3/2: " <u>M-409909-01-4</u> X X X | |
| Guideline followed in for not specified of the second se | |
| study: $\mathcal{L}^{\mathcal{Y}}$, \mathcal{Q} , $\mathcal{O}^{\mathcal{Y}}$ | |
| Deviations from current Cuideling. not applicable | |
| test guideline: N A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A | |
| Previous evaluation: Staluator and accepted 2 | |
| \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O}^{T} \mathcal{O}^{T} \mathcal{O}^{T} \mathcal{O}^{T} \mathcal{O}^{T} | |
| GLP/Officially Qt appricable & & | |
| recognised setting | |
| facilities of a state of the st | |
| Acceptability/Reliability? Yes 🔨 🗸 | |
| | |
| γ $O^{\varphi} \sim \rho^{\gamma} V$ $\nabla \gamma = O^{\gamma}$ | |

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing

The document above was only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first his process. It does not contain information relevant for the current active substance renewal process.

Ċ.



ð

CP 10.2.1 Acute toxicity to fish, aquatic invertebrates, or effects on aquatic algae and macrophytes

| Data Point: | KCP 10.2.1/01 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2007 |
| Report Title: | Acute toxicity of fluopyram SC 500 G to fish (Oncomynchus mykis) under tatic |
| | conditions & & & |
| Report No: | EBGMP066 Tr O O O |
| Document No: | <u>M-291039-01-1</u> L O ^V L O ^V L O ^V |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EPA-FIFRA § 72-1/SEP-EP @ 540/9-85-00 (1982/1985) O |
| study: | OPPTS 850.1075 (Public Fraft, 1996) |
| | Directive 92/69/EEC, C.9(1992) |
| | OECD No. 203 (rev. 4292) 🖉 🎝 🖉 🖓 🖉 |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: 20° (20) 9° 2° 2° 2° 2° 2° |
| test guideline: | Deviations: not applicable Q Q Q |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted a solution of the |
| | in DAR (201) 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conduced under GLP Officially recognised toting facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes a w w x a a a a a |
| | |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first fixing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.

| Data Point: C KCP40.2.1/02 ~ A A A |
|--|
| Report Authors of a straight and a straight and a straight and a straight a s |
| Report Year: 6 1907 |
| Report Title? Acute toxicit for AE 0656948 SC 5@A G to he waterflea Daphnia magna in a |
| state aborder y test system a state aborder test system as a state aborder test system aborder test system aborder test system aborder test system as a state aborder test system aborder te |
| Report No: BROMP067 & A |
| Document No: 29 14-294207-01-1 2 2 2 |
| Guideline(s) follogied in A OECL guideline 202 (2004); EEC LOrective 92/69/EWG, part C.2 (1992); U.S. |
| study: EP Pestigne Assessmen Guide pres, Subdivision E, § 72 2 (1982), OPPTS |
| Gideline 850. KO public draft 1996 (modified); JMAFF 12 Nousan No. 8147 |
| |
| Deviation From current Current Guideline: 292 (2064) |
| test guideline: Deviations: Not applicable |
| Previous evaluation: y es, evaluated and accepted |
| \sim $DAS(2011)$ |
| GLP/Officially Yes conduced under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testog |
| facilities: |
| Acceptability/Reliapility: Ψ Y es \sim \vee |
| |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.



Ĩ

| Data Point: | KCP 10.2.1/03 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2007 |
| Report Title: | Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata growth inhibition test wittoiuopyram SCOO |
| Report No: | EBGMP068 |
| Document No: | <u>M-292592-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OECD Guideline 201: Freshwater Alga and Cyanokacteria, Growth Philbitten Test |
| study: | (March 23, 2006); Equivalent to USEPA OPPTS Suideline No. \$50.5440, SUPPS |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 201 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: not applicable |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted |
| | in DAR (2011) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GDP/Officially resognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes A & Q Q A O O Q |
| | |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outgated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.

| Data Point: | KCP10.2.1/04 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Lemna groba of growth inhightion tes with fluopyrage SC 500A G under static |
| <u> </u> | conditions |
| Report No: 0 | EBGMP157 40 27 2 27 |
| Document No: | <u>×v-297699-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in 🗶 | OECD Guidetine 22 (March 23, 20%); Equipalent to US EPA OPPTS Guideline |
| study: | Not 30.44 (SUPP) S Y |
| Deviations from current | Current Guidelin (221 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Beviations: Not applicable |
| Previous evaluation. | yes, a diuated and accepted |
| | In BAR (2691) by by by |
| GLP/Official | V93, conducted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptacenty/Reliability; | Yest y |
| | |
| ~~ () | |

The study above was performed with an outgated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons The study above was performed with an outgated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.2.1/05 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2013 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500D G - Acute toxicity to fish (Oncorhynchus mykiss) under |
| | static conditions (limit test) |
| Report No: | EBGMN042 |
| Document No: | <u>M-467867-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC; Regulation (EC) No 110/72009 (2009); US EPA |
| study: | OCSPP 850.1075 |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: 203 (2019) $\sqrt[5]{2}$ |
| test guideline: | Deviations: The fish length at test start was 5, \mathbb{O}^2 0.6 cm and thus higher than the \mathbb{O}^2 |
| | maximum 6 cm recommended in OECD 203 This deviation was not expected to |
| | have impacted the study results. All validity criteria were net. |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP Officially recognised testing fagilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes of the second secon |
| | |

Executive Summary

An acute toxicity test was performed with the Rainbox trout (Onco hynchus myters) in a static system. Juvenile fish were exposed to FLU SC 500 in groups of 30 (two replicates of 15 fish per test level) to an aqueous solution of the product of the single nominal concentration of 236 mg prod/L (corresponding to 100 mg a.s./L) for a period of 96 hours. Additionally, a control was included. Observations of mortality and other signs of toxicity were made approximately 4, 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours after test initiation.

Concentrations of Buopyram were verified by HPLC equipped with an UV- detector on days 0, 2 and 4 for the test concentration and the control. Measured concentrations were in the 106 - 111 % range of nominal concentrations and to residues were found in the control samples above 0.139 mg a.s./L, which was used as the lowest standard concentration during the study. The thean measured concentration was 108 mg a.s./L.

The study fulfils all varidity criteria of OECD 203 guideline.

In the controls no mortalities or sub-lethal efforts were observed during the test. After 96 hours all 30 fish in the single test concentration of 236 mg prod/L showed symptoms like remaining for unusually long periods of the bottom of the aquarium aying on their sides or backs, showing laboured respiration, turned turning dark in coloration of oper mouth

The endpoints based on nominal product concentrations of FLU SC 500 were: $LC_{50} - 96$ hours: (95 % C.1.): > 236 mg prod/L (n.e.), LOEC = 96 hours: 236 mg prod/L and NOEC - 96 hours: < 236 mg prod/L.

Test material FLUSC 500 Specification No.: 102000022633 Batch No. 2010-008475 Content of a.s.: 42.4 % w/w fluopyram Guideline(s) adaptation



| Test species | Rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Acclimation | At least 14 days to test conditions |
| Acclimation | Health during acclimation: less than 5 % mortality in the 48-hour acclimation period before testing, all unsuitable fish (e.g. injured, deformed, etc.) were eliminated prior to the assignment of test groups. |
| Organism age/size | Mean length: 55 ± 6 mm at the start of the study Mean body weight: 1.7 ± 0.7 g at the start of the study |
| Test solutions | Nominal concentration: 236 mg prod./L Nominal concentration fluopyram: 100 mg a.s./L Corresponding mean measured concentration: 108 mg a.s./L Control: water Evidence of undissolved material During the whole exposure period an intensive turbienty caused by the test item was observed. Additionally, a komogeneous dispersion in the water and a turbidity were noticed observable after 4 Hours of termination |
| Replication | No. of vessels per concentration (replicates) 2 |
| Organisms per replicate | No. of organisms per versel: 15,7 2, 7 2, 2, 2, 5, 7 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, |
| Exposure | Static Total exposure duration 96 holds of the state of |
| Test Vessel Loading | 0.64 g fish/kztest medium |
| Feeding during test | None None None None None None None None |
| Test conditions | Temperature: 11.6 12.1 Protoperiod: 16 hours light, 8 hours date Light intensity: not reported pH 9.1 - 7.8 Water hardness: 40 - 60 ing Cac 0 3/L Dissolved oxygen: 69 95 % of saturation (actation was added on study to reach oxygen saturation). Conductivity: < 0.2 mS/cm |
| Parameters Measured / Observations | Fish over e observed for mortalities and sub-total behavioural effects after 4, 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours. Discrete measurements of dissolved ox gen, pH and temperature were obtained at test initiation and after 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours. Temperature was measured hourly by a calibrated data logger in one control replicate. |
| Sampling for Chemical analysis | Samples of test solution Qvere taken at test initiation (0 hour), after 48 hours and at test termination (96 hours) for analysis of test substance. The chemic Q analysis were performed by using a High-performance liquid chromatograph (1992C) compped with arQUV – detector. |
| Data analysis | Not needed as himit test. |



II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

| Table 10.2.1- 1: Validity criteria | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Validity criteria | Required | 🔊 Obtain | ed |
| Mortality in control during test | ≤ 10 % | 0% | |
| Dissolved oxygen saturation | ≥ 60 % | 69,-95 | % |
| <u>Analytical results:</u> Full details and acceptable validation data to document M-CA 4, which comply with | o support the analytical met | hod are presented to the set | nted within yed wothin |
| SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1. | | | , W |
| Recoveries on day 0, day 2 and day 4 were betw are based on nominal concentrations of FKU S | veen 106 and 111 & (see able \$500. | below). Brolog | gigal results |
| No residues of fluopyram were found if the co the lowest standard concentration during the st Table 10.2.1- 2: Analytical results | ntrol samples above 0.139 stale udy: | | was Dised as |
| Nominal Measured Oncentration | S % of nominal % | Mean mensured | Mean % of |
| img img Day Day Day Day | 4 Bay 0 Day Day Day 4 | ↓ Sconc. √mg a.s./L] ^A | nominal |
| 236 100 115 - 07 106 | , HQ 807 K 106 @ | 108 | 108 |
| A Not given in report. Calculated based on measurer Biological results: Observations: In the controls no portalities or sub-lethal find | concentrations of 2 replicate sample: | s on each sampling | g day. |
| After 96 hours all 30 Ash in the single test co | oncentration of 236 mg prod. | /L showed syn | nptoms like |

remaining for unusually long periods on the bottom of the aquarium, laying on their sides or backs, showing laboured respiration, turning dark in extoration or open mouth.

| Table, 10.2.1- 3: | Mortafity | ~ |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | ~ <i>u u</i> | <i>((</i>)) |

| | Fynosure time | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| | Exposure time | | |
| 24 h | 48 h | 72 h | 96 h |
| 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| $\left(0\right)$ | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| 2)) | 4 h (0) (0) | 4 h 48 h (0) 0 (0) (0) 0 (0) | 4 h 48 h 72 h (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) (0) 0 (0) 0 (0) |

Cumpative mortality of 2 replicates of each test level



III. CONCLUSION





| Data Point: | KCP 10.2.1/06 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2010 |
| Report Title: | Acute toxicity of fluopyram SC 500B to fish (Cyprinus carpio) under static |
| | conditions |
| Report No: | EBGMP260 |
| Document No: | <u>M-366324-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EPA-FIFRA § 72-1/SEP-EPA-540/9-85-006 (1982/4985) OPPTS 859.10750 |
| study: | (Public Draft, 1996) Directive 92/69/EEC, C.1 (1992) OECD Nov203 (rev/1992) |
| | JMAFF, 11 Nousan No. 6283 (OG. 1999) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: 203 (2019) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: The fish length a dest start was 48 ± 1.0 cm and hus higher than the 2 |
| | maximum 4 cm recommended in OECD 203. This deviation was not expected to |
| | have impacted the study results. All validity criteria were met |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted of the the the second se |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLB Officially recognised testing facilitie |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes Q V X Y X Q Q Y |
| | |

Executive Summary

An acute toxicity test was performed with the Common carp (Sprinus carpio) in a static system. Juvenile fish were exposed to FLUSC 500 in groups of 10 (one veplicate of 10 fish per test level) to an aqueous solution of the product at nominal concentrations of 12.5, 25.9, 50, 400 and 200 mg prod./L for a period of 96 hours. Additionally, a control was included. Observations of mortality and other signs of toxicity were made approximately 4, 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours after test initiation.

Concentrations of thopyram were verified by HPLC – MS/M& on days 0, 2 and 4 for each concentration and the control. Measured concentrations were in the \$2 - 95% range of nominal concentrations and no residues were found in the control samples above 0.188 mg a.s./L which was used as the lowest standard concentration during the study. The mean measured concentrations are: 4.90, 8.91, 18.1, 36.9 and 76.6 mg a.s./L.

The study fulfils all vandity coveria of OECD 203 guideline.

There were no behavioural abnormalities or mortalities of the fish in the controls. At test termination all fish in the two lowest test concentrations (12,5 and 25.0 mc prod./L) did not show any abnormal signs. However, in the three bighest test concentrations (50.0, 140 and 200 mg prod./L) 8 to 10 fishes showed sub-lethal effects after 96 hours of exposure.

The endpoints based on nominal concentrations were. $LC_{50} - 96$ hours (95 % C.I.): > 200 mg prod./L (n.d.) and NOEC - 96 hours: 25 mg prod./L

| , O | I MATERIALS AND METHODS |
|-----------------|--|
| Q ⁵⁴ | |
| Test material | \$¥LU §Õ 500 💭 ~♡ |
| | SpecificationNo.: 102000018148-01 |
| Nº G | Batch No. 2009-004770 |
| | Content of a.s.: 42.0 % w/w fluopyram |
| Guideline(s) | None specified |
| adaptation | |
| Test species | Common carp (<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>) |



| Acclimation | At least 14 days to test conditions. Health during acclimation: less than 5 % mortality in the 48-hour acclimation period before testing, all unsuitable fish (e.g. injured, deformed, etc.) were eliminated prior to the assignment of test groups. |
|--|--|
| Organism age/size | Mean length: 48 ± 10 mm at test start Mean body weight: 1.9 ± 0.7 g at test start |
| Test solutions | Nominal concentrations: $12.5 - 25.0 - 50 - 100 - 200 \text{ mg prod/L}$ Nominal concentrations fluopyram: $5.25 - 00.5 - 21.0 - 42.0 - 84.0 \text{ mg as/L}$ Corresponding mean measured concentrations: $4.90 - 8.01 - 18.1 - 36.9 - 76.6 \text{ mg a.s.L}$ Control: water Evidence of undissolved material: In the third highest test concentrations (50 mg prod./L), intensive turbidity caused by the test item was observed doring the whole exposure period. The two highest test concentrations (100 and 200 mg prod./L), spowed during the whole exposure period a homogeneous dispersion in the water, however, a turbidity was also observable. |
| Replication | No. of vessels per concentration (replicates): 1 |
| Organisms per replicate | No. of organisms pervessed 10 , 7 , 7 , 7 , 7 , 7 , 7 , 7 , 7 , 7 , |
| Exposure | Static Total exposure duration: 96 hours |
| Test Vessel Loading | 0.48 g fish/L test medium |
| Feeding during test | None, The Control of the second secon |
| Test conditions | Remperature: 203 - 229°C Photoperiod: 46 hours light, 8 hours dark Light intensity: not reported pH: 6.7 - 7.2 Water trandness: 40 - 60°mg CaCO ₃ /L Dissolved dovgen: 81 - 105 % of saturation (aeration was added on study to reach oxygen saturation) Conductivity: 20.2 mS/cm Alkabrity: Pot reported |
| Parameters Measured / Observations | Figh were observed for mortalities and sub-lethal behavioural effects after 4, 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours. Discrete measurements of discolved oxygen and pH were obtained at test initiation and after 24, 48, 72 and 96 hours. Temperature was measured hourly by a calibrated data logger and daily by manual reading via a calibrated thermometer in one control replicate. |
| Sampling for Chemical analysis | Samples of teer solutions were taken at test initiation (0 hour), after 48 hours and at test termination 96 hours) for malysis of test substance. The chemical analyses were performed by using a High-performance liquid chromatograph (HPLC) MS/MS). |
| Data analysis | Whenever possible, the LC_{50} values and the 95 %-confidence intervals were calculated every 24 hour using a computer program, which estimated the LC_{50} using one of three datistical techniques: moving average, logit analysis or probit analysis. The appropriate |



II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 10.2.1-4: Validity criteria

| Table 10.2.1- 4. Valuety criteria | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Validity criteria | Required | <i>z</i> o | Obtained 5 |
| Mortality in control during test | $\leq 10 \%$ | - Or | 0 % |
| Dissolved oxygen saturation | ≥ 60 % | 4 | 81 - Q05 % Q |
| | Ĉa di | | |

Analytical results:

Full details and acceptable validation data to support the analytical method are presented within regulatory, requirements, outlined document M-CA 4, which comply with the EU within SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1. Ò Recoveries on day 0, day 2 and day 4 were between \$2 and 5 % (see table below). Biological results °

Ô are based on nominal product concentrations of ELU S6,500. Table 10.2 1-5:

| Nom concent | inal ration | Measur | ed concer mg a.s./L | ntration | | of nomi | nal 🔊 | Mean Smeasured | Mean % of |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| [mg prod./L] | [mg a.s. /L] | Day 0 | Day 2 | Day 4 | Day 0 | Day 2 | Day 4 | concentration [mg a.s./L] | nominal |
| 12.5 | 5.25 | 4.84 | 4088 | ~ \$ 4 .98 ' | 92 🍣 | ° 93@ | .95 | 4.90 | 93 |
| 25.0 | 10.5 | 8 .81 | 8.80 | [∞] 9.₩ | \$4∕ | ,8 ⁴⁴ | 8 7 ~ | 8.91 | 85 |
| 50.0 | 200 | 98.8 ^B O | 17.2 | 1.8 <u>9</u> 1 | ي 90 | 82 | 86 | 18.1 | 86 |
| 100 | 42.0 | 35.8 | 355.1 | . _¶ 39.7 ू≈ | 85 💭 | × 84 [©] | 95 | 36.9 | 88 |
| 200 | 84.0 | 7 4 .9 ^B _▲ | б .4 ^в | 78.6 ^{BO} | 89 | | ~94 | 76.6 | 91 |

Table 10.2.1- 5: Analytical

Not sizen in report. Calculation ased on measured concentrations on day and 4. Α

Average of duplicate water samples analysed.

Biological results

Observations:

In the controls no mortalities of sub-lethal fordings were observed during the test.

At test termination all fish anthe two lowest test concentrations (12.5 and 25.0 mg prod./L) did not show any abnormal signs. However, in the three highest test concentrations (50.0, 100 and 200 mg prod./L) 8 to 10 fishes showed sub-lethal effects after 86 hours of exposure. In the third highest test concentration of 50.0 mg prod./L eight fiste were mactive or displayed abnormally low activity. In the two highest test concentrations (100 and 200 mg prod 0) the fish showed the following behavioural observations: inactive @abnormally low activity, laboured respiration, remaining for unusually long periods on the bottom of the aquarium, loss of equilibrium with lateral deviation from their normal orientation or turning in a certical position.

Ŀ,





| Table | 10.2.1- | 6: | Mortality |
|-------|---------|----|-----------|
| | | | |

| Nominal concentration | | | Dead fish No. (%) | | |
|-----------------------|-------|---------|----------------------|---------------|-----------|
| [mg prod./L] | | | Exposure time | ð | |
| | 4 h | 24 h | 48 h | <i>∂</i> 72 h | 96 h |
| Control | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | A 0 (0) | |
| 12.5 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | × 0(0) | | |
| 25.0 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) 🚿 | 0(0) | 0(0) | |
| 50.0 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (05) | Q 0.67 \$ |
| 100 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 🛞 🧷 | ° 0560) ~ | 0(0) |
| 200 | 0 (0) | Q(0) | َنْ (0) کې د (0) کې | | |

III. Coxelusion

(2019) and the endpoints based on nominal \mathcal{L}_{μ} The study meets the validity criteria according to DECD2 concentrations were:

| $LC_{re} = 96 \text{ hours} (98\% C 12\%) > 20$ |) mg prod./L |
|---|---------------|
| | determined) |
| NORC - 96 hours | ma prod /I |
| highest concentration without an effect (based on mortality) is a set of the | nig prod./L |
| NOEC - 96 hours: A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A | ma prod /I |
| highest concentration without an effect (based on sublethal ffects) | o nig prod./L |
| | |

Assessment and conclusion by applicant? The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment. (96 hours) > 200 mg prod. (corresponding to ~ > 84 mg a.s./L)

red as acceptable and reliable (196 hours) > 200 mg prod & (correspond (196 hours) > 200 mg prod & (correspond (196 hours) - 200 mg prod & (correspond (196



Õ

| Data Point: | KCP 10.2.1/07 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2010 |
| Report Title: | Acute toxicity of fluopyram SC 500B G to the waterflea Daphnia magna in astatic 🔊 |
| | laboratory test system |
| Report No: | EBGMP261 |
| Document No: | <u>M-366819-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OECD guideline 202,(2004); EEC Directive 92/69/EFC, part C.2 (1992) |
| study: | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: 202 (2004) 🐨 🖉 🖉 🖉 |
| test guideline: | Deviations: None. All validity criteria were mo v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes A & Q Q O' Q' A |
| | |

Executive Summary

An acute toxicity test was performed with daphnids (*Daphnia mogna*) (inder static conditions to determine the 48-hour EC₅₀. First-instar neonate daphnids (24 hours old) were exposed to FLU SC 500 in groups of 30 (6 replicates of 5 organisms per test level) to the nominal concentrations of 9.53, 17.2, 30.9, 55.6 and 100 mg prod L. Additionally, a control was included. Immobilisation and sub-lethal behavioural effects were determined after 24 and 48 hours.

Concentrations of fluopyram were verified by HPLC – UV on day 0 and 2. Recoveries on day 0 and 2 ranged in the three highest test concentrations (309, 55 6 and 100 mg or d./L, nominal concentrations) from 85.5 to 111 % of nominal values. The two lowest test concentrations (9.53 and 17.2 mg prod./L) revealed increased contents of fluopyram in aqueous solution with recoveries between 127 and 154 % of nominal values. Nevertheless, since these test concentrations caused no biological effects within 48 hours and since all biological effects-concentrations (30.9 - 100 mg brod./L) were located well within the recommended 80-120 % of nominal, all results, including EC_{50} , are based on nominal test concentrations. No residues of fluopyram were found in the control samples higher than 0.207 mg a.s./L, which was used as the lowest standard concentration during the study.

The study fulfils al validity criteria of OECD 202 guidelines

No immobility or other effects on behaviour were observed in the control within 48 hours of exposure. Immobility effects were observed after 24 hours at the 2 highest test concentrations (55.6 and 100 mg prod./L). After 48 hours daphness were immedile at the 3 highest test concentrations (30.9, 55.6 and 100 mg prod./L)

The endpoint based on nominal concentrations was: $EC_{50} - 48$ hours (95 % C.I.): 141 mg prod./L (78.7 – 251 mg prod./L).

| | I. MATERIAL AND METHODS |
|----------------------------|---|
| | Ft. SC 500 pecification No.: 102000018148-01 Batch No.: 2009-004770 content of a.s.: 42.0 % w/w fluopyram (507 g a.s./L) |
| Guideline(s) adaptation | None specified |



| Test succios | Water flee (Dershuiz an even) |
|------------------|---|
| rest species | water mea (Daphnia magna) |
| Organism | First instar neonates, less than 24 hours old |
| age/size at | |
| study initiation | |
| Test solutions | Nominal concentrations: $9.53 - 1/.2 - 30.9 - 55.0 - 100 \text{ mg prod pL}$ |
| | concentrations) |
| | Control: water |
| | Evidence of undissolved material: In the three lowest test concentrations $(9.53, 15, 2)$ and $(2, 3, 15, 2)$ |
| | 30.9 mg prod./L), there were no remarkable observations and the test media were clear. In |
| | the two highest test concentrations (5% and 100 mg prod./L) the test litem was lying on the |
| | bottom of the test beakers after 24 and 48 hours. |
| Replication | No. of vessels per control (replicates): 6 % |
| <u></u> | No. of vessels per control (represents). |
| replicate | No. of organisms per vessel: s |
| Tepheate | |
| Exposure | Static St |
| | Total exposure duration: 48 values 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
| Feeding during | None $\mathcal{L} \mathcal{D} \mathcal{D}^{Y} \mathcal$ |
| test | |
| Test conditions | Temperature: $@0.1 - 20.4 \circ C$ $@$ $@$ $@$ $@$ $@$ |
| | Photoperiod 716 hours light 8 hours dark |
| | Light intensity: max. 1200 lux of the second |
| | Water hardness: 249 mg/L as a CQ Wat test start) 4 |
| | Dissolved \hat{p} vgen $(2, 8, -8.3 \text{ mg/L}, 91.5, -92.5 \% $ |
| | Conductivity: 566 µS/cm (at test start) |
| | Alkalimity: 533apg/L as CaCO3/L (at test start) |
| Parameters | Deservations for immobility and sub-fethal behavioural effects were made after 24 and 48 |
| Measured / "" | Homes of exposure of test concentrations conductivity at a hardness pH and alkalinity of |
| Observations | the dilution media (Element M D) were determined. Additionally the dissolved oxygen and |
| 20 ² | pH values were measured in the freshly prepared test solutions of each treatment level and |
| | control and in media from the pooled replicates at test termination (day 2). Temperature of |
| | the test media was measured inside one vessel of the control and of the highest test |
| (| concentration of start and end of exposure. Light intensity was measured at start of the study |
| | as the function of the second se |
| Chemical \ll | Samples mere taken at test start and at test end. |
| anarysis | The chemical analyses were performed by high-performance liquid chromatograph–UV |
| | |
| Data analysis | For EC_{50} determination, a dose response relationship curve (displayed as sigmoid, shaped |
| \sim | over the logarithm of the concentration) was modelled by Probit Analysis after Finney fitted |
| , O | by an iterative weighed linear regression according to the Maximum Likelihood principle |
| Y | which anows comparation at $E \subset 50$ and 95 % confidence limits for immobility rates II mostible mathematical limits based on quality of the dose-response pattern). The 95 % |
| , S | confid@ce intervals are calculated according to the method described and published by |
| , Č, Č | Fieller (1944) and Finney (1972). |
| N R | Calculations (mean and standard deviation) were performed using Microsoft Excel. |
| | The statistical analysis was carried out using the ToxRat Professional® Software |
| | (Vers. 2.09, ToxRat Solutions GmbH, Germany). |
| | 4 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |



II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

| Table 10.2.1- 7: Validity criteria | | | |
|---|----|---------------------------|------------|
| Validity criteria acc. to OECD 202 | | Required 🖉 | Obtained S |
| Mortality in control during test | | $\leq 10 \%$ | |
| Dissolved oxygen concentration at the end of the test | Å | $\geq 3 \text{ mg/L}^{3}$ | x79 mg∕B ≥ |
| | A. | | |

Analytical results:

Full details and acceptable validation data to support the analytical method are presented within document M-CA 4, which comply with the EU regulatory requirements outwide within SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1.

Recoveries on day 0 and 2 ranged in the three highest test concentrations (30.9, 55.6 anO100 ng prod L, nominal concentrations) from 85.5 to 111% of nominal values. The two lowest test concentrations (9.53 and 17.2 mg prod./L) revealed increased contents of fluopyram in aqueous solution with recoveries between 127 and 154% of nominal values. Nevertheless, since these test concentrations (30.9, 55.6 anO100 ng prod./L) were located well within the recommended 80-420% of nominal, all results, including EC₅₀, are based on nominal test concentrations.

No residues of fluopyram were detected in the control samples higher than 0.207 mg a.s./L, which was used as the lowest standard concentration during this study.

| Nominal concentration / Measured concentration / % of nominal | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| [mg prod./L] | (příng a.s. /L) | Day 0 (New) | Day 2 (Aged) | Day 0 (New) | Day 2 (Aged) |
| 9.53 | 2,63 | 3.82 ^A | ≠ _4Q95 ^ ~ | 145.2 | 154.0 |
| 17.2 | <u>کے 5.25 کے ا</u> | € 6 67 Å × | 6.89 A | 127.0 | 131.1 |
| 30.9 | 10.5 | \$ \$11.7 ° | 0 11.4 | 111.4 | 108.6 |
| 55.6 | | Jo 19:1 (| 20.0 | 91.0 | 95.2 |
| 100 | ~ ⁰ 42.0 Č | 200 x | 35.9 | 85.7 | 85.5 |

Table 10.2.1-8: Analytical results

A Not given in report. Calculated based on measured concentrations of 2 replicate samples.

Observations

No immobility of other effects on behaviour were observed in the control within 48 hours of exposure. Immobility effects were observed after 24 hours in the 2 highest test concentrations (55.6 and 100 mg prod./L).

results



| N • • • • • | No. of immobilized (cumulative %) | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Nominal concentration | Exposure time | | | |
| [] | 24 h | 2 48 h 0 6 | | |
| Control | 0 (0) | | | |
| 9.53 | 0 (0) | | | |
| 17.2 | | | | |
| 30.9 | 0 (0) | 0 (3.3) x | | |
| 55.6 | 24(6.7) | | | |
| 100 | م مح المح المح المح المح المح المح المح | ² ² ² ² ² ² ² ² | | |
| a study masts the validity criteria | HI. Conclusion | A product of the control of the cont | | |
| le study meets the validity cifteria | | | | |
| EC ₅₀ – 48 hours (95 % | | At 41 mg prod A (78.7 - 2 a mg prod./L) | | |
| EC ₅₀ – 24 hours 95 % (| | Not determined | | |
| Not determined due to minor effect | ts (10% improbilisation) at the high | est test concentration (100 mg prod./L). | | |
| × Å | | 4 4 | | |
| Assessment and conclusion by an | plicant: | O' Y | | |
| The study and its data are consider | ed as acceptable and repable f | Bruse invrisk assessment | | |
| The endpoint S^{2} EC_{∞}^{2} (48 bours) = | 41 me prodel (corresponding | ng t $\sigma_{\rm rec} = 59.2$ mg a s /L) | | |
| | | | | |
| | | Š | | |
| | | | | |

Table 10.2.1-9: Immobilisation of daphnids



| [i | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Data Point: | KCP 10.2.1/08 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata growth inhibition test with fluopyram SC 500 G |
| Report No: | EBGMP159 |
| Document No: | <u>M-299910-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OECD Guideline 201: Freshwater Alga and Cyanobacteria, Growth Intribition, Test |
| study: | (March 23, 2006) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 201 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: None. All validity criteria were met |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted a construction of the construction of |
| GL P/Officially | Ves. conducted under GL DAfficially recognised fasting faulities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes O C C C C A |
| | |
| | |
| Executive Summary | |

Executive Summary

The green alga Pseudokirchneriella Subcapitata were exposed to FLLSC 500 understatic conditions for 72 hours. Algal cultures with an initial nominal cell count of approximately 1.0 104 cells/mL were used to test the nominal concentrations of 0.95%, 3.05%.77, 2P.3, and 100 mg proOL. The study design included 3 replicates for each test concentration and 6 replicates for the control. At 20 hour-intervals, the cell density (cells/mL) of each culture was counted. @

Concentrations of fluopyram were verified by MPLC UV on day of and 3 for each concentration and control. Measured concentrations were in the 86-98% range of nominal concentrations and no residues were found in the control samples above the lowest standard conceptration (0.0417 mg a.s./L). The biological results are based on nominal concentrations of FLL SC 500.

The study fulfils all validity criteria at OECD 201, gaideline.

No physical abnormalities were observed in the controls or treatment groups during the study.

The 72 product concentrations were: 72 hour – E_rC_{50} : 16.1 mg prod./L, 72 h@ar – E \mathcal{O}_{50} : 10.3 mg prod./Dand 72 hour $\mathcal{O}_{E_y}C_{50}$: 8.39 mg prod./L.

PMAPERIAL AND METHODS

| ~Ç | |
|--|---|
| Test material | FLUSC 500 F S S |
| La . | Specification No.: 102000018148 |
| ×, | Batch ID: 2007-011657 |
| - San and a second seco | Content of a.s. 42.2 @ w/w (S01 g fluopyram/L) |
| | Density: 1,188 g/mJ |
| Guidelines 🔬 | Not specified. |
| adaptation | |
| Test spectes | Freshwater Green alga Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata |
| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | Strain SAQ 61.81 |
| Culturing | fr-house A day old pre-culture held under test conditions. |
| çouditions | |
| Test solutions | Nominal product concentrations: $0.954 - 3.05 - 9.77 - 31.3 - 100$ mg prod./L |
| Ŭ | Mean measured recoveries based on a.s. content ranged from 86 to 98 % of nominal a.s. |
| | concentrations. |
| | Control: untreated medium |



| | Evidence of undissolved material: not reported |
|--|---|
| Replication | No. of vessels per concentration (replicates): 3 |
| Exposure | Static Total exposure duration: 72 hours |
| Initial cell density | 1×10^4 cells/mL in each test group |
| Test conditions | Temperature: 21.5 - 22.0 °C Photoperiod: 24 hours light Light intensity: 6190 - 7570 lux Type of light: bank light containing cool white fluorescent lamps pH of control: 8.1 - 8.9 Conductivity: not reported Growth medium same as culture mediam: Yes |
| Parameters Measured / Observations | The pH values were measured at test start (haily afterwards: At test end the pH was determined in composite samples of all replicates for each test concentration. Temperature was determined by a continuous measurement on one additional incubated glass vessel. Also, light intensity was measured, however, time point was not reported. Cell density measurements and morphological examinations were done daily. Cell numbers per volume (as a surrogate for biomass per volume) were estimated by direct algae cell counting under a microscope |
| Sampling for chemical analysis | Samples of test solutions were taken at test initiation (0 hour) in all treatment levels and the control At test termination (72 hours) samples were collected from composite samples of all replicates for each test concentration. Samples were analysed by using a HPLC – IIV . |
| Data analysis | Probit analysis using linea max. Belihoo Pregression was used for EC _x -value estimation. LOEC/NOEC determinations were done using the ANOVA procedure and properly elected multiply t-tests Calculations were done with Microsoft Excel sheets and the further statistical evaluations with the commercial program Tox Rat Professional (version 2.09). |

Ø

Table 10.2.1- 10: Validity criteria

| Validity criteria accor OECD 2014 adopted 2006 | Required | Obtained |
|---|----------|----------|
| The biomass in the control culture should have increased exponentially by a factor of at least 16 within the 72-hour test period. | ≥16 | 81.7 |
| The wean coefficient of variation for section by section specific growth rates (days) -1, 1, 2, and 2-3, in the control cultures must not exceed 35 % | < 35 % | 32.7 % |
| The coefficient of variation of average specific growth rates during the 75 hour test period in replicate ontrol cultures must not exceed 7%. | < 7 % | 1.5 % |



Analytical results:

Full details and acceptable validation data to support the analytical method are presented within document M-CA 4, which comply with the EU regulatory requirements outlined within Ó SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1.

Recoveries on day 0 and day 3 were in the range between 86 and 98 % of nominal concentrations (see table below). Therefore, biological results are based on nominal concentrations of FLU S\$500

No residues of fluopyram were detected in the control samples in a concentration higher than 0.0417 mg a.s./L, which was used as the lowest standard concentration during the study.

| Nominal | concentration | Measured a seconcentration 76 of nominal |
|--------------|---------------|---|
| [mg prod./L] | [mg a.s./L] | Day 0 Day 3 A Day 3 |
| 0.954 | 0.403 | 0,390 0 10.3970 v 95 v 85 |
| 3.05 | 1.29 | D 4 21 0 1.20 0 4 0 696 |
| 9.77 | 4.12 | 3.58 3.00 0 0 87 5 97 |
| 31.3 | 13.2 | 140 ⁴ 27 0 ¹ 1.9 ⁴ 7 80 4 90 |
| 100 | 42.2 | [™] 36 [®] 0 89 0 86 |

Biological results:

* (*) (*) No physical abnormalities were observed in the controls or freatment groups during the study.

| able 10.2 1712: Cell density 2 2 | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------|
| Nominal product | Mean cell density [x 104 cells/mL] | |
| [mg prodAL] A 24 h C | 🏷 48 h | 72 h |
| Control | ۵ ⁹ 14.3 | 81.7 |
| 19954 U O N 32 P | > 17.7 | 84.0 |
| A 3.05 | 16.5 | 79.3 |
| § 9.77 2.28 2.7 | 11.8 | 35.8 |
| 31.3 J A D 2 N | 1.7 | 1.8 |
| | 1.5 | 0.7 |
| | | |



| Nominal product concentration | Mean growth rate [1/d] | % Inhibition A |
|--|---|--|
| [mg prod./L] | 0 - 72 h | <u></u> |
| Control | 1.467 | - 4 A |
| 0.954 | 1.474 | -0.5 |
| 3.05 | 1.448 | |
| 9.77 | 1.191 * | |
| 31.3 | 0.179 * | 8.8 5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |
| 100 | -0.154 * | |
| A -% inhibition means increa * Significantly (α=0.05, one-test for inhomogeneous va The study meets the validity | see in growth relative to the pointrol -sided smaller) reduced, based on Williams in riances with bonferroni adjustment | ultiple sequential t-test procedure or Weich-t |
| 72 hours were: | | |
| ErC50 -72 | hours (95 % GI.): 🖉 🖉 🎽 | \sim 1621 mg prod./L |
| | | <u>√</u> (1, 0, 10, mg prod./L) |
| $E_r C_{20} - 72$ | hotms (95% C.I.) | ✓ (9.58 → 90.5 mg prod./L) |
| EC10 -72 | hours \$5 % \$1.): 5 5 6 | 0° 7\\$0 mg prod./L (7.26.8.22 mg prod./L) |
| | | © 10.3 mg prod./L |
| | | ✓ (9.70 – 11.0 mg prod./L) |
| ÉC20 - 72 | hours (95 % C.I.): | 6.22 mg prod./L |
| E.C. 72 | howers (05% CI): | ✓ 4.76 mg prod./L |
| | | (4.07 - 5.36 mg prod./L) |
| E C 50 - 72 | hours (95 % CI): ^ / / / / / / / | 8.39 mg prod./L |
| | | (0.59 - 10.55 Hg prod./L) |
| E _y C ₀ ≠72] | poetrs (950% C.I.)** 0° 0° | (2.40 - 5.90 mg prod./L) |
| $E_{\rm r}C_{10}$ | hours (195 % (QL): ^ () | 3.11 mg prod./L |
| | | (1.25 - 4.49 mg prod./L) |
| lowest concentration with | h an effect (based on growth rate) | 9.77 mg prod./L |
| highest concentration withou | C - 72 hours 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 | 3.05 mg prod./L |
| A Please refer to recalculation | a docuritent <u>M-757704-01-1</u> | |
| Reliability assessment (EPS | <u>A 2015)</u> | |
| The following table provide | Seliability indicators for EC ₁₀ values | for Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata. |

Table 10.2.1-13: Algae growth rate



| <mark>Biological</mark> endpoints | EC10 [mg a.s./L] | <mark>95% CL</mark> | NW | Relationship EC10/EC20/50 | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--------------------|
| Growth Rate | <mark>7.8</mark> | <mark>7.36 – 8.22</mark> | 0.110 (excellent) | $\frac{\text{EC}_{10} < \text{EC}_{20}, \text{ low}}{(hogh)}$ | |
| Yield | 3.11 | <u>1.25 – 4.49</u> | 1.042 (poor) | $\leq EC_{50}, low$ (medium) | |
| Biomass | <mark>4.76</mark> | <u>4.07 – 5.36</u> | 0,291 (good) | $\frac{\mathcal{C}_{10} < \mathrm{EC}_{20}}{(\mathrm{high})} \overset{\text{low}}{\sim} \overset{\text{c}}{\sim} $ | |
| | | Ŕ | | | |
| Assessment and | conclusion by ap | plicant: 🔬 | | | , S |
| The study and its | data are consider | ed as acceptable | and reliable wit | houbuse in Ask assessm | cont ~ |
| | | | | | |
| Data Point: | KCP 10.32 | 1/09 | | | |
| Report Author: | 2028 | | | | |
| Report Year: | 2020 | | | <u>()</u> | |
| Report 1 tile: | 2008, EBC Pseudokirc under stati | MP259) or the c MP259) or the c chneriella Subcani | hronic toxicity of ata (currently kno | W 2999 10 501-1 (Gorgerio) Duopyrum SC 500 G to wm as: Raphylocelis subca | n, M., apitata) |
| Report No: | <u></u> | <u>-01-1</u> ~ | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | |
| Document No: | <u>β φM-757704</u> | <u>-01×1</u> ″ ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | |
| study: | ved in None | | | | |
| Deviations from cu | rrent Current Gu | ideline: not appli | icable 🕺 | 5 | |
| test guideline: | Deviations | : not applicable | | \$ | |
| Previous | n: No prot pro | Toously submitte | | | |
| GLP/Officially | not applica | ıble 😽 👘 | | | |
| recognised testing | | | | | |
| Acceptability Belia | bilûty: Kes 🔊 | | | | |
| | | | Š. | | |

Summary

In the existing report M-299910 91-1 endpoints for yield were statistically determined at 72 h.

A statistical evaluation addressing the calculation of valid 72-h EC_{10} , EC_{20} , and EC_{50} values as well as NOEC values for stell we conducted to fulfill the data requirements according to regulation EU 283/2013. Furthermore, the validity orderia for the study were re-evaluated according to the current guideline@ECD 201 (2011).

The recalculations were performed with the software ToxRat Professional (Version 3.3.0) based on nominal concentrations (EFSA 2015).

Models, providing best fit to the respective data were selected and are as follows: In order to derive Effect Concentrations that have 10, 20 and 50 % effects on yield of the test subjects (EC_{10} , EC_{20} , and EC_{50}), a logit analysis using linear maximum-likelihood regression was performed.



NOEC was determined by Williams Multiple Sequential t-test Procedure (one-sided smaller, p = 0.05). To test for normal distribution and variance homogeneity, a Shapiro-Wilk's test and a Levene's test were performed respectively.

| Table 10.2.1- 14: | Re-calculated EC10, | EC20, EC50 and NOEC | values based on nominal | concentration |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| | | | • | |

| Endpoint | Fluopyram SC 500 G [mg product/L] Yield | Fluopyram [mg a sul] Q Yigd Q Sul |
|---|---|---|
| 72 hours - EC ₁₀ (95 % C.I.) | 3.11 (1.25 - 4.45) | 1.31 (0.53 - 190) O |
| 72 hours - EC ₂₀ (95 % C.I.) | 4.49 (2.40 - 2.90) | |
| 72 hours - EC ₅₀ (95 % C.I.) | 8.39 (6.59 - 10.35) | \$54 (258 - 4,36) J |
| 72 hours - NOEC | 9.05 J 2 | \$ \$1.29 A |
| C.I.: Confidence interval | | A St . St . |

Assessment and conclusion by applicant:

The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable without use in risk assessment.

| ` / | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Data Point: | KCP 10.2,190 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata growth inhibition fest with fluopyram SC 500B G |
| Report No: | EBGMP267 6 S |
| Document No: | <u>*4-367124-03-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in 🔬 | OECD Guidebre 20 OF reshwater Alga and Gyanobacteria, Growth Inhibition Test |
| study: | (Match 23, 2006) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline, OECD 201 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: None. All validity criteria were met. |
| Previous evaluation. | No, not previously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officiall | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability; | Yest of the second seco |
| | \rightarrow $0'$ $0'$ γ' |
| × | |

Executive Summary

The green algo *Pseudokirchieriella* subegpitata were exposed to FLU SC 500 under static conditions for 72 hours. Algal cultures with an initial nominal cell count of approximately 1.0×10^4 cells/mL were used to test the nominal concentrations of 0.960, 3.06, 9.80, 31.3 and 100 mg prod./L. The study design included 3 replicates for each test concentration and 6 replicates for the control. At 24 hour-intervals, the cell density (cells/mL) of each culture was counted.

Concentrations of fluopyram were verified by HPLC – UV on day 0 and 3 for each concentration and control. Measured concentrations were in the 92 - 105 % range of nominal concentrations and no residues were found in the control samples above the lowest standard concentration (0.0388 mg a.s./L). The biological results are based on nominal concentrations of FLU SC 500.



The study fulfils all validity criteria of OECD 201 guideline.

No morphological change in algae was observed in any test concentration and the control. The 72 hour- endpoints based on nominal product concentrations were: 72 hour E_rC_{50} . 14.6 mg prod./L, 72 hour – E_bC_{50} : 8.82 mg prod./L and 72 hour – E_yC_{50} : 9.00 mg prod./L. I. MATERIAL AND METHODS Test material FLU SC 500 Specification No.: 10200001814 Batch ID: 2009-004770 Content of a.s.: 42.0 % w/w Density: 1.193 g/mL Guidelines Not specified. adaptation Test species Freshwater Green alga Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata Strain SAG 61.81 In-house 3 day out pre-calture held under test conditions Culturing conditions Nominal product concentrations: 0, 90 - 3, 9 - 9, 8 - 31.3 100 pg prod/L Test solutions Mean measured recoveries based on a.s. content ranged from 92 to 105 @ of nominal a.s. concentrations. Control: untreated medium Evidence of andissolved material for reported No? of versels per concentration (replicates): 3 $^{\circ}$ Replication No. of vessels or compol (replicates) of Static Exposure Total exposure duration: 72 hours Initial cell 10⁴cells/mL in each test group density 🔪 🖗 Test conditions Teroperature. 21.3 ୭୦ °C Photoperiod: 24 hours light Light intensity 7630 3320 line 0 Type of light bank fight containing cool white fluorescent lamps pH of compol: 7.86 8.1 Conductivity: not reported conductivity: not reported grad pH values overe measured at test start, daily afterwards. Temperature was determined by a Parameters Measured / continuous measurement in one additional incubated glass vessel. Light intensity was Observations measured; however time point was not reported. Cell density cheasurements and morphological examinations were done daily. Cell numbers per volume (as a gurrogate for biomass per volume) were estimated by direct algae cell counting under a microscope. Samples of test solutions were taken at test initiation (0 hour) in all treatment levels and Sampling chemic the control At test termination (72 hours) samples were collected from composite samples of all reportes for each test concentration. analy Samples were analysed by using a high-performance liquid chromatograph (HPLC) – UV. Bata analysis Proble analysis using linear max. likelihood regression was used for EC_x-value estimation. LOEC/ NOEC determinations were done using the ANOVA procedure and properly selected multiple t-tests. Calculations were done with Microsoft Excel sheets and the further statistical evaluations with the commercial program ToxRat Professional (version 2.09).



Required

Øþtain

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

| Table 10.2.1- 15: | Validity criteria |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Validity criteria a | acc. to OECD 201 (adopted 2006) |

| valuty criteria acc. to OECD 201 (adopted 2000) |
|--|
| The biomass in the control cultures should have increased |
| exponentially by a factor of at least 16 within the 72-hour test? |
| period. |
| The mean coefficient of variation for section-by-section \mathbb{Q}^{\vee} |
| specific growth rates (days 0-1, 1-2 and 2-3) in the control |
| cultures must not exceed 35 %. |
| The coefficient of variation of average specific growth rates |

during the 72-hour test period in replicate controDcultur@mus not exceed 7 %.

Analytical results:

Full details and acceptable validation data to support the document M-CA 4, which comply with the bu re analytical method are presented within regulatory requirements outlined within SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1. $\hat{\bigcirc}$

Recoveries on day 0 and day 3 were in the Fange between 92 and 105 % of nominal concentrations (see table below). Therefore, biological results are based ob nominal concentrations of FLU SC 500.

No residues of fluopyram were detected in the control samples above 0.0388 mg a.s./L, which was used as the lowest standard concentration during the study.

| Measured a.s. concentration % of | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-------------|-------|-------|--|
| Nominal concentration | /mg a | SEL O | nomi | nal | |
| [mg prod./L] [mg a.s./I | Day 🕅 🌾 | Day 3 | Day 0 | Day 3 | |
| 0.96 | \$ 00 ³ 83 ° | 0.397 | 95 | 99 | |
| 3.06 | × 1.32 | 1.32 | 102 | 102 | |
| 9.80 0 0 .12 | 3.78 | 3.81 | 92 | 92 | |
| 313 | A & & & .9 V | 13.4 | 98 | 102 | |
| | 38.9 | 43.9 | 93 | 105 | |
| All of the second se | | | | | |

Table 10.2.1- 19: Apalytical result



| Nominal concentration | М | ean cell density [x 10 ⁴ cells/ | /mL] |
|------------------------------|----------|--|-----------------|
| [mg prod./L] | 24 h | 48 h | 72 h 5 |
| Control | 3.1 | 9.1 | \$ 23. 2 |
| 0.96 | 4.5 | 10.0 | 26.2 |
| 3.06 | 4.2 | 6.0 | × 25.2 × × |
| 9.80 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 10.5 0 |
| 31.3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | |
| 100 | 0.8 | | 0 ¥.0 0 |
| Table 10.2.1- 18: Algae grov | wth rate | | |

Table 10.2.1-17: Cell density

| Table 10.2.1- 18: | Algae growth rate |
|-------------------|-------------------|
|-------------------|-------------------|

| Table 10.2.1- 18: Algae gro | wth rate |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Nominal concentration [mg prod./L] | Mean growth rate [1/d] / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / |
| Control | 0 × 1.042 2 2 2 2 5 6 0 |
| 0.96 | |
| 3.06 | @ ~ @ 075 ~ @ 6 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |
| 9.80 | |
| 31.3 | 0.002 ^(b) 2 (0).2 * |
| 100 | A \$2.000 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ 100 * |

-% inhibition mean increase in growth relative to the control significantly (α =005, one-sided smaller) reduced, based on Williams multiple equential t-test procedure or Welch-t test for inhomogeneous gariances with botherroni adjustment QА * J.

WI. CONCLUSION Structure in the Endpointer in

The study meets the validity criteria and the endpoints based on nominal product concentrations after 72 hours were:







| Data Point: | KCP 10.2.1/11 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2020 |
| Report Title: | Statistical evaluation (non-GLP) of the study <u>M-367124-03-1</u> (Bruns, E., 2009, |
| | EBGMP262) on the chronic toxicity of fluopyram SC 500BG to |
| | Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata (currently known as: Raphidocelis subcapitata) |
| | under static conditions |
| Report No: | <u>M-757717-01-1</u> |
| Document No: | <u>M-757717-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | None V O O V V |
| study: | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable |
| test guideline: | Deviations: not applicable |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | not applicable O V V V V V V |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes $\partial \gamma \partial $ |
| | |

Summary

In the existing report M-367124-03-1 endpoints for field were statistically determined at 72 h.

A statistical evaluation addressing the calculation of value 72-h EC₁₀, PC₂₀, and EC₃₀ values as well as NOEC values for yield was conducted to fulfill the data requirements becording to regulation EU 283/2013. Furthermore, the validity criteria for the study were re-evaluated according to the current guideline OECD 201 (2011)? O \bigcap

The recalculations were performed with the software Tox Bat Profession (Version 3.3.0) based on nominal concentrations (EFSA 2015). L 1 m

Models providing best fit to the respective data were selected and ate as follows: In order to derive Effect Concentrations that have 0, 20 and 50% effects on yield of the test subjects (EC10, EC20, and EC₅₀), a probit analysis using forear maximum-likelohood regression was performed.

NOEC was determined by M Illiams Multiple Sequential t-test Procedure (one-sided smaller, p = 0.05). To test for normal distribution and variance homogeneity a Shapiro-Wilk's test and a Levene's test were performed respectively.

| Endpoint SC 500 | Fluopyram [mg a.s./L] |
|--|--------------------------|
| Areld | Yield |
| 72 hours - EC (95 2 C.I.) 4.79 2.50 – 6.05) | 2.02 (1.06 - 2.54) |
| 72 hours $\frac{1}{2}C_{20}$ (95% C.6% $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2.50 (1.60 - 2.95) |
| 72 hours - EC 95 % C.1.) 9.00 (8.13 – 9.52) | 3.78 (3.42 - 4.00) |
| 2 house NOEC 3.06 | 1.29 |

| | | 0. 9 | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| T_LL 10 261 / 10. | Do colorio A STEC OFC | | ⁷ |] |
| | Re-Maichiaten F.C. 10/Art | 20. THA 50 SIDE NUTLU | values based on nomin | 191 Concentrations |
| | Ite culturated LC10gLC | | y and based on nomin | an concentrations |
| | | | | |

A



| Assessment and conclu | usion by applicant: |
|--------------------------------|--|
| The study and its data a | re considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment. |
| The and raint is E.C. (| 72 hours = 14.6 magned / 1.6 compared in a to = 6.12 magned / 1.6 mag |
| The endpoint is: E_rC_{50} (| /2 nours) = 14.6 mg prod./L (corresponding to ~ = 6.16 mg a.s./L) |
| | |
| | ****** A 6 2 2 |
| | |
| | |
| Data Point: | KCP 10.2.1/12 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | FLU SC500 - Toxicity to the aquatic plant Lemra gibba in a static growth |
| | inhibition test |
| Report No: | EBGM0677 |
| Document No: | <u>M-758230-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Commission Regulation (EC) No.761/2009, Annex, Part C, C.26.: "Lemma sp |
| study: | Growth Inhibition Test", Official Journal of the European Union (EN), dated |
| | August 24, 2009 |
| | - EPA Guideline 72-C-008: OCSPP 850/4400, 'Siquatic Plant Exicity Test |
| | Using Leprina spp.", January 2012. |
| | - OECD Guiderines for the Lesting of Chemicals, No. 221: Remna sp. Growth |
| | Inhibition fest", adopted March 23 (2006 |
| | - SANCO/3029/99/rev.4.11/0//00: Residues: Guidance for generating and |
| | Peporting methods of analysis in support of pre-registration data requirements for |
| Deviations from ourrant | Annex II (parts, Sector 14) and Annex III (part A, section of of directive 91/414 |
| test guideline: | Derations None All validity oritoria were met |
| Provious evaluation: | No. not provide submitted |
| Tievious evaluation | a so interpretention of the second seco |
| GLP/Officially | Ves conducted under GLP Officially recognised witing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability / Reliability : | Yes a a a a |
| | |
| "× ,~ | |
| Executive Summary | |
| | |

The duckweed *Lemna gibba* was exposed to FLUSC 506 under static conditions for 7 days. 12 fronds per test vessed were used to jest the nominal concentrations of 60, 19, 6.0, 1.9, 0.6 and 0.19 mg prod./L (corresponding to 25.38, 9.037, 9538, 0.804, 6, 2538 and 0.0804 mg a.s./L). The study design included 4 replicates for each test concentration and control. Observations and frond counts were done on days 3, 5 and at test termination (day 7). At test termination, frond density for each replicate treatment and control vessels were determined.

Concentrations of fluopyram were verified by LC-MS/MS on day 0 and day 7 for each concentration and control. Measured concentrations were in the 83 - 105 % range of nominal concentrations and no residues were found in the control samples above the limit of detection (LOD: 0.005 μ g a.s./L). The biological fesults were based concentrations of the product.

The study fulfers all validity oriteria of OECD 221 guideline.

No visual effects were observed in the three lowest test concentrations (0.19, 0.6 and 1.9 mg prod./L). At the three highest test concentrations the fronds showed deviations from the control replicates after 7 days; i.e. gibbous growth (6.0, 19 and 60 mg prod./L), slightly overlapping fronds (6.0 mg prod./L), smaller fronds (6.0, 19 and 60 mg test item/L), shortened roots (19 and 60 mg prod./L), necrosis (19 and 60 mg prod./L), chlorosis (19 and 60 mg prod./L)and separated fronds (19 and 60 mg prod./L).



Endpoints based on nominal concentrations of the product were: E_rC_{50} (based on frond numbers) (95 % C.I.): 16.2 mg prod./L (15.4 – 16.9 mg prod./L); E_rC_{50} (based on dry weight) (95 % C.I.): 35.3 mg prod./L (27.7 – 47.6 mg prod./L); E_yC_{50} (based on frond number) (95 % C.I.): 11.9 mg prod./L (15.3 – 12.3 mg prod./L) and E_yC_{50} (based on dry weight) (95 % C.I.): 12.5 mg prod./L (10.8 – 13.9 mg prod./L).

| 2.5 mg prou. D) | |
|--|--|
| | I. MATERIAL AND METHODS |
| Test material | FLU SC 500 Specification No.: 102000018148 Batch No.: EV57002782 Content of a.s.: 42.3 % w/w (502 g/L) Density: 1.189 g/mL |
| Guideline(s) adaptation | Not specified |
| Test species | Duckweed (<i>Lemna gibba</i>) |
| Acclimation | Inoculum pre-culture, preparation days before the start of the main test |
| Culturing conditions | Growth medium and a second sec |
| Test solutions | Nominal concentrations $60 - 19 - 6.0 - 1.9 - 0.6 - 0.19$ mg prod./L Corresponding nominal concentrations of fluopyram: 25.38 \times 8.037 \times 2.538 - 0.804 - 0.2538 - 0.6804 mg a.s./L Control: water Evidence of undissolved material: At the highest test concentration (60 mg prod./L) slightly pronounced colouration was observed at test start, and then slightly pronounced turbidity of the test medium was observed on bays 3 \times and 7 \times |
| Replication | No. of vessels per concentration (replicates): 4 No. of vessels per control (replicates): 4 |
| Organisms per replicate | No of fronds per vessel: 10 , y |
| Exposure | Static St |
| Test conditions | Incubation chamber used: not specified Vessels: 250 and glass dishes with 200 ml test solution Temperature: 23.2 – 24.8 (Photoperiod: permanent light Light fortensity, 6560 - 7900 Jux (mean: 7117 lux) Type of light: fluorescent tobes pH of controls: 7.5 - 8.8 Water bardness: not reported Dissolved oxygen: not reported Conductivity: < 5 μS/cm |
| Parameters Measured / Observations | Determination of frond number was made on days 0, 3, 5 and 7. Visual observations of sub- lethal effects were performed on days 3, 5 and 7. |



| | Temperature was determined daily in one additional incubated glass vessel. The pH of each treatment was measured at test start and test end. The light was measured at least once during the test. |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Sampling for chemical analysis | Duplicate samples were taken from all freshly prepared test media on day 0 including of control. On day 7 duplicate samples were collected from all aged test levels including of control by pouring together the contents of each treatment. Samples were analysed by using a LC-MS/MS. |
| Data analysis | ECx calculations were performed by probit analysis. LOEC and NOEC values were determined by the Williams't-test (frond fumber and dry weight) to detect significant differences between test concentrations and control. All statistical evaluations were done using the commercial program ToxRat Professional (version 3.3.0) |

| | | QD [×] | · \ . « | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--|----------|------------|
| | | , × 、 ° | N IN | | |
| | | S Q | | N A | \sim |
| | II D- | 0. 0 | | ~0° 07 | 1. A . |
| | II. REŞ | ULTS AND DISC | FUSSION | 0, | |
| | | \rightarrow \sim \sim | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Ş | Ŭ 🖉 🖉 |
| | á. | $\sim \sim \sim$ | jõ "C | | |
| Table 10.2.1-20: Val | idity criteria | , N. O. | N Ó ^y | 17 S | |
| | | <u>, Si Si .</u> | <u> </u> | | |
| Validity anitania (OEC | | | De Quined | | Bibtoin 01 |
| valuty criteria (OEC | D 221) | | required | ř dř | Sonainen |
| | N V | Ô Ô | (And Contraction of the second | | |
| Doubling time | | O S | 2.5 da ys | | 6 days |
| | | | | | |
| | | y f. a | | | 0 |
| | | | | " ~~" () | 1 |

Analytical results:

Ø Full details and acceptable validation data to support the analytical method are presented within document M-CA & which comply with the EC regulatory requirements outlined within , , SANTE/2020/128 \$, Rev Y.

SANTE/2020/12859, Rec 1. Second between 99 and 105 % of nominal concentrations and on day 7 between 83 and 105 %. All biological results are based on nominal test concentrations of the formulation.

Fluopyram was not detected in the compol samples above the limit of detection (LOD: 0.005 µg a.s./L).

| 10010101201 200 | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------|-------|-------|
| Nomination | ncentration | % of nominal | | | |
| [mg prod/L] | [µg a.s./L] | Day 0 | Day 7 | Day 0 | Day 7 |
| 0.99 | ×80.4 | ~ 890. | 81.1 | 100 | 101 |
| <u>م</u> لك 0.6 | × 252 8 3 | Ø <u>1.3</u> | 255.1 | 99 | 101 |
| 1.9 | × 804 C | @ 816.A | 822.8 | 102 | 102 |
| 6.0 | 2538 | 2614.6 | 2652.8 | 103 | 105 |
| 19 | L ⁷ 8007 L | ~®132.5 | 8164.3 | 101 | 102 |
| | 25380 | 26591.7 | 20994.5 | 105 | 83 |

Table 10.2.1-21: Analwtical

given report Calculations based on two measured samples.

Ô



0

Biological results:

Observations

No visual effects were observed in the three lowest test concentrations (0.19, 0.6 and 1.9 mg pcd./L). At the higher test concentrations the fronds showed deviations from the control eplicates after 7 days; i.e. gibbous growth (6.0, 19 and 60 mg prod./L), slightly overlapping fronds (6.0, mg prod./L), smaller fronds (6.0, 19 and 60 mg test item/L), shortened roots (19 and 60 mg prod./L), necrosis (19 and 60 mg prod./L), chlorosis (19 and 60 mg prod./L)and separated fronds (1% and 60 mg prod./L)

| | | | - | 1 | × 6 | à V | |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Nominal con | centration | Mean ^A frond number | Mean dity www.aht | Growth fra Growth fra Growth fra July Growth fra Growth fra July Growth fra Ju | exte for Grond ' mber' (days | Growth | rato for dey verght 5 -7 dayş |
| [mg prod./L] | [µg a.s./L] | Day 7 | Day 7 | Mean A | 6 Inhibition | Mean ** [1/d] | % Jahribition [°] |
| Cont | rol | 241.0 | 32.8 | 0.429 | | Q:461 | |
| 0.19 | 80.4 | 254.0 | \$¥34.8 | 0:4056 | | ©0.469 | -1.8 |
| 0.6 | 253.8 | 2628 | 35.1 | 0.441 | Ž.9 Č | 0.4 🏹 | <i>چ</i> -2.1 |
| 1.9 | 804 | م \$57.8 ملي ال | 340:4 | \$ 0.43 | -2.10 | 2 ^{9.467} « | -1.3 |
| 6.0 | 2538 | 237.3 | \$\$31.3 J | 0.426 | | 0.454 | 1.5 |
| 19 | 8037 _ @ | p 3 0 8 | 5 6 S | 0.159 | 26 2 .8 * | 0,236 | 48.9 * |
| 60 | 25380 | 4.0 | ð.4 á | Q 0.0Q | ¢ 94.9 [€] | ê 9 .203 | 56.0 * |
| A Mean valu | ie of 4 replicate | es P V | a, 5 | | j v c | , Y | |

| Table | 10.2.1-2 | 2: Re | sults for from | nd number an | d correspondi | ng growth rates | and inhibition |
|-------|----------|----------------------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| | | | | | | a . | |
| | | | | | e | Å. | |
| | | | | | | Ø | <u> </u> |
| U | • | <i>, , , , , , , , , ,</i> | | U I | í Č | | Ĩ, Ĉ |

В

Significantly different from the control (brised on Williamst-test, of 0.05 Sne-side@smaller) *

| Table 10.2.1 323: | Results for yield | based on frond | number and | corresponding % inhibitions |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|------------|--|
| | | m ^y U | Q | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ |
| | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | |

| Nominal con | ncentration | Yield based o | n frond number av | ⊖ [≫] Yield bas | ed on dry weight Day 7 |
|--------------|----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| [mg prod./L] | (prg a.s./L) | Mean | % Infabition ^B | Mean ^A | % Inhibition ^B |
| Con | trol 8 | 2 9 .0 | - 6 7 - 6 7 | 31.5 | - |
| 0.19 | 80.4 | ~~242.0~ | | 33.5 | -6.4 |
| 0.6 | 253.8 | J 25678 ~ | \$9.7 | 33.8 | -7.1 |
| 1.9 | \$04 | ~245.8 | م م 7.3 | 33.1 | -5.0 |
| 6.0 | ⁴ 2538-5 ³ | 225.0 | 1.6 | 30.0 | 4.9 |
| 19 | © [∿] 8037 | 24.8 | 89.2 | 5.5 | 82.6 * |
| 60 | 23380 | × 2.0 | 99.1 | 4.1 | 87.0 * |

A Mean alue of Areplicates ~Õ K)

В -% phibition means therease wyield relative to the control

Significantly different from the control (based on Williams t-test, $\alpha = 0.05$, one-sided smaller)

E C



III. CONCLUSION

| TTI - 1 1 - 1'-1' ' '- | | |
|---|--|---|
| The study meets the validity criteria a | nd endpoints based on nominal p | broduct concentrations were: "" |
| Endpoint (Day 0-7) | Effect on mean growth rate of frond number | Effect on mean growth rate of dry weight |
| ErC50 (95 % C.I.): | 16.2 mg prof./L (15.4 – 16.9 mg prod./L) | 35.3 mg prod 1 (27.7 – 406 mg prod./L |
| E _r C ₂₀ (95 % C.I.) | 10.7 mg prod./L 9.20 - 14 mg prod./L | 9.49 mg prod./L ° (5.844 13.0 mg prod./L) |
| E _r C ₁₀ (95 % C.I.) | 8.56 mg prod./L (7.00 - 9.80 mg prod./L) | © 4.78 mg prod \$ 0 @:31 - 535 mg prod./L) |
| LOE _r C: lowest concentration with an effect | 0 6.0 pre prod 2 | of mg.prod./LA |
| NOE _r C: highest concentration without an effect | 19 mg prod./L | 19.mg prod.7L |
| | | |
| Endpoint (Day 0 - 7) | Effect on mean yield of | Effect on mean yield of dry |
| EyC50 (95 % C.I.): | 11.9 mg prod./L | H2.5 mg prod./L (10.8 – 13.9 mg prod./L) |
| E _y C ₂₀ (95 % C.L.). | (895 – 92) mg prod./L | 8.54 mg prod./L (6.73 9.97 mg prod./L) |
| E _y C ₁₀ (95 % C.I.): | 7.20mg prod./L @ (6.72\$7.78 me prod./L) | <pre>% .01 mg prod./L % (\$\frac{5}{21} - 8.46 mg prod./L)</pre> |
| LOESC: 5 | 6.0 mg prod 2 | 6.0 mg prod./L |
| highest concentration without an effect | g mg ptod./L | 2 19 mg prod./L |
| | | |
| Reliability assessment (EFSA 2015) | | |
| The following table provides reliability | $\frac{1}{2}$ $\frac{1}$ | Lemna gibba. |
| Biological endpoints [mg a.s./sp | 95% 62 NW | Relationship EC10/EC20/50 |
| Growth Rate, Frond Number | 769-9.8 0.327 (good) | EC ₁₀ < EC ₂₀ , low (high) |
| Grøwth Rate, Dry Weight | 2.31 7.35 1.054 (poor) | EC ₁₀ < EC ₂₀ , low (high) |
| Vield, Frond Number | $\begin{array}{c} 672 - 7.78 \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0.146 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} 0.146 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} 0.146 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} 0.146 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} 0.146 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} 0.146 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline \\ \hline$ | EC ₁₀ < EC ₂₀ , low (high) |
| Yield, Dry 7.010 Weight 27 4 7.010 | ∀ 5.21 – 8.46 0.464 (good) | $\frac{\text{EC}_{20}, \text{low} < \text{EC}_{10}}{< \text{EC}_{50}, \text{low}}$ (medium) |
| | | |



n

Assessment and conclusion by applicant:

The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment.

The endpoint is: $E_r C_{50}$ (72 hours) = 16.2 mg prod./L (corresponding to ~ = 6.80 mg a.s./L)

CP10.2 Additional long-term and chronif toxicity stratics on fish squarts in the square strate square strate squares in the square strate strate



CP 10.3 Effects on arthropods

CP 10.3.1 Effects on bees

The risk assessment has been performed according to the existing guidance in force at the time of the preparation and submission of this dossier namely the EU Guidance Document on Verrestrial Ecotoxicology (SANCO/10329/2002 rev 2) and EPPO Standard PP 3/10 Environmental Risk Assessment Scheme for Plant Protection Products – Chapter 10: Honeybees

Where bees are likely to be exposed, Commission Regulations (EU) 283/2013 and 284/2013 require testing of both acute (oral and contact) and chronic toxicity, including sub-lethal effects. Although there O are no current testing requirements for any bee other than for the honey bee within Regulation EU 1107/2009, acute oral and contact bumble bee studies were conducted with Quopy and tech. and the representative formulation FLU SC 500 which is presented as additional information (see table below).

Consequently, in addition to the standard toxicity studies performed with adult honey bees (OBCD 213 and 214), the following studies are also provided (please refer to MCA, Section 8):

- Acute oral and contact toxicity of hup war tech. to addit burble bes under laboratory conditions (OECD 246/OECD 247; M-542447-01-1, M-510849-01-1 and MO63126-01-1)
- Chronic 10-day toxicity test with the solve formulation TLU SC 500 on adult honeybees under laboratory conditions (OECD 245, M-540072-00-1)
- Toxicity to honeybee larvae under larvatory conditions following repeated exposure (OECD guidance document 239, M-60/279, 91-1)
- One semi-field study using a special design to determine potential adverse acute, short-term and long-term effects on horey bees (*Apis mellifera* L) and honey bee colonies, during and after continuous exposure exclusively to floopyram fortified carbohydrate and protein diet for a period of two complete honey bee brood cycles (6 weeks, 42 days) (this sente field study is presented in KCA Section 8, Point 8.3.1/3/03(M-542350-0162))
- One semifield bood study following OECD guidance document 75 (using a more realistic spray scenario onto flowering *Phacolia* covering effects on mortality, foraging activity as well as general colony development) with the solonormulation ELU SC 500. This semi-field study is presented in KCR Section 10, point 103.15/01, M-53247401-1.
- One semi-field study following EPPO 170 with the solo formulation FLU SC 500 using a more realistic spray scenario onto flowering Phacelia overing effects on brood development, adult and pupal mortality, for a ging activity behaviour and colory development and strength. This semi-field study is presented in MCP Section 10 Point 0.3.1.5/02, M-547034-01-1.

| À | | | | | |
|------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Table 10\$.1- 1: | Ecotoxicological | endpoints r | elevant for t | the risk assessment for | bees for FLU SC 500 |

| Test/substance | study type | Endpoint | References |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| Laboratory | | Ý Ý | |
| Eluon wam tech | Apis folliferty acute test | ⁶ 2D ₅₀ oral (48 h) > 102.3 μg a.s./bee LD ₅₀ contact (48 h) > 100 μg a.s./bee | (2005) <u>M-261594-01-1</u> KCA 8.3.1.1.1/01 KCA 8.3.1.1.2/01 |
| | <i>Boinbus</i> <i>terrestris</i> , acute test | $LD_{50} \text{ oral } (48 \text{ h}) > 92.5 \ \mu\text{g a.s./bumble bee}$ | (2015) <u>M-542447-01-1</u> KCA 8.3.1.1.1/06 |



| Test substance | Test species/ study type | Endpoint | References |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | <i>Bombus</i> <i>terrestris</i> , acute test | LD ₅₀ contact (48 h) > 100 μ g a.s./bumble bee | (2015) <u>M-510849-621</u> KCA 8.3 01.2/045 |
| | <i>Bombus</i> <i>terrestris</i> , acute test | $LD_{50} \text{ oral } (48 \text{ h}) > 90.5 \mu\text{g a.s./bumble bee}$ $LD_{50} \text{ contact } (48 \text{ h}) > 100 \mu\text{g a.s./bumble bee}$ | (2021) M-768723-007 KCA 8.3.4 P1/07 KCA 8.3.9.1.2/05 |
| | Apis mellifera, larva 22-day repeated feeding test | $\begin{array}{rcl} NOEC & \geq 520 \text{ mg a.s./kg diet} \\ NOED & \geq 80.1 \ \mu\text{g a.s./larva} \\ EC_{10} & 390 \ \text{mg a.s./kg diet} \\ & & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & &$ | (2018) (2018) (2018) (2018) (1018) (2 |
| | Apis mellifera, acute test | D ₅₀ oral (48 μ) > 220 μg a /bee D ₅₀ contact (48 h) > 200 μg a.s./bee | (2020) <u>M-704653-61-1</u> KCP 10.3.1.1.1/02 SCP 10.3.1.1.2/02 |
| FLU SC 500 | Bombus terrestris acute test | LD_{50} oral (480h) $>$ 232.4 µS a.s./bumble bee LD ₅₀ contact (48 h) $>$ 200 µg a.s./bumble bee | (2020) <u>MC690268-01-1</u> KCP 10.3.1.1.1/03 KCP 10.3.1.1.2/03 |
| | Apis mellifera, D-day otal Seeding test | LDD20 > St.4 µg a.s./bee/day NOLOD 81.4 µg a.s./bee/day LC ₅₀ > 3333 mg a.s./kg diet NOEO 3335 mg a.g./kg diet | (2015) <u>M-540072-01-1</u> KCA 8.3.1.2/01 KCP 10.3.1.2/01 |
| Higher Tier O N Y Y Y Y Y Y | | | |
| Fluopyram tech. | Apis mellifera, Servir field honey bes feeding study with post- exposure field observation period | Overall, no adverse koute, short-term and long-term effects on martality, colony/strength and colony development, broad development, food storage, honey bee behaviour queen survival, overall hive vitality and colony health, as well as on overwintering performance after continuous exposure of honey bee colonies under confined conditions to a fluopyram-concentration of 10000 ug a.s. kg diet for a period of 6 consecutive | (2016) <u>M-549350-01-2</u> KCA 8.3.1.3/03 |
| , s | | weeks during pringtime/early summer. | |
| | Semi-field horey bee brood study (acearding to OF D 75. forced exposure conditions) | Overall, no odverse effects on honey bee behaviour, brood development, colony strength and queer survival after one application of 250 g a.s./ha onto flowering <i>Phacelia</i> <i>conacettolia</i> , during active foraging of honeybees | (2015) <u>M-532474-01-1</u> KCP 10.3.1.5/01 |
| FLU SC 580 | Honeybee Acolony Colony Honeybee Acolony Col | Overall, no adverse short-term or long-term effects on mortality, colony strength and - development, brood development, food storage, honey bee behaviour, queen survival, overall hive vitality and colony health, as well as on overwintering performance after two sequential foliar applications at a rate of 250 g a.s./ha each onto blooming <i>Phacelia tanacetifolia</i> . | (2016) <u>M-547034-01-1</u> KCP 10.3.1.5/02 |

Bold values used in risk assessment a.s.: active substance


µg product/ bee]

Risk assessment for bees

The risk assessment for bees for fluopyram is based on the application rates of one time 0.15L product/ha corresponding to the maximum single application rate of 75 g a.s./ha for the application in apples using the endpoints (LD₅₀ values) for the active substance fluopyram and the formulation FLU SC 500.

Hazard Quotients

The risk assessment is based on Hazard Quotient approach (Q_H) by cateullating the ratio between the application rate (expressed in g a.s./ha) and the laboratory contact and oral DD_{50} (expressed in μ g a.s./bee).

 Q_H values are calculated using data from the studies performed with the active substance and with the formulation. Q_H values higher than 50 indicate the need of higher tiered activities to clarify the actual risk to honeybees.

Hazard Quotient, oral:

 $Q_{HO} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac$

[μg as.s./bee, or

Hazard Quotient, contact: $\bigotimes_{a} Q_{HC} \bigoplus_{a} \underbrace{\max_{a} \max_{b} \max_{b} \max_{c} \max_{b} \max_{c} \max_{b} \max_{c} \max_{b} \max_{c} \max_{b} \max_{c} \max_{c} \max_{b} \max_{c} \max_{c}$

Table 10.3.1- 2: Pazard quotients for bees for the application in apples, 1 & 75 g a.s./ha- oral exposure

| Fluopyran tech. 75° 75° 902.3 75° 902.73 50° 902.3 FLUSC 500 3200° 3200° 3200° 3200° 3200° 3200° 3200° 3200° | Compoint | Oral LD5 [#g a.s./bee] | Max. application y pate y 22/hal | Hazard Fuotient Que | Trigger | <i>A-priori</i> acceptable risk for adult bees |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------------|---------|--|
| | Fluopyram tech. | چ >202.3 | 7567 29 | 69 .73 | 50 | yes |
| $\begin{bmatrix} FLU SU 500 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0$ | FLU SC 500 | ي ⊄220 لا | 0 ⁵⁷ 4 ⁷⁵ 4 | گ≪0.34 | 50 | yes |

The hazard quotients of oral exposure are below the valuated trigger value for higher tier testing (i.e. $Q_{HO} < 50$).

 Table 10.3.1-3:
 Hazard motients for bees for the application in apples, 1 x 75 g a.s./ha – contact exposure

| Compoind | Contact I.D.50 | Max. application | Hazard quotient Q _{HC} | Trigger | <i>A-priori</i> acceptable risk for adult bees |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|--|
| Fluopyran tech | | 75 | < 0.75 | 50 | yes |
| FLUS 5000 5000 | مرتب مرتب 200 | 75 | < 0.38 | 50 | yes |
| | | | | | |

The hazard quotients for contact exposure are below the validated trigger value for higher tier testing (i.e. $Q_{HO} < 50$).



Further considerations regarding the risk to bees

The active substance fluopyram and the formulated product FLU SC 500 are both of low toxicity to bees. The technical material exhibits acute LD_{50} values for adult bees of > 100 μ a.s./bee (contact) and $> 102.3 \ \mu g a.s./bee$ (oral). The formulated product FLU SC 500 is of low to ocity with acute oral and contact LD₅₀ values for adult bees in excess of 200 µg product/bee. HQ values based on the use in spiples for both the active substance and the formulated product are considerably fower than the tevels acgarded to indicate a risk to bees. Acute contact and oral endpoints for bumble bees are similar and comparable to honeybee endpoints for both the active substance and the formulation (FLU SO 500) Hence the of findings indicate that bumble bees do not exhibit greater sensitivity to FLU SC 500 or fluopyrapi tech compared to the honey bee. The risk assessment for poneybees was therefore considered to be protective of other bees and to cover the exposure of non-Apps bees such a Bombus terrestric

Chronic adult toxicity A 10-day laboratory feeding study investigating the effects of fluoryram (administered as formulated product FLU SC 500) was conducted to assess chrome toxicity to honey bees in accordance with OECD Guideline No. 245. A solo SC formulation was chosen in place of technical parterial to enable chronic administration of fluopyram in a 50 % sugar solution and to overcome any solubility issues that may have occurred by using technical fluopyram with organic solvents

The study concluded that continuous ad librum feeding at 3333 mg a.s. kg diegover a period of 10 days led to 10 % mortality. The DD50 Was determine as > 81.4 µg a.s./be day, The NOPDD was identified at 81.4 µg a.s./bee/day. Daily dosing with 81.4 µg a.s./bee/da@over 10 days@otal cose = 814 µg a.s./bee) thus did not induce higher mortality compared to a single acute orak exposure at 102.3 µg a.s./bee. Therefore, study results do not indicate delayed or cumulative to acity effects following chronic exposure to fluopy and compared with actite testing. Details of the study are presented together with the ecotoxicological endpoints in MCA, Section 8, Point 8.3.1.201, 12540012-01-1.

Chronic laural toxicity/effects on brood

A honeybee larval to with the assessing the effect of fluopyram on adult emergence following repeated feeding exposure was conducted to address effects on immature honey bee life stages and their development. The 22-day laboratory dose-response test as a sense larval and pupal survival as well as adult emergence, following Sexposure to nominal concentrations of 32.5, 65.0, 130, 260 and 520 mg a.s./kg diet The corresponding cumulative doses were 5.01, 10.0, 20.0, 40.0 and 80.1 µg a.s. (larva. The 2^{2} -day NOED (emergence) was determined to be \geq 80.1 µg a.s./larva (corresponding NOEC of \geq 520 mg as /kg diet), indicating no risk to honey bee development. Details of the study are presented together, with the exploxicological endpoints in MCA, Section 8, Point 8.3.1.3/01, <u>M-617249-01</u>

Higher tier risk assessment for bees (tunnel tests, field studies)

Although the findings of the laboratory toxicity tests and the tier 1 risk assessment based on acute tests did not ordicate a risk to bees due to the use of FLU SC 500, further assessment of the chronic risk to adult bees an arvacits derived through findings from higher tier studies.

In order to investigate whether fluopyram would pose an acute, short-term and long-term risk on honey bees (Apps mellifera L.) and honey bee colonies, a semi-field study was conducted with fluopyram tech. by exposing honey bee colonies exclusively to fluopyram-fortified carbohydrate and protein diet (M-549350-01-2). Based on the results of the study no adverse acute, short-term and long-term effects on mortality, colony strength and colony development, brood development, food storage, honey bee



behaviour, queen survival, overall hive vitality and colony health, as well as on overwintering performance after continuous exposure of honey bee colonies under confined conditions to a fluopyramconcentration of 10000 µg a.s./kg diet. for a period of 6 consecutive weeks during springtime arly summer were detected.

Moreover, a semi-field honey bee study (according to the provisions of the OECD Guidance Document 75 in combination with the OEPP/EPPO Guideline No. 170(4) (2010)) was conducted with the representative formulation FLU SC 500 under forced/confined exposure conditions (KCP10.3 5; M-9 532474-01-1) to clarify whether fluopyram poses a risk to honey bee blood and colony development under realistic worst-case conditions.

Furthermore, a semi-field honey bee study (according to OEPP/EPPO guideline No. 176(4)) with the representative formulation FLU SC 500 was conducted under forced/gonfined exposure conditions (KCP 10.3.1.5; <u>M-547034-01-1</u>), with two sequential foliar applications onto blooming *Phacelia* tanacetifolia at a rate of 250 g a.s./ha.

In both semi-field studies (KCP 10.3.1.5; M-53247401-1 and KCP 10.3.05; M-54703401-1) to shortterm or long-term effects on mortality, cotony strength and _development, brood development, God storage, honey bee behaviour, queen spevival, overall hive stality and colony health, as well as on overwintering performance were detected after one or two applications of 250 gas./hg onto flowering

It can be concluded from all higher tige studies (special design, QECD Quidance Document 75 and OEPP/EPPO guideline No. 170(4)) performed with Ruopytam tegs, and the representative formulation FLU SC 500, investigating side-effects on immature honey be life stages that fluopyram and the representative formulation PLU Se 500 are of low general intrinsic for intrinsic for bees.





- **CP 10.3.1.1** Acute toxicity to bees
- CP 10.3.1.1.1 Acute oral toxicity to bees

Honeyhees

| CP 10.3.1.1.1 | Acute oral toxicity to bees | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------|
| <u>Honeybees</u> | | | E CONTRACTOR OF | |
| | | | × A | |
| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.1.1.1/01 | Ö | | |
| Report Author: | | - And a second s | | |
| Report Year: | 2007 | Å i | 0° vĩ | |
| Report Title: | Effects of AE C656948 SC | 00A G (acute of | ntact and oral) on he | pney bee QApis |
| | mellifera L.) in the laboratory | × × | | |
| Report No: | 34481035 | · | N R N | |
| Document No: | <u>M-288186-01-1</u> | | | × × |
| Guideline(s) follows | ed in OECD 213: OECD Guideling | for the Testing of | of Cosmicals, Hone | vbees, Aeute |
| study: | Oral Toxicity Test, (adopted | 21st September 1 | 998); OECD 214: | ECD uidel |
| | for the Testing of Chervicals, | , Noneybeor, Acu | te ContaQ Toxicity | Test, (adopted |
| | 21st Septemb@1998), Æquiy | alent to VS EP/C | OPPTS Guideshe 1 | No. 850.3670 |
| | SUPP & & | | | <u>V</u> |
| Deviations from cur | rent Current Guideline? OECT 2 | 13 (1998) and OI | E GP 214 (†9 98) 🔊 | |
| test guideline: | Deviations not pplicable. | $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ | | °∼γ |
| Previous evaluation | yes, caluated and acapted | , U Q | | & |
| | in DXR (2011) | | | <u>O</u> ` |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under G. 9/0 | Offi@ally recognis | setMesting Pacilities | |
| recognised testing | | ~~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~ ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | |
| facilities: | | <u>V</u> Öř <u>k</u> | | |
| Acceptability/Reliab | oiligy Yogy y | <u> </u> | <u>~</u> ~~~ | |
| | | , Ž , O , A | U 'Y | |

The study above was performed with an outsided formulation. It is conly shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulations or the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.1.1.1/02 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 (500 g/L): Effects (acute contact and oral) on honey bees Apis |
| _ | mellifera L.) in the laboratory |
| Report No: | 153531035 |
| Document No: | <u>M-704653-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 |
| study: | Directive 2003-01 (Canada/PMRAD) |
| | US EPA OCSPP 850.3020, 850.50pp. |
| | OECD 213 and 214 (1998) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guidelines: OECD 2 ¹ / ₂ (1998) and ECD 214 (1999) |
| test guideline: | Deviations from OECD Gradeline 214: An application volume of 5 µL was chosen |
| _ | in deviation to the guidefine-specified value of 1 µL to ensure reliable dispersion. |
| | The limit dose was 200 µg a.sc/bee instead of the recommended 100 pg a.s./bee. |
| | These deviations are not expected to have impacted the study results. All validity |
| | criteria were met. |
| | Deviations from OECD Quideline 213 The limit dose was 200 µg a.s./bee instead |
| | of the recommended 100 µg as bee. This deviation is not expected to have |
| | impacted the study results. All validity criteria were met. |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted L ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under SLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | bes O' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' 2' |
| | |

Executive Summar

The purpose of this study was to determine the acute contact and oral toxicity of FLU SC 500 to the honey bee (*Api mellifera* L.). Mortality of bees way used as the toxic endpoint. Sublethal effects, such as changes in behaviour, were also assessed.

Under laboratory conditions 50 worker bees were exposed for 48 hours to a single dose of 200.0 μ g a.s./bee by topical application (contact limit test) and to a single dose of 200.0 μ g a.s./bee by feeding (oral limit test) actual dose based on the intake of the test item was 220.0 μ g a.s./bee).

The contact test included a water control group (tap water with 0.5 % Adhäsit). In the oral test bees in the control group were exposed to 50% were aqueous suppose solution. In both tests a toxic reference item (dimethoate) was included.

In the contact toxicity test the LD₅₀ value (48 b) of ELU SC 500 was $> 200.0 \ \mu g$ a.s./bee. The oral LD₅₀ value (48 h) of FLU SC 500 was $> 220.0 \ \mu g$ a.s./bee.

The study fulfils alk alidity criteria of current Guidelines OECD 213 (1998) and OECD 214 (1998).

I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

<u>Test item</u> FLU SC 500, Specification No.: 102000018148, batch No.: EV57002782; TOX. No: TOX21459-00; shalysed content of a.s.: 42.3 % w/w, Density: 1.189 g/mL (at 20°C).

<u>Test species</u> Hones Bee (Apis mellifera L.); female worker bees from a healthy and queen-right colony.

<u>Test design</u>: Under laboratory conditions 50 worker bees were exposed for 48 hours to a single dose of 200.0 μ g a.s./bee by topical application (contact limit test) and to a single dose of 200.0 μ g a.s./bee by feeding (oral limit test; actual dose based on the actual intake of the test item was 220.0 μ g a.s./bee).



The controls used for the contact and oral tests were tap water containing 0.5 % Adhäsit) and 50 % w/v sucrose solution (500 g/L tap water), respectively. As a toxic reference dimethoate (D400.0 g/L nominal, 408 g/L analytical) was applied at nominal dose levels of 0.30, 0.20, 0.15 and 0.10 µg dimethoate bee in the contact test and at nominal doses of 0.30, 0.15, 0.08 and 0.05 µg dimethoate/bee in the oral test.

In the contact and oral toxicity test each treatment group (test item, water control and reference item) comprised 5 replicates including 10 bees each.

Application in the contact test: In the contact toxicity test the test item was dissolved in tap water with 0.5 % Adhäsit and applied as one 5 µL droplet onto the dorsal thorax of bees using a calibrated pipele. For the control, one 5 µL droplet of tap water containing 0.5 % Adhasit was used. The reference item of was applied as one 5 µL droplet of dimethoate, dissolved in tap water with 0.5 % Adhäsit. A5 µL droplet was chosen in deviation to the guideline recommendation of a KuL droplet since a higher volume ensured a more reliable dispersion of the test iter Bees were shortly anaesthetized with Coo until they were immobilized immediately before application.

Application in the oral test: The test item and reference iter were applied in 50 % w/v sucrose solution, which was used as carrier (food) in the orar test. For the control pure 50 % W/v sucrose solution was offered to the bees. This diet was offered in syringes which were weighed before and after introduction into the cages. After a maximum of bour and 25 minutes the test item treated food was completely ingested by the bees and afterwards eplaced by fresh, untreated food gellibitum.

Dose levels:

200.0 µga.s./bee (contract limit test) Nominal doses of the test item

200. Qug a.s. bee (oral ling) test Ŝ 220.0 µg@.s./bee (based on the actual food intake) Actual dose of the test item (oral test); Nominal doses of the reference item. 0.30, 0.20, 0.45 and 0.10 µg dimethoate/bee (contact test), d' 0.30, 0.15 0.08 and 0.05/µg diffethoate/bee (oral test)

Actual doses othe reference item (oral test 0.33 0.16 0.08 and 0.06 µg dimethoate/bee 24 - 25 3C, relative handidity: 59 - 52 %; photoperiod: 24 h darkness Test conditions: Temperature: (except during observations).

Statistics. Results obtained from the honey bees treated with the test item were compared to those obtained from the control in both the contact and oral tests. The contact and oral LD50/20/10 values of the test item were estimated and not determined with any statistical methods since less than 10 % mortality occurred in the contact and oral tests. The contact and oral LD50 values of the reference item were determined with Probit Analysis (according to Finney 1971). The LD50 calculation of the reference item was carried out taking into account the mortality data corrected using Abbott's formula (1925). The software used to perform the statistical analysis was ToxRat Professional, Version 3.2.1 (ToxRat® Solutions GmbH).

Dates of work: May 04th to May 07th, 2020



II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Biological findings:

Contact Test:

In the contact toxicity test 6.0 % mortality was observed at 200.0 μ g/bee after 48 hours. In the control 4.0 % mortality occurred. No test item related behavioural effects were observed at any time.

| Table 10.3.1.1.1- 1: Mor | tality and bel | havioural abno | ormatities of | the becom th | e contact toxi | rity test of a |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| | Afte | er 4 h | A Afte | r 24 🕀 💦 | Afte | r 48 h 🗸 🖉 |
| Treatment group | Mortality | Behav. abnorm. | Mortality | Behava Ø abnørm. | Mortality | Behav. |
| | Mea | n [%] 💍 | O Mea | n [%] | Mea | n [%] |
| Water control | 0.0 | .0.0 | | ₩ 0.0 | \$ ^{4.0} | 0.0 |
| Test item [µg a.s./bee] | | | | | | |
| 200.0 | 0.0 | Q 0.0 V | × 0.0 × | ×0.0 Č | <u>e</u> õ â | ¥ 0 <u>.0</u> |
| Reference item [µg a.s./ | bee] | | Ý V | N 83 | | L. |
| 0.10 | 0.0 | \$0.0 Q | Q.0 É | \$` <u>9</u> .9` | 0 4.0 ⁰ | 0.0 |
| 0.15 | 100 | × 4.0 | 26.0 L | Q.0 | 30 6.0 | ⊿ 0.0 |
| 0.20 | 10.0 & | 12,0 | 42,0 | \$ 0.0 ¥ | \$ \$50.0 | 0.0 |
| 0.30 | \$24.0 ° | 30.0 | e72.0 | 0.0 | 78:0 | 4.0 |

Results are averages from 5 replicates then bees each) for the te titem, control group and the reference item groups Test item = FLU SC 500; reference frem = dimethoate, control CO2/typ water control Behav. abnorm. = behavio ral abnormalities

In the oral toxicity test the maximum nominal test concentration of FLU SC 500 (200 µg/bee) corresponded to an actual intake of 2200 µg/bee. This dos@level resulted in 2.0 % mortality after 48 hours. In the control group (30% we sucrose solution), 2.0 % mortality was observed. No test item

And the second s



| After | | r 4 h | h After 24 h | | After 48 h | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------|------------------|----|
| Treatment group | Mortality | Behav. abnorm. | Mortality | Behav. abnorm. | Mortality | Behav. abnorm | ð. |
| | Mean | ı [%] | Mea | n [%] | 🔊 Mear | n [%] | |
| Water control | 0.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 🔍 🗘 | <u> </u> | Î, |
| Test item [µg a.s./bee] | | | Ò | | L. | | ſ |
| 220.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | \$ 0.0° | Å |
| Reference item [µg a.s./b | ee] | | , O Y | Å | | | × |
| 0.06 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | [™] 0.0 ©° | 2.0 | 0.0 | ĺ |
| 0.08 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 14,0 | 40 | | |
| 0.16 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 66.0 | J4.0 ~~ | \$6 .0 | 0.0 | |
| 0.33 | 14.0 | 18.0 | × 100 v | 0.0 0 | 100.05 | 0.0 ~ ° | |

Table 10.3.1.1.1-2: Mortality and behavioural abnormalities of the bees in the oral toxicity test

Results are averages from 5 replicates (ten bees each) for the yest item, control group and the reference item groups Test item = FLU SC500; reference item = dimethoate, control = tap water with sucr Behav. abnorm. = behavioural abnormalities

able below. The endpoints for the contact and oral toxicity fest are show

| Table 10 2 1 1 1 2. | Control | | tovisity | of EV II | SG 500 | to honous boos | |
|----------------------|-------------|-------|----------|----------|--------|----------------|--|
| Table 10.3.1.1.1- 5. | Contact and | 01 a1 | UNIGITY | ULLU | 38,300 | ty noneyspees | |

| Test item 🔬 | _~FLU_&C 500 ° ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Test species | Honey been pis met ifera L. |
| Exposure | Contact Ora |
| Test duration | 48 h 48 h |
| Dose rate.[192 a.s./bee] | 290.0 A V Nominal dose: 200.0 A Actual dose: 220.0 |
| LD ₅₀ [ĥỹ a.s./bee] | > 200.0 5 5 5 220.0 |
| 8 A | |

<u>кеterence item</u> The contact and oral LD₃₀ (240) values of the reference item (dimethoate) were calculated to be 0.22 µg gs/bee and 0.44 µg gs/bee respectively. These values corresponded to the expected range cited in the OECD Guideline 213 (1998) and 210 (1998) and thus demonstrated the sensitivity of the test item.



Validity criteria:

The contact and oral toxicity tests were considered valid as the control mortality in each case was $\leq 10^{\circ}$ % and the LD_{50} values obtained with the reference item (dimethoate) were within the required ranges.

Table 10.3.1.1.1-4: Validity criteria

| Validity criteria | Recommended 🖉 | | Otstained 5 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| | Č | Contact Test | |
| Control mortality | Control <u>S</u> 'S | 0% | |
| | | Oral Test 0 ' | |
| | Control | | 2.0% |
| | | ontact Test | Ô 4 A |
| LD ₅₀ of reference | Dimethoate | μg a.s. bee | > 0.22 µg a.s. bee |
| item (24 h) | | OraPtest S | |
| | Dimethoate | jug a.s./bee | Ø.14 up a.s./bee |
| | | | Ĩ S. S |

W III. Concension

The toxicity of FLU SC 500 was tested in an acute contact and gral toxicity test on honey bees. The LD₅₀ (48 h) was determined \mathbf{O} be > 200.0 for a.s./bee in the contact to society test. The LD₅₀ (48 h) was determined to be > 220.0 µg a.s./bee in the oral toxicity test.

Assessment and conclusion by applicant: The study and its data are considered as a comptable and reliable for use in risk assessment. The endpoints are LD₅₀ contact (48 hours) > 2000 µg os bee LD₅₀ oral (48 hours) > 2200 µg os bee LD₅₀ oral (48 hours) > 2200 µg os bee LD₅₀ oral (48 hours) > 2000 µg os bee LD



Bumble bees

| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.1.1.1/03 |
|--|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 (500 g/L): Effects (acute contact and oral) on bumblebees |
| - | (Bombus terrestris L.) in the laboratory |
| Report No: | 153531105 |
| Document No: | M-690268-01-1 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 |
| study: | Directive 2003-01 (Canada/PorRA) |
| | US EPA OCSPP 850.3020 550.supp. |
| | OECD 246 and 247 (2010) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 246 and 245 2017 C |
| test guideline: | Deviations from OE G Gui Celine 246: No information on Spimble bee colonies |
| | concerning size, brood stages and number of bumble bees are reported. The limit |
| | dose was 200 µg(a.s./bee instead of the recommanded dose of 100 µg as /bee |
| | These deviations are not expected to have impacted the study results. All validity |
| | criteria of the current guidekine were met. |
| | Deviations from OBCD Grideline 247: No information of bumble bee colonies |
| | concerning size, brood stages and number of burnble bees are reported. These |
| | deviations are not expected to have inspacted the study results. All validity criteria |
| | of the current guideline weromet. |
| Previous evaluation: | No not previously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under SLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| tacılıties: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | $ \chi es _{\mathcal{O}} \land \chi \land$ |
| a la | |
| a a | |

Executive Summary

Executive Summary The purpose of this study was to determine the acute contact and Gral toxicity of FLU SC 500 to the bumble bee (Bombus terrestric L.). Mortality of bumble bees was used as the toxic endpoint. Sublethal J'Y effects, such as changes in behaviour, were also assessed.

Under laboratory conditions 50 worker bumble bees were exposed for 48 hours to a single dose of 200 µg a.s./bumble bee by propical application (contact limit test) and to a single dose of 200 µg a.s./bomble kee by feeding yoral timit test, actual dose based on the intake of the test item was 232.4 μ g a.s./bumble bee) L.

The contact test comprised a water control group (tap water with 0.1 % v/v Triton X-100). In the oral test bees in the control group were exposed to 50% w/v aqueous sucrose solution. In both tests a toxic reference item (dimethoate) was included.

The purpose of the analytical part of this study was to verify the concentrations of the active ingredient fluopyram in the single contact application solution (limit test) and in the single oral feeding solution (limit test)

In the contact to kicity test the D₅₀ value (48 h) of FLU SC 500 was estimated to be > 200 µg a.s./bumble bee. The contact NGED value (48 h) was calculated to be $\geq 200 \ \mu g \ a.s./bumble bee.$

The oral \sum_{50}^{1} value (48 h) of FLU SC 500 was > 232.4 µg a.s./bumble bee. The oral NOED value (48 h) was calculated to be $\geq 232.4 \ \mu g a.s./bumble bee.$

The study fulfils all validity criteria of the current OECD Guideline 246 and 247 (2017).



I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

<u>Test item:</u> FLU SC 500, Specification No.: 102000018148, origin Batch No.: EV57002782; TOX. No.? 21459-00; analysed content of a.s.: 502.7 g/L; Density: 1.189 g/cm³.

<u>Test species:</u> Adult bumble bees (*Bombus terrestris* L.); adult female worker bumble bees from healthy and queen-right bumble bee colonies obtained from a commercial bumble bee breeding company After collection from the hive the bumble bees were kept individually in cylindrical, latticed plastic cages. Medium-sized bumble bees were selected visually and kindomly distributed to the treatment groups. Each bumble bee was weighed individually after apesthetisation with CO₂ to prove a consistent distribution among the treatment groups. Bumblebees were acclimatised to test conditions (contact test 21 hours 39 minutes; oral test: 43 hours 25 minutes) with *ad libitum* access to undeated 50% w/v success solution.

<u>Test design</u>: Acute contact toxicity of FLUSC 500 to addit bumble bees was assessed by exposing 50 worker bumble bees to 200 μ g a.s./bumble bee dissolved in tap water containing 0.1 % v/v Triton X-100 (contact limit test). Additional groups of 50 and 30 adult bumble bees each wore assigned to either a water control (tap water containing 0.1 % v/v Triton X-100) and reference item (10 μ g dimethoate/bumble bee) treatment group, respectively.

Acute oral toxicity of FLU SC 500 to adult bumble bees was assessed by exposing 56 worker bumble bees to 200 μ g a.s./bumble bee in 50 % v/v sucrose solution (oral limit test). This nominal treatment dose corresponded to a mean oral dose of 232 4 μ g a.s./bumble bee) based on the actual mean intakes of the test item. In addition, 50 and 30 adult bumble bees each were assigned to either a water control (50 % w/v sucrose solution) or reference item (mean oral dose of 4.9 μ g dimethoate/bumble bee) treatment group, respectively. Bumble bees which did not consume at least 80 % of the mean food uptake per treatment group were excluded from the evaluation (Test item; b=42, Water control: n= 43, Reference item; b=20

<u>Application in the contact test:</u> In the contact to vicity test the test iter was dissolved in tap water with 0.1 % v/v. Triton X-100 and applied as one 2 μ L droplet onto the dorsal thorax of bumble bees using a calibrated pipette (Multipette), Eppendorf). The efference iter was applied as one 2 μ L droplet of dimethoate, dissolved in tap water with 0.4% v/v Triton X-100. For the control, one 2 μ L droplet of tap water containing 0.4% v/v Triton X-100 was used.

<u>Application in the oral test</u>: The test item and reference item were applied in 50 % w/v sucrose solution, which was used as carrier (food) in the oral test. For the control untreated 50 % w/v sucrose solution was offered to the bumble bees Approximately 40 µD food solution per bumblebee was provided in syringes which were weighed before and after introduction into the cages in order to determine the exact consumption. After a maximum of 4 hour, all syringes containing remaining food were removed, weighed and afterwards replaced by fresh untreated food. The calculation of the target dose was based on 40 mg food uptake. The injected consumed oral doses were calculated based on the measured consumption.

In the acute contact and oral test mortality and sub-lethal effects were assessed at 4, 24 and 48 hours after treatment. \swarrow

Dose levels: Nominal doses of the test item

200 µg a.s./bumble bee (contact limit test),

200 µg a.s./bumble bee (oral limit test)

Actual dose of the test item (oral test):

232.4 μ g a.s./bumble bee (based on the actual food intake)



Nominal doses of the reference item:

10 µg dimethoate/bumble bee (contact limit test),

4.0 µg dimethoate/bumble bee (oral limit test)

4.9 µg dimethoate/bumble bee

Actual doses of the reference item (oral test):

- 63 %; photopetiod Test conditions: Temperature: 24.8 - 25.3 °C; relative humidity: 43.5 darkness (except during observation).

Statistics: Results obtained from the bumble bees treated with the test iterfund the reference itern were compared to those obtained from the control in both the contact and oral test. For the evaluation of the results of the oral test, bumble bees which did not consume at least 80% of the mean food uptake per treatment group were excluded from the evaluation of mortality and behavioural apnormalities as well as from the calculation of the final actual doses in the test item treatment group Acute contact and oral toxicity endpoints (e.g. LD50, LD20, LD10) could not be determined from the limit modelling, as the mortality in the test item treatment groups did not reach of exceed 10% at the end of the test. The contact and oral NOED of the test item was estimated using the multiple segrential isher fest after Bonferroni-Holm (pairwise comparison, one-sided greater, α = 0.05) which a distribution-free Dest and does not require testing for normality or homogeneity prior to analysis. The software used to perform the statistical analysis was ToxRat Professional, Version 9.2.1 (@ ToxRat Solutions (SinbH) yen) open) op. Those of years Analytics: Freshly prepared application and feeding solution (20 mL perspectionen) of the control and the test item treatment group were sampled in duplicates on the day of application. The chemical analysis was performed by using LC-MS/MS-method.

Dates of work: May 26th to May 29th 2020 (biological phase)

> 2020 (analytical June 18th to July 02nd,

ANDDISCUSSION

Analytical resol

Full details and acceptable valuation data support the analysical method are presented within documents M-CA 4 which comply with the EU regulatory requirements outlined within SANTE/2020/12830, Rev. 1 K,

In the oral and contact test the mean recoveries of the active ingredient fluopyram in the test item spiked Ő, solutions were 93 and 89 % Fespec vely.

No residues of luop fram were found in the control solution in the oral and contact test above the limit of quantification (LOQ_{contact}: 0.3 µg@.s./L; 10Q or \$7.6 μ@a.s./L).

| | 20 | |
|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Test system | test concentration | Водомощи |
| μgæs./bumble beef | [g a.s./kg feeding solution] | Kecovery |
| Contact Test | 100 | 89 % (mean value) |
| gral Tear 200 | 5 | 93 % |
| | | |

11



Biological findings:

Contact Test:

At the end of the contact toxicity test (48 hours after application) there was no mortality observed at 200 μ g a.s./bumble bee. In the water control group (water with 0.1 % Triton \$100) 2.0 % mortality occurred. There were no test item related behavioural abnormalities at any time arise for the test of the second second

Table 10.3.1.1.1- 6: Mortality and behavioural abnormalities of the bumble bees in the contact to test

| | | | | | %) | |
|---------------------|------------------|--|--|----------|--------------------|--|
| | After | r 4 h | After 24 h | | • After | ~48 h 🖉 🕺 |
| Dose | Mortality | Behav. abnorm. | Mortality | Behav. | Mortality | Behav. |
| | Mean [%] | Mean [%] | Mean [%] 🔨 | Mean/[%] | Mean [%] | Mean [%] |
| Water control | 0.0 | 0.0 | ~~~0.0~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | \$0.0 × | 2.0 O ^v | 0.0 |
| Test item [µg a.s./ | /bumble bee] | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | | |
| 200 | 0.0 | 840 K | \$0.0 \$ | 9.0 | Q .0 | 0.0 |
| Reference item [µ | g a.s./bumble be | elo ~ | | | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ |
| 10 | 0.0 | v ,76 Л (| y 96.7 C | 100.0 | 07 % ,9 « | 100.0 |

Application volume: 2 µL /bumble.bge

Results are mean values of 50 individuals per treatment group (control, test item) and 30 individuals for the reference item treatment group Behav. Abnorm mean. = mean of living individuals persteatment group (control) (contro

Test item = FLU SC 500; reterence item = dimethoate, water control + tap water containing 0.1% Triton X-100

Oral Test

At the end of the oral toxicity test (48 hours after application) 2324 μ g a.s./bumble bee resulted in 4.8 % mortality. No mortably occurred in the water control treatment group (50 % w/v sucrose solution). No test item induced behavioural approximatives were detected a cany time of the test.

Ø

| | | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | • | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------|--|-------------------|------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | After 4 h | | After 24 h | | After 48 h | | | |
| Treatment group | Nortality | Behav. | Mortality | Behav. abnorm. | Mortality | Behav. abnorm. | | |
| | Q Mean | ٩%] کې | Mear | 1 [%] | Mean | [%] | | |
| 🦽 Control 🦨 | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | |
| Test item [µg a.s./bee] | Test item [µg a.s./bee] | | | | | | | |
| 232.4 | | Ê QÎ | 4.8 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | | |
| Reference item [µg/a,s./bee] | | | | | | | | |
| 4.9 | 0 <u>.0</u> | № 100.0 | 80.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | - | | |

Table 10.3.1.1.1- 7 Mortality an Obehavioural abnormanties of the bees in the oral toxicity test

Application volume 40 µL /bumble@ee

Modality mean = mean of individuals per treatment group, considering only those bumble bees, which achieved at least 80 % of the mean food uptake per treatment group (test item: n=42, water control: n=43, reference item: n=20) Behav. Abnorm mean. = mean of living individuals per treatment group

Test item = FLU SC 500; reference item = dimethoate; control = 50 % sucrose solution

Results are mean falues of 50 individuals per treatment group (control, test item) and 30 individuals for the reference item treatment group of the reference item monotone and the second seco



| The endpoints for the contact and oral toxicity test are shown in the table below. | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Table 10.3.1.1.1- 8: Contact and oral tox | icity of FLU SC 500 to bumble bees | | | | | |
| Test item | FLU SC 500 | | | | | |
| Test species | Bumble bee Bombus terrestris L. | | | | | |
| Exposure | Contact ³ (tap water containing 0.1 % v/v Trition X-100) (based on recorded consumption considering bumble bees with food whate of at least 80 % of the mean (uptake per treatment group ¹) | | | | | |
| Target (nominal) dose rates [µg a.s./bumble bee] | | | | | | |
| Actual dose rates [µg a.s./bumble bee] | | | | | | |
| Test duration | 24 48 h 34 h h 34 h h h 34 h h h 34 h | | | | | |
| LD _{50, 20, 10} [µg a.s./bumble bee] ² | 200 200 200 238 2 238 2 232.4 | | | | | |
| NOED [µg a.s./bumble bee] ^{2,} ⁴ | $\geq 200 \qquad \qquad$ | | | | | |
| LOED [µg a.s./bumble bee] ^{2,4} | > 200 > 232.4 > 232.4 | | | | | |

1 For the 232.4 µg as /bumblebee test item treatment group 42 bumblebees were considered for the evaluation. 2 Results obtained from text item treded groups were compared to those obtained from the water control treatment group.

43 bumblebees of the Water control group were considered for the evaluation.

As the test item treatment groups did not show mortality above 50.0, 20 and 100 %, no statistical evaluation on the 3 4

LD₅₀, LD₅₀ and LD₅₀ was carried on $\sqrt{2}$ $\sqrt{2}$ $\sqrt{2}$ $\sqrt{2}$ The NOED/LOED was estimated using Fisher's Exact Test ofter Bohrerroni Holm (pairwise comparison, one-sided greater $Q_{0} = 0.05$) greater $\alpha = 0.05$).

<u>Reference item</u> \mathcal{D}' $\mathcal{D$ contact test and 4.9 µ@ dimethoate/bumble bee in the oralitest. The reference item mortality of 96.7 % and 100.0 % in the end of the contact and oral test (480 rours after application) was within the required range. $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$



| Table | 10.3.1.1.1- | 9: | Validity | criteria |
|-------|-------------|-----|----------|----------|
| | 10.0.11111 | - • | , | |

| Validity criteria | R | ecommended | Obtained |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| | _ | Contact Test | |
| Control mortality | Control | ≤ 10 % | 2.0 % L |
| Control mortanty | | Oral Test | |
| | Control | $\leq 10\%$ | |
| | | Contact Test | |
| LD_{50} of reference | Dimethoate | | 96.7 |
| item (24 h) | | <u>A</u> Oral Test | |
| | Dimethoate | | |
| | | | |
| | | II. Coxclusion 🖉 🔿 | |
| he toxicity of FLU S | C 500 was tested in | in acute contact and oral toxicit | ty Ost on bumble bees. |
| he contact NOED va | lue was calculated to | o be ≥ 200 µg as bumble bee | The contact D50 volue was |
| stimated to be > 200 | ug a.s./bumble@ee. | | |
| he oral NOED value | was calculated to b | $e \ge 232.4 \ \mu g a.s./bumble dee.$ | The contact LDs value was |
| stimated to be > 232.4 | $4 \ \mu g a a.s bumble be$ | | |
| | | | |
| Assessment and con | clusion by applican | t: A A A | |
| The study and its data | are considerent as a | - Contable and certable for use in | n risk Øsessment |
| The order sints and | | | L'Instrussessment. |
| The endpoints are | 1 | | Q |
| LD ₅₀ oral (48 hours) | >\200 µg(a.s./bumble | | Y Y |
| LD50 contact 48 hou | $rs) > 292.4 \ \mu ga.s./ba$ | mblednee O S Q | |
| | | | |



CP 10.3.1.1.2 Acute contact toxicity to bees

Honeybees

| <u>Honeybees</u> | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.1.1.2/01 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Effects of AE C656948 SC 500AG (acute control and oral) on Gney Ses (Agi |
| * | mellifera L.) in the laboratory \mathcal{L} |
| Report No: | 34481035 |
| Document No: | <u>M-288186-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OECD 213: OECD Guideline for the Toxing of Chemicals, Honeybeet, Acute |
| study: | Oral Toxicity Test, (acopted 20st September 1998); (JECD 254: OECD Guideline |
| | for the Testing of Chemicals, Honerbees, Are the Caract Toricity Test, (adopted |
| | 21st September 12(8); Equivalent to US RA OPPTS Grideline Do. 85(20020 |
| | $SUPP \qquad $ |
| Deviations from current | Current Guid@nes: (75/CD 2 @ (1998) and (00 CD 21 A (1994) |
| test guideline: | Deviations of approved able. |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated an maccepton \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim |
| | in DAR (2011) a b b c c v |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, Onducted under CLP/C ficial Orecogn sed tes Ong far these & |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | gees of a contraction of the con |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation At is only shown for transparency reasons

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation at is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance tenewapprocess, which is presented in this section further below.



| Report Author: Report Vear | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Report Vear | |
| | 2020 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 (500 g/L): Effects (acute contact and oral) on honey bees (Apis a mellifera L.) in the laboratory |
| Report No: | 153531035 |
| Document No: | <u>M-704653-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 |
| study: | Directive 2003-01 (Canada/PMRA) |
| | US EPA OCSPP 850.3020, 850.50pp. |
| | OECD 213 and 214 (1998) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guidelines: OECD 203 (1998) and OECD 214 (1998) |
| test guideline: | Deviations from OECD Grudeline 214: An application volume of y µL was chosen |
| | in deviation to the guidefine-specified value of 1 ftL to ensure reliable dispersion. |
| | The limit dose was 200 µg a.s./bee instrad of the recommended 100 pg a.s./bee. |
| | These deviations are not expected to have impacted the study results. All validity o |
| | criteria were met. |
| | Deviations from OECD ouideline 213 The lines dose was 200 µg a.s./bee instead |
| | of the recommended 400 µg as the Ahis deviation is not expected to have |
| D 1 1 | impacted the study results. All validary criteria were met. |
| Previous evaluation: | INO, NOL DICATOUSING NOT THE AND THE ADDRESS OF THE |
| CI D/Officially | Vac and ustadiundared I. D/Officially Gazariand taking facilities |
| olf/Onicially | Tes, winducing under all Francian precognised testing factories |
| facilities: | |
| A cooptobility/Poliobility: | Alter O A G A A |
| | |
| | |



Bumble bees

| | Q° (|
|---|--|
| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.1.1.2/03 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 (500 g/L): Effects (acute contact and oral) on bumblebees |
| Report No: | |
| Document No: | M_690268_01_1 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 |
| study. | Directive 2003-01 (Canada/PWRA) |
| study. | US EPA OCSPP 850 3020 550 supp |
| | OFCD 246 and 247 (20) \sim |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OFCD 246 and 24% 2017 |
| test guideline: | Deviations from OE(D) Guideline 246. No aptormation on bymble bee colonies |
| test galdeline. | concerning size, brood stages and number of bumble bees are reported. The limit |
| | dose was 200 us a s/bee instead of the recommended dose of 100 ug a s/bee |
| | These deviations are not expected to have impacted the study results All validity |
| | criteria of the current guide the were met. |
| | Deviations from QECD Gurdeline 247: No information of bumble bee colonies |
| | concerning size, brood stages and number of burnble bees are reported. These |
| | deviations are not expected to have inplacted the study results. All validity criteria |
| | of the current guideline wer@met. |
| Previous evaluation: | No, hot previously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under CLP/Officially recognised testing fact tites |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliabority: | Wes Of the second secon |
| | |
| For the study summary | on acute contact to active on burghle base please refer to Section CP |
| 103111/@ | |
| | |
| Â, Ŭ | |
| \sim | |
| | |
| Q. | |
| | |
| × × . | |
| | |
| | |
| 4 | |
| N N | |
| | |
| & A | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| S & P | ۶. The second |
| A A | |
| $\mathcal{C}_{\mu}^{\mathcal{O}^{\nu}}$ | |
| \lor | |
| | |
| | |



| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.1.2/01 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Chronic oral toxicity test of fluopyram SC 500B G on the honey bee (Apis |
| | mellifera L.) in the laboratory |
| Report No: | 87481136 |
| Document No: | <u>M-540072-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | GLP compliant study based on OECD 213 (1998) and CEB No. 230 with |
| study: | modifications and current recommendations of the ring test group (2014) |
| | US EPA OCSPP Guideling No. 850. SUPP 😵 🔊 🖉 🎸 |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECQ 245 (2017) |
| test guideline: | The test solution was not checked for possible ovaporation from the feeders. The |
| | measured humidity (4)-90 % exceeded the recommended range of 50-70 %. |
| | These deviations are not expected to have impacted the study results. No further |
| | deviations to the current OECD Guideline 245 occurred All validity criteria were |
| | met. |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted in the submitted in the submitted of the subm |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognise testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes a a a a a |
| | |

CP 10.3.1.2 Chronic toxicity to bees

to MOA Section For study summary please refe

Effects on honey bee development and other honey bee life stages **CP 10.3.1.3**

No studies are available for this formulated solo formulation. However, information on the toxicity of Fluopyram technical to honeybee larvae is presented in the seture substance dossier MCA 8.3.1.3.

Š

Sub-Lethal effects





| CP 10.3.1.5 | Cage and tunnel tests |
|-------------|-----------------------|
| | Cage and funnel tests |

| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.1.5/01 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Assessment of side effects of fluopyram SC 500B G on the honey bee (Apis |
| | mellifera L.) in the semi-field after one application on Phacelia tana cifolia in |
| | Germany 2014 |
| Report No: | S14-00165 |
| Document No: | <u>M-532474-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OECD Guidance Document No. 75 (2007) and current recommendations of the |
| study: | AG Bienenschutz (Pistorius et al., 2012); OBPP/EDPO Gusteline No. 170(4) |
| | |
| | US EPA OCSPP Guideline No. 850.SUPP $\sqrt{2}$ |
| Deviations from current | Current Guidance Doument DECISTS (2007) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: Minimum dayture temperature was below 15 °C, however, for aging |
| | activity was not adversely impacted and consistently above 10 bees/m ² during and |
| | after application. No information about medication of bees prior to test start are |
| | given. O K K K K C C O |
| | No further deviation to the current Suidance Document Soccurred. Alloyalidity |
| | criteria were met. |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously subpritted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognised resting facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yest & O & S |
| <u> </u> | |

Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine potential side effects of FLU SC 500 on honey bee colonies (*Apis mellifera* L.), including brood development, after one application onto full-flowering *Phacelia* tanacetifotia in a semi-field study.

The test item FLU St 500 was applied once at 250 g a.s. ha during full flowering of the crop *Phacelia tanacetifolia* (BBC) 65) while honey bees were actively foraging. The study included a control group (tap water) and reference item group (Insegar, active ingredient: fenoxycarb). For each treatment group (control, test item and reference item) 4 tunnels/replicates were set up, resulting in 12 tunnels in total, with each tunnel containing one honey bee colory.

No biologically relevant adverse effects of the test item on mortality of worker bees or pupae were observed. Foraging activity, behaviour, nectar, and pollen storage and bee brood development in individually marked brood cells were not affected.

No effects on colony strongth of overall bee brood development were observed.

Based on the results of the strady, it can be concluded that FLU SC 500 does not adversely affect honey bee mortality flight intensity, behaviour prood development, colony strength and queen survival when applied once at a rate of 250 g a \$//ha during honey bees actively foraging on a bee-attractive, flowering crop.

The study fulfits all validity criteria of OECD Guidance Document 75 (2007).

I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

<u>Test item:</u> FLU SC 500; Specification No.: 102000018148-01; Batch ID: EM4L011550; Sample Description: TOX10112-00; Analysed content of a.s.: 42.2 % w/w (501.4 g/L); Density: 1.188 g/mL.



<u>Test species:</u> Honey bees (*Apis mellifera* L.); small bee colonies, maintained according to normal beekeeping practice, consisting of a total of 11 combs containing 8 - 9 combs with honey and pollen and 7 - 9 brood combs containing eggs, larvae and capped cells. The preliminary brood check indicated healthy colonies with all brood stages present. The mean strength of the colonies per treatment group, one day before the application, was similar and ranged between 5161 and 5484 adult bees per colony

Location of the field site: Germany

<u>Test concentrations</u>: Four control tunnels treated with 400 L tap water/ha four test tunnels treated with the test item at 250 g a.s./ha in 400 L water/ha (corresponding to 498.6 m) product/ha, and four tunnels treated with the reference item Insegar at 1.2 kg product/ha in 400 L water/ha (corresponding to 300 g fenoxycarb/ha).

<u>Test design</u>: The aim of the study was to evaluate potential side effects of a spray application of FLU SC 500 on the honey bee (*Apis mellifera* L.) under confined somi-field conditions. A plot of *Phacelia tanacetifolia* with an effective crop area of ca 65.12 m^2 (2) 32.56 m^2) was prepared for each tunnel (16.0 m length x 5.0 m width x 3.5 m height) and each plot constituted one replicate. For each treatment group (control, test item and reference item): 4 tunnels/replicates were set up resulting in 12 tunnels in total. One honey bee colony was moved into each tunnel. Commercial bee colonies were placed in the tunnels at early flowering of *Phacebia tanacetifolia* (BBCH 62) four days before the application. Applications of the test item FLU SO 500, control and reference item were conducted by spraying the whole area of *Phacebia* plants within the tunnel during full flowering of the crop (BBCH 65) with worker bees actively foraging.

The confined phase of the test started on 4DBA (DBA= days before the application) with the set-up of the colonies in the tunnels and ended with the removal of the colonies from the tunnels on 8DAA (DAA= days after the application). The monitoring phase started after removal of the colonies from the tunnels and ended after the last mortality and colony assessments on 26DXA.

After foliar (spray) application of the water (control) jest item and reference item, ontogenesis of a defined number of honey dee eggs was observed for each colony of each treatment group. Mortality of adult bees and pupae arvae as welk as foraging activity of the adult bees were also assessed. The condition of the colonies was assessed in regular intervals until the end of the trial. Ontogenesis of the bees from egg to adult workers was observed for a period of 22 days following the daytime application (*i.e.* one complete honey bee brood cycle). On the Brood Area Fixing Day (BDF0), one day prior to the application, a digital focture of one or more brood comb(s) out of each hive per treatment group and replicate was taken the file saved on a computer and a minimum of 209 eggs per colony marked. For each subsequent brood assessment (BFDn), the same comb(s) were taken out of the hives and digital photos were taken in order to provestigate the progress of the brood development until day 22 following the daytime application (= BFD23 following BFD0).

The following parameters were assessed.

Mortality of adult bees and pupae: 4DBA 26DAA (DBA: days before application; DDA: days after application);

Behavioural abnormalities and foraging activity (flight intensity): 4DBA - 7DAA (DBA: days before application; DDA: days after application);

Condition of the colonies flood stores, bood status and colony strength): 1 day before and 3, 9, 15, 22 and 26 days after the day of application (= end of the trial);

Bee brood development: 1 day before (= BFD0) and 3 (= BFD4), 9 (=BFD10), 15 (= BFD16), 22 (= BFD23) days after the day of application.

<u>Test conditions</u>: Natural field conditions. During the period of confinement, the daily precipitation was 0 mm on most days and 2 mm only on 5DAA. Temperatures were almost optimal. Accordingly, there was a good honey bee foraging activity on the crop within the tunnels. The temperature during the confinement period (day - 4 to day + 7) was between a min. of 5.7 - 13.0 °C and a max. of 19.3 - 27.7 °C.



After the exposure phase inside the tunnels rain occurred on 11 occasions until day 26. The temperature was between a min. of 11.0 - 18.4 °C and a max. of 15.9 - 26.1 °C.

Statistics: The data of mortality (adult, and pupae separately) and flight intensity in the pre- and postapplication period of the test item group and the reference item group were compared to the control in a separate approach but in the same way. The data were tested for normality and nomoscedasticity using the Shapiro-Wilk Test (p > 0.05) and folded F-Test (p > 0.05), respectively. Data were statistically compared using Student's t-Test (method pooled, one-sided, $p \le 0.05$) in case of formality and homoscedasticity. In case of non homoscedascity but proven normality, t-Test was conducted with method Satterthwaite (one-sided, $p \le 0.5$). In case of non-normality and non-homoscedasticity, Mann-Whitney exact test (one-sided, $p \le 0.5$) was used. Log-transformation was conducted in the constant of the c achieve better fit to normality and homoscedasticity of data. Q

For the pre-application period, the test was performed as a two sided lest. During the exposure plase, right-sided tests were used for mortality of test item group and reference item group compared to control and left-sided tests were used for flight intensity of test item group and reference item group compared to control.

The data for brood indices, compensation indices and termination rates and colony condition were compared to the control using the same tests as the data of mortality and fight intensity with left-sided tests for brood and compensation inclices as well as right-sided lests for the termination rates after the application and left- or right-sided ests for the colony condition.

All statistical analyses were conducted using SAS release Version

Dates of work: June 13th to July 19th, 201 (field phase)

Application amounts

The amount of test item applied was determined by measuring the prepared and the remaining spray solution and results confirmed that the spray schutions were prepared correctly and that the honey bees were adequately exposed to the test item. The accepted spray tolerance of +10% was met in all treatment groups to rainfall occurred within at least 2 hours after the applications and wind speed was 0 m/s during all applications?

| Table 10.3.1.501: | Summary: | fluon | ram con | centrat | tions in | spray solutions | |
|-------------------|----------|-------|---------|---------|----------|-----------------|--|
| Q | ~ | | áQ. | , Q | O' | 1 0 | |

| C C | b (| | ر المراجعة Fluopyram | |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Sample material | Day of sampling | Concentration ratige | Mean concentration [g a.s./kg] | Mean deviation to target [%] |
| Spray solution | DAA0 | \$50.5 \$61.0 \$ | 256.7 | 2.74 |
| DAA: Days a | fter application | n s s | | |

Biological

The bifluence of FDU SC 300 was evaluated by comparing the data of the assessments of the test item group to the reference item group and the control, and by comparing the pre-application data to the postapplication data.



Mortality of the adult bees (worker bees)

Pre-application phase (4 to 0 days before application):

Mean mortality in the test item group $(103.7 \pm 29.6 \text{ dead bees/colony/day})$ was not statistically significantly different compared to the water control $(107.2 \pm 41.6 \text{ dead bees/colony/day})$ during the pre-application phase. Mortality in the reference item group was statistically significantly higher compared to the water control on day 4 before application $(13.8 \pm 6.4 \text{ dead bees/colony} \text{ and } 3.0 \pm 1.6 \text{ dead bees/colony}$, respectively), however, this difference was not biologically relevant.

Exposure phase in the tunnels (day 0 after application to Tay 7):

On the application day the mortality in the test item and reference item groups $(168.3 \pm 59.9 \text{ and } 100.6)$ ± 23.5 bees/colony/day, respectively) was lower compared to the control group (116.5 ± 42.8 bees/colony/day) but with no statistically significant difference

A statistical evaluation of the mean mortality levels in the test item group of the post application period from day 0 after application to day 7 showed no statistically significant differences when compared to the control group. The average control mortality of adult bees during the exposure phase (day 0 to day 7 following the application) was 84.6 ± 23.1 dead bees/colony/day. The average mortality in the test item group was 75.7 ± 24.0 dead bees/colony/day. The reference them mortality was 62.5 ± 16.0 dead bees/colony/day.

Exposure and post-exposure phase (outside the gunnels) (day & after application to day 26)?

The mean mortality of adult worker bees over the whole study ported following application (0DAA - 26DAA) in the control, test item and reference item group were comparable and not statistically significantly different ($35\% \pm 8.0, 31.1 \pm 7.7$ and 33.5 ± 6.9 dead bees day colony respectively). A day wise comparison of mortality between test item treatment group and control indicated one statistically significant difference 26 days after application ($10\% \pm 7.4$ and $2.8\% \pm 1.5$ dead bees/colony, respectively), however, this difference was not biologically relevant.

Mortality of brvae and pupae

Pre-application phase (4 to 0 days before application).

No statistical differences were found in the test them (62 ± 0.9) dead larvae+pupae/day/colony) and control group (0.0 ± 0.0) dead larvae+pupae/day/colony) when assessing larvae and pupae mortality.

There were no statistical differences in larval and pupal modulity between the reference item group and the control group. \mathcal{O}

Exposure phase in the turnels (day 0 after application of day 7):

On the application day to mortality was observed in any treatment group.

From day 0 to day, 7 after the application and daring the exposure phase inside the tunnels, a mean of 0.3 ± 0.2 dead larvae+pupae/day/colony/was bund in the test item group which was not statistically significantly different compared to a mean of 0.1 ± 0.1 dead larvae+pupae/day/colony in the control group, respectively.

The reference item group ondicated a mean of 0.1 ± 0.2 dead larvae+pupae/day/colony during this time. This value was not statistically significantly different compared to the control group.

Exposure and post-exposure phase (outside the tunnels) (day 0 after application to day 26):

The mean mortality of larvae and pupae over the whole after application period (0DAA - 26DAA) in the control and test item group were comparable with means of 0.2 ± 0.1 dead larvae+pupae/day/colony in both groups. The mean mortality in the reference item group of 7.2 ± 5.5 dead larvae+pupae/day/colony was statistically significantly higher compared to the control.



Thus, during the entire period after the applications (0DAA to 26DAA), the average sums of dead pupae per colony were similar for the control and test item treatment group, whereas in the reference item group, mortality was elevated by a factor of 36 compared to the control. Effects on pupae of Insegar are a well-known effect and the elevated mortality shows the efficacy of the reference treatment and the high sensitivity of the test system to detect adverse effects on brood and colony

| Table 10 3 1 5_ 2+ | Daily mean mortality of dead worker here | larvae and nunae ner color |
|---------------------|--|------------------------------|
| 1 abic 10.5.1.5- 2. | Daily mean mortanty of dead worker by | , iai vac anu Rupac per cong |

| | | | <u> </u> | |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Table 10.3.1.5- 2: Da | ily mean mortality of | f dead worker bees, la | arvae and supae per | colony in the |
| | | L. | Treatment group | |
| Daily mean mortality | Assessment day | Control | Testatem of | Reference item (K) |
| | 4DBA to 0DBA | \$107.2 ± \$1.6 | 163.7 ± 29.6 | 120/2 ± 33.9 |
| Number of dead | 0DAA | 1165±42.80 | Q108.3 £55.9 | 0100.0 #23.5 Ly |
| \pm SD | 0DAA to 7DAA | 84.6 ± 23.1 | 75,7±24,9 | 62.5 ± 16.0 |
| | 0DAA to 26DA | 4 35.7 ¥ 8.0 € | 31.1€7.7 | 33.5 ± 6.9 |
| Number of dead larvae+pupae/colony ± SD | 4DBA to @BA | 0.0 ± 0.0 | | |
| | OPAA S | 0.0 ĐO.0 V | $Q_{0.0} \pm 0.0$ | 0.0 ± 0.0 |
| | 0DAA to 780AA | | | 0.1 ± 0.2 |
| | ÔĐĂA to 26DAA | 0.2 ±0.1 | 0.2±01 | 7.2*±5.5 |

DAA: days after application; DBA: days before application;

SD: standard deviation

statistically significantly higher than control group

Overall no adverse treatment elated affects of juvenile mortality were observed.

Foraging Activity

(4 to g days before application); Pre-application phase

The mean foraging activity in the test item and reference them groups was comparable to the control group, resulting in overall daily mean values of 1606 ± 1.4 , 18.0 ± 3.6 and 16.3 ± 1.6 bees/m²/day in the control group, test item group and reference item group, respectively. No statistically significant differences were found between the three treatment groups.

unnels (day 0 after application to day 7): Exposure phase in the

On the application day the foraging activities in the test item and reference item groups (26.5 ± 1.9 and 24.1 ± 3.7 bees/m²/day, respectively) were lower when compared to the control group (28.8 ± 3.5 bees/m²/day), but with no statistically significant differences.

From day 6 to day 7 the overall daily mean foraging activity in the test item group of 26.0 ± 0.8 bees/m²/day was higher compared to 25.8 ± 2.4 bees/m²/day in the control group but showed no statistically significant difference from the control.

The reference item resulted in a significant reduction of the foraging activity $(21.6 \pm 2.7 \text{ bees/m}^2/\text{day})$ compared to the control.

Flight activity across treatments was similar when comparing the two phases with flight observation (pre-exposure and exposure phase), however a slight statistically significant reduction in foraging postexposure was observed in the reference item group.



No significant test-item related adverse effects on flight intensity were observed.

| Table | 10.3.1.5- 3: Daily | mean flight intensity as for | ager bees per m² j | per 15s | | , |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Daily mean flight | | Assessment day | | | | |
| | intensity | Assessment day | Control | Test item | Reference Item | |
| | 4DBA to 0DBA | 165 ± 1.4 | 3.0 ± 3.6 | 169 ± 1.60 | Z | |
| | $Bees/m^2 \pm SD$ | 0DAA | 28.8 ± 3.5 | 26.5 ± 1.9 | Q4.1 ± 3.7 | |
| | 0DAA to 7DAA | 25.8 ± 2.4 | | | | |
| DAA: | days after application; | DBA: days before application, | , | | | |
| SD: | standard deviation | | | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | |

*: statistically significant difference to control; $p \leq 0.05$

Behavioural abnormalities

Differences in behaviour were observed in a small number of bees in the test dem and reference item treatment groups on the day of application and on the day after application. However, these did not persist and are not considered to be biologically relevant.

Condition of the Colonies

The condition of the colonies was assessed over one complete brood cycle of the honey bees (*i.e.* 21 days).

At the beginning of the trial, the order and all brood stages (eggs, larvae and closed brood) were found in all colonies as an indication of healthy colonies. The observed mean abundance of brood in the colonies (sum of cells containing eggs, larvae, and pupae) in the test item treatment group was similar to that in the control group.

From 3DAA onwards, the broad area in the reference item group was consistently lower than in the treatment group and watistically significantly different when compared to the control. This can be explained by the lethal effect of the reference item to broad and is consistent with the high broad termination rate in this treatment Overall, honey bee broad tevelopment in the test item treatment group was not affected when compared to the control.

Besides the brood area, allocation of comb space to food (pollen and nectar) was also assessed. The proportion of pollen cells and nectar cells fluctuated with the needs of the colonies and showed no difference between treatment groups. The colonies were well provided during the course of the study.

Thus, to test-item related adverse offects on the development of the food storage area were observed.

Colony Strength

The mean humber of howy bees per colony in the three treatment groups was similar one day before application and and out differ datistically (mean of 5161 to 5484 per colony).

Overall, the number of bees per colony developed similarly over the course of the study. A significant difference in the number of bees between the reference item group and the control group was observed only at the end of the monitoring phase (26DAA). This is most likely a first effect of the decreased hatching rates of young bees due to the pupal-disturbing effect of the reference item. The significantly stronger hives in the test item treatment group (compared to the control group) on day 9DAA could be explained by the larger number of brood cells before that time (i.e. on 3DAA).



The overall development of colony strength of all treatment groups showed fluctuations, which can be considered to be in a typical and normal range. The colony strength values of the test item group were on approximately the same level or even higher during the entire study than the corresponding values of \mathcal{A} the control group. Therefore, no test-item related adverse effects on colony strength were observed.

| Fable 10.3.1.5- 4: | Colony strength: Mean numbers of bees |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|

| Treatment | Mean numbers of bees SD | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--|-------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| group | Day ¹ -1 | Day 3 | Day 9 | Day 15 | Day 22 | | | | |
| Control | 5484 | 6595 | ð 7988 | ~ ⁹⁰⁷¹ | ~Q6539 O | ¢ 7102 € | | | |
| Control | ± 460 | ± 666 | ≫± 1137 | ~~ ± 828 | <i>∞</i> ± 398 | ≪J [*] ± 30€ [*] | | | |
| Test Item | 5161 | 6216 🖉 | 11391** | D 10983 × | 6792 | 7453 | | | |
| i est item | ± 956 | ± 1134 🔍 | چ <u>ب</u> 1265 ک | ±02003 | £0748 🔬 | ≠660 ∘ | | | |
| Deference Item | 5260 | 6286 | @ 9605@ | ~9591 ° | € 6399 [©] | \$316 * | | | |
| Reference field | ± 706 | ±,596 ~ | × ± 1822 | 332 ± 1720 | $O' \pm 1 \frac{1}{2}$ | ± 1530 | | | |
| ¹ In relation to the | application | ~~ ~~ | | y jo' k | | | | | |
| Statistically signi | ficant difference | (lower) to $\mathcal{C}, p \leq 0$ | .05 ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | (🔊 🖉 | a û | | | | |
| ** Statistically signi | ** Statistically significant difference (higher) top, p=0.05 V V V S | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Development of Bee | Brood | 14 AC | O' L | | | ? | | | |
| Brood Termination F | Rate: | | | | | | | | |

Development of Bee Brood

Brood Termination Rate:

The brood termination rate is the percentage of brood cells that do not successfully transition from egg to hatched worker bees. Based on this brood tertoination rate (BTR) the failure of individual eggs or larvae to develop was quantitatively assessed. If the expected brood stage was reached, a low BTR indicated successful development, while a high BTR indicated unsoccessful bee brood development.

Following the successfully hatched worker bee, a mean termination rate of 32.06 % at BFD (Brood Figing Day) 23 in the test item group was lower compared to the control group (42.60%). The test item treatment group BTR was not statistically significantly different compared to the control group BTR

Treatment with the reference item Insegar caused a clear decrease in brood development, resulting in a termination rate of 98,20 %. This decrease was statistically significantly different compared to the control group.

Brood Compensation Inde

Ć The Brood Compensation Index is an indication for recovery and shows the development of the brood at each assessment. A continuous prood development was observed in the test item group as well as in the control group. The Brood Compensation bodices following the labelling of the egg stage up to day 22 after application (BFD+23) were higher in the test item group compared to the control group. Differences in the Brood compensation Index between test item and control were not statistically significant. ~Õ

The high Brood armination rate of the marked cells after treatment of the crop with the reference item Insegatis also reflected by the statistically significantly lower Brood Compensation Indices in the reference item group when compared to the control, suggesting no recovery in the marked areas.



| Treatment | compensation indices ± SD | | | | | Termination rate (BFD523) |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Group | BFD 0 | BFD 4 | BFD 10 | BFD 16 | BED 23 | \$%) \$ |
| Control | 1.0 ± 0.0 | 1.66 ± 0.11 | 2.34 ± 0.53 | 2.34 ± 0.46 | $3 + 0 \pm 0.53$ | € 2 .63 ± 2 .96 |
| Test Item | 1.0 ± 0.0 | 1.79 ± 0.14 | 2.79 ± 0.50 | ©2.76±0.48 | 3.85 ± 0.47 ≰ | 32.06 ₽ 12.39 |
| Reference Item | 1.0 ± 0.0 | $0.47^* \pm 0.46$ | $0.20^* \pm 0.28$ | $0.17* \pm 0.08$ | 0.59* ± 0.55 | 98.20* ±Q.16 |
| BFD: Brood area SD: Standard of | a fixing day; leviation | | A | Q" | | |

| Table 10.3.1.5- 5: | Results for Brood Compensation Index and Brood Termination Rate |
|--------------------|--|
|--------------------|--|

* Statistically significant difference to the control, p < 0.05

Brood Index

The Brood Index is an additional indicator for the beobrood development and fact intates a comparison between the different treatments. Following the labeling of the egg stage, the Brood Indices of the test item group were higher compared to the control values. Differences in the Brood Index between test item group and the control group were not statistically significant. Following the belling of the eggs after treatment with the reference item Insegar, the prean Brood brdices were patistically significant lower compared to the control Brood indices, indicating unfavourable brood development in the reference item group.

| Table 10.3.1.5- 6: | Results for Brook | Index S | 5 0 . | 0 * | |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Treatment | | sit x days after | Brood Indices | day (BFD) ± SD | |
| Sroup () | or of o | 4 4 | \$ 10 ⁰ ≼ | 16 | 23 |
| Control | | Q.62 ± 0.15 | 2.32 = 0.53 | 2.30 ± 0.52 | 2.87 ± 0.65 |
| Test Item | ≥1.0 ±~0.0 × | 1.75€±0.13 | 2.78 ± 0.50 | 2.72 ± 0.50 | 3.40 ± 0.62 |
| Reference Item | $1,0 \pm 0.0$ | $0.45*\pm0.47$ | ©0.17*±0.28 | $0.07^* \pm 0.09$ | $0.09* \pm 0.11$ |
| BFD: Brood area fixi | ng dao | 8° ° 6 | | | |

BFD: Brood area fixing da Standard deviation SD:

Statistically significant difference to the control

Accordingly, no adverse effects of the test item on brood development were observed throughout the study following the Yabelling of the egg stage up to day 22 after application (BFD+23).

All validity criteria were met in this study.



| Validity criteria | Reco | mmended | Obtained 🖉 |
|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Control mortality | Control | Should not be considerable (it is known that the method itself causes mortality due to the handling). | Daily mean control mortality from day 0 after application for day 76 varied between 12.3 and 143.5 dead bees per tunnel. The overall mean mortality after application until day 7 was 84.6 dead bees trannel/day. |
| Reference item mortality (bee brood termination rates) | Fenoxy- carb | There should be a high number of impacted bees | There was a high number of impacted bec brood which resulted in 98.20 % termination of the initially observed eggs. This was statistically significant compared to the control. The mean number of dead bupae found in the reference item group was statistically significantly higher compared to the control. The effects on honey bee brood as observed in the reference item group demonstrated the sensitivity of the test system to detect effects on humature honey bee life stages |
| Foraging activity shortly before and during daytime application | All groups | 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 | Mean flight densities shortly before (4 - 0 days) the application were: 46.6 ± 14 bees m^2 in the control tunnels 18.0 ± 3.6 bees m^2 in the test tem tunnels 16.3 ± 1.6 bees m^2 in the reference item tunnels Mean flight densities at daytime application were: 28.8 ± 3.5 bees m^2 in the control tunnels 26.5 ± 1.9 bees m^2 in the test item tunnels 26.5 ± 1.9 bees m^2 in the test item tunnels 24.1 ± 3.2 bees m^2 in the reference item tunnels |
| Č | | | ATT. CONCLUSION |

In order to assess the potential effects of OLU SC 500 on honey bee colonies, including brood development, 250 g fluopyrate in 400 L tap water ha, tap water for the control and a reference item (Insegar, a.s. fenoxyearb) were applied to a full flowering and highly bee-attractive crop (*Phacelia tanacetifolia*) under semi-field (trumel) conditions during bee-flight.

No test-item related adverse offects on moreality of flight intensity were observed.

The quantizative assessments in adjuited by marked bood cells revealed that FLU SC 500 did not cause any treatment-related adverse offects on hopey bee brood development in individually marked cells.

The overall honey bee brood development in the test item treatment group T, measured as mean number of cells per colony containing the different types of brood, was not affected when compared to the control.

No test-item celated adverse effects on colony strength or on the development of the food storage area were observed. \swarrow

Some behavioural differences between control and test item were observed on days 0DAA and 1DAA but did not persist and were not considered to be biologically relevant.

Overall, FEU SC 500 applied at 250 g a.s./ha (target) to a flowering crop in the presence of foraging honey bes did not cause significant effects on mortality, flight intensity, behaviour, colony strength and brood development.



Assessment and conclusion by applicant:

The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment.

FLU SC 500 applied at 250 g a.s./ha (target) to a flowering crop in the presence of foraging horey bees did not cause significant effects on mortality, flight intensity, behaviour, colony or ength and brood development.

| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.1.5/02 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Semi-field tunnel study in Phacelia tanacetifolia evaluating the effects of repeated |
| | foliar applications of Flyopyram SC 500 on hovey bees Apisapellifera L. |
| | (Hymenoptera, Apidae) under confined conditions, fellowed by a post-exposure |
| | field observation period |
| Report No: | E 319 4538-2 |
| Document No: | M-547034-01- |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OEPE/EPPO/Guideline No. 7/0 (4) 2010 (modified) |
| study: | USEPA OCSPP Gaideline No. 850.SUPP |
| Deviations from current | Gurrent Guideline: EPP 170 (4) (2010) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: A mortality and behaviour assessment was carried out on day 6 after |
| K) | the application, instead of any 7 as requested in the guideline. This deviation is not |
| - S | expected to have impacted the study results. All validity criteria were met. |
| Previous evaluation | No, not previously submitted & O |
| , Š | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability | Yes v v |
| | |
| _ `` | |
| Executive summary | |

This semi-field tunnel study was designed to evaluate the acute, short-term and long-term effects of repeated foliar applications of FLU-SC 500 during full-bloom of the highly bee-attractive surrogate crop *Phacelia tanacetifolia*, on boney bees (*Apis metafera* **b**).

The study involved a full-factorial randomized block design, with five blocks and four treatment groups. Each block represented a tunnel containing one hancy bee colony. The treatment groups consisted of a (negative) control group (\bigcirc) - treated 2 \bigcirc with tap water, two reference item groups (R1, R2) - treated with 1 x 400 g dimethoate a.s./ha, respectively, and the test item treatment group (T) - treated with 2 × 250 g fluopyram/ha, amounting to 20 tunnels in total. With foliar applications occurring in sequence, staggered seeding of the Phacelia crop was employed to ensure sufficient forage over the course of the 16 day exposure period. Mortabily of bees, foraging activity, behaviour, brood development, colony strength food solves, and colony health were assessed. After the confined semi-field exposure period, the control and in the test item treatment group were released from confinement, to be repeatedly monitored under field conditions for the remainder of the season until overwintering, and were assessed for a final time after overwintering in the next spring.

The confined exposure of honey bee colonies to two repeated foliar applications with FLU SC 500 during full bloom did not result in adverse acute, short-term or long-term effects on mortality, colony strength and -development, brood development, food storage, honey bee behaviour, queen survival,



overall hive vitality and colony health, as well as on overwintering performance.

Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded that FLU SC 500 does not adversely affect homey bee behaviour, brood development and colony strength when applied as two sequential foliar applications at a rate of 250 g a.s./ha, under the above described conditions.

I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

Test item: FLU SC 500, Specification No.: 10200001848-01, Batch code: EZO1217101 description: TOX No. 10066-00; Analysed content of a.s." 41.6 % w/x@(493.9 g/L), @

Test species: Honey bees (Apis mellifera L.); small bee colonies, maintained according to normal beekeeping practice, each consisting of one laying sister queen and five occupied frames with a total of about 4000 honey bees; four of the five occupied frames were bood frames, one frame contained pollen and honey. The preliminary brood check indicated healthy colonies, with all brood stages present and a sufficient amount of pollen and honey to guarantee colony viability

Location of the field site: Germany

Test concentrations:

Test item treatment: 250 g a.s./ha, corresponding to 602 g product/ha (based of an analytical content of 493.9 g a.s./L and a density of Q188 g/mL). Control: Tap water (concurrently to the test item applications).

Control: Tap water (concurrently to the test item applications)?

Reference item treatment: 400 g dimethoate ha, corresponding to 2031 g product ha (based on an analytical content of 420 (

analytical content of 420.6 g a.s./L and a density of 1.08 g/mL).

A water volume of 300 L/ba was considered for all treatment groups

Test design: The test was conducted under confined exposure conditions (turnel) in order to assess acute, short-term and long-term effects of repeated folder application of FBU SC 500 on honey bee colonies under semi-field conditions. A plot of Phacelia taracetifolia with an effective crop size of 100 m² was prepared for each tunnel. For each treatment group Control, test item and two reference item groups), Stunnes/replicates vore set up, resulting in 20 minnels in total (biological assessment tunnels). One honey bee colony was placed into each tupnel. Colonies were placed into the tunnels three days before the 1st application of the test iter. The 1st application was conducted when the Phacelia crop on one half of the confined exposure area had reached full boom (BBCH 64-65). The 2nd test item application was carried out once the crop in the second half of the confined exposure area had reached full-bloom (BBCH)64-65). Applications of the test icm FLU SC 500 involved spraying of the entire Phacelia-crop inside the tunnes during honey been actively foraging on the crop. The colonies in the control group grere concurrently exposed to two subsequent tap water applications. In contrast, the colonies in the reference item group R1 were exposed to a single foliar application of the reference item concurrently to the 1st, application in control and test item groups, whereas the colonies in reference item group R2 were exposed to a single application of the reference item at the same time as the 2^{nd} water and test item applications in control and test item groups, respectively. Control and test item group colonies remained in their respective gauge tuppels for a period of 16 consecutive days following the 1st test item application. The entire confinement period (including acclimation prior to the 1st foliar applications) was 19 days.

The following parameters were assessed

Mortaling of bee (worker, drones, larvae and pupae) in dead bee traps and on polyethylene sheets laid out in front othe hives and along tunnel walls: -2DA1A (2 days before the 1st application) to 6DA2A (6 days after the 2^{nO} application);

Foragin Dactivity of the bees was assessed twice daily within an area of 1 m² at two different locations within each tunnel and with each count lasting 1 minute: -3DA1A to 6DA2A;



In addition, behavioural anomalies were recorded during foraging activity assessments and during colony assessments as part of the post-exposure monitoring period. Q_{μ}°

Assessments of colony strength (number of adult honey bees), brood development, presence of a healthy queen, food storage, and colony health were carried out once immediately before confinement, three times during the confined exposure period, and six times post-exposure, including one final assessment after overwintering.

Seven days after the 2nd test item application, all control and test item treated colonies, were peleased from the tunnels and moved to a monitoring location. Reference item treated colonies (R1 and R2) were discarded. At the monitoring site, bees were allowed to forage freels under ambient field conditions. The development of the colonies and their overall health status were assessed in regular intervals of approximately 3 weeks until the end of the season and one last time after overwintering during springtime of the following year.

<u>Test conditions:</u> Climatic conditions were recorded by a weather station and by a data logger installed in one of the tunnels.

<u>Statistics</u>: The influence of the test item treatment was evaluated by comparing the data obtained for the test item, treatment group and with the data of the reference item group, respectively. Linear mixed effects models were used to evaluate the potential effect of test item, the effect of the different honey bee colonies (hives) was added as an error term. For mortality and foraging activity, additional linear mixed effects models for the comparison of control and reference item were calculated. Count data the mortality colony parameter, estimates of bees at the tunnel/foraging bees) was log (decadic logarithm) transformed (log x α 1) in order to achieve normal distribution of residuals (homoscelasticity). ANOVA was performed for the fittee model in order to detect the influence of factors and interaction on the encountered variance. A significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ was selected.

All statistical analyses were performed with the statistical software package R 3.1.3 (R Development Core Team, 2015)

Dates of work Qune 20, 2013 to March 100, 2014

Results And discussion

Biological results

Mortality

During the confined exposure period, worker bee mortality in front of the hive and at the tunnel walls was low in both the control and the test frem treatment group. In contrast, mortality in the reference item treatment was biologically and statistically significantly elevated following application.

Statistical analysis (linear prixed effects model) revealed no significant effect of the test item treatment on worker bee mortality as recorded in front of the hive (p = 0.637) or as recorded at the tunnel walls (p = 0.299). A significant effect of the date was found (p = < 0.001), the interaction of date and treatment was not significant (p = 0.162 for mortality at the front of the hive; p = 0.128 for mortality at the tunnel walls), indicating that mortality changed over time, but in the same manner for test item treatment and control. Furthermore, statistical analysis showed a highly significant (p < 0.001) effect of the reference item in comparison to the control. Thus, the honey bee colonies were sufficiently sensitive and the test system was dequate to detect effects on honey bee mortality.



| | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | 0 | |
|------------------------|---------------|---------------|--|----------------------|---|---------------------|---|---------------------|----------|
| Control (Tap w Date | | `ap water) | Test Item Treatment (2 x 250 g FLU SC 500) | | Reference Item R1 (1 x 400 g dimethoate/ha) | | Reference Item 42 (1 x 400 g dimethoate na) | | |
| | Mean count | ±SD | Mean count | ±SD | Mean count | ±SB | Mean count | | I |
| -2DB1A | 3.8 | 5.2 | 8.4 | 9.9 🔊 | 1.4 | Q1.9 | 4.8 | 3.8 | R |
| -1DB1A | 5 | 3.9 | 7.2 | 5.3 | 3.6 | Q 2.5 | Ø.8 🔊 | 83 | × |
| 0DB1A | 3 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.4 🔍 | 1.7 | ~4.4 Q | 0.7 | <i>J</i> |
| 0DA1A | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.6 | 0:-9, | 148.4% | 66.9 | 2.2 | $O_{1.6}$ | |
| 1DA1A | 2.4 | 1.1 | 4.8 | QA.2 | 298/ | ູ @ໂ04.5 🗳 | 4 <u>9</u> | Q 2.3Q [°] | |
| 2DA1A | 1.6 | 0.9 | 3 | ° ۾ 2.0 گ | 7.2.8 | >> 26,0℃ | ∂2.6 × | 3.7 | |
| 3DA1A | 1.4 | 2.1 | 1.8 | o [™] 1.1⊘° | ×20.6 🖌 | 774 | \$ 1.2 | « 2.2 | |
| 4DA1A | 1.6 | 2.1 | 1.4 🔬 | ĝ9 | 13.40 | Q r .5 | 6 64 | ~1.0 L° | |
| 5DA1A | 1.4 | 1.3 | 0.6 | °~0.5 | & 2 [×] | A 5.2 X | 1.6 | 0 <u>0</u> | |
| 6DA1A | 1.2 | 1.6 | 12 | 1.3 | 25.4 <i>(</i> | 18:0 | | 1 A | |
| 7DA1A | 1.6 | 0.9 | Q.2 | 13 | ي 39 🖉 | 27.1 | Ø 1.4S | 9.7 | |
| 8DA1A | 2 | 2.0 | 0.8 | ~Q*8 × | J WO | چې9.6 چ | LG . | l.8 | |
| 0DB2A | 2.6 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.8 | 102 | 5.6 | 2.6 | 1.3 | |
| 0DA2A | 0.2 | 0.4 🔊 | 33.6 | 72.2 | 4 .6 | 286 | 92.6 | 67.1 | |
| 1DA2A | 1.2 | 0.8 | °≫0 | 0.0 | الأني 13 m | 6.2 | D 504.0 | 185.5 | |
| 2DA2A | 1.6 | 1.1 | لاي 2.6 ¢ | £2.3 | , 27 % | ∿~13.1 © | 32.2 | 13.2 | |
| 3DA2A | 1.2 | Q .3 (|) j | 1.7 | 17.4 🧳 | 12 | ¥J15.2 | 8.3 | |
| 4DA2A | 4 | ≈2.9 | 2 4 | 1.2 | SNA_ | MĂ | NA NA | NA | |
| 5DA2A | 2.2 | 1,15 | | 200 | NA NA | «⟨NA »ς | NA NA | NA | |
| 6DA2A | 0.6 | 1.3 | Q 1.20 | A.6 | NA NA | © [™] NA ∜ | NA | NA | |
| SD: Standa | ard deviation | | Ď. Š | | | <i>a</i> , | | | |

| Table 10.3.1.5- 8: | Mean mortality \pm SD of worker bees in front of the hives during confined exposu | e |
|--------------------|---|---|
| | r_{1} | • |

The number of dead from specorded during the confined exposite period in front of the hive and at the tunnel walls was always low and much tower than the number of worker bees. Furthermore, there were several days where no grone portality was recorded at all 0[°]

In both the control and the test item treatment group, no dead larvae or pupae were recorded at the tunnel walls. Mortality primmature horey bee life stages in from of the hive in both control and test item treatment, was very lowand occurred only sporadically. Throughout the entire confined exposure period 32 dead immature life stages were found in the control group and 51 dead immature life stages were observed in the test item matment group.

Thus, it can be concluded that sequential for a spray applications of 2 × 250 g fluopyram/ha during flowering of a highly bee-attractive crop did not cause adverse effects on honey bee mortality.

Foraging Activit

Ŵ

Flight actives was very semilar in the sest item treatment group and in the control group. Honey bees accepted the flowering Chacella-crop as foraging habitat and were therefore actively foraging on the crop in the tunnels. Eluctuations in foraging activity occurred simultaneously in the control and in the test item treament group, foraging activity was especially low on days with unfavourable weather conditions Colonies experiencing a reference item treatment showed a temporary cessation of foraging activity following the respective application. Thus, the results showed a distinct effect of the reference item of foraging activity, indicating that the honey bee colonies were sufficiently sensitive and that the test system was adequate.



| Date | Timing | Control (Tap water) | | Test Item Treatment (2 x 250 g FLU SC 500) | | Reference Item R1 (1 x 400 g dimethoate/hay | | Reference Item R2 (1 x 409 g dimethoate/ha) | |
|---------|----------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|-----------------|---|-------------------|
| | | Mean count | ±SD | Mean count | ±SD | Mean count | Ś≟SD | Mean count | SD SD S |
| -2DB1A | AM | 28 | 8.7 | 26.4 | 3.4 | 33.4 | 11.5 | © 32 S | Ć. |
| | PM AM | 16.2 32.6 | 2.3 | 14.2 | ∑ [¥] 5.4 6.5 | - 1408 | 4.2 • 12 7 | ~ 15.% 42.6 | 0 ^{#.4} |
| -1DB1A | PM | 58.6 | 13.9 | 58.6 | 16.2 | ~60.8 Ø | 21.9 | _063 ∅ | 7.0 |
| 0DB1A | BA | 42.4 | 2.7 | 40.6 | 5.9 | 0° 40, Y | @:3 | → 43 × | ĴØ.1 |
| | AA1 | 45.8 | 6.3 | <u></u> | <u>y 6.9 (</u>) | | $\sim 0.0 \sim$ | 46.6 | 3.0 |
| 0DA1A | AA2 | 44.4 | 7.0 | 43.8° | <u> </u> | | 0.0 aa | <u>4</u> 6.2 | 5 Ø |
| | AA3 | 53.0 68.2 | 4.1 | 49% | 7 2 | | ₩ ₩ | 53.4 « 64.8 | 2 |
| 1DA1A | PM | 63.6 | 4.67 60 | \$09%.2 . & \$9.8 % | <u>@, 7.2</u> | ×02 | 04.0 | 6.2 | \mathbb{O}_{43} |
| 00.11 | AM | 5.8 | 9.8 | ¥ 11.4 | 12,8 | | 0.6 | 8.2 | 8.2 |
| 2DATA | PM | 0.6 | Q 1.3 | Q | م 0.0 | | 0.0 | | 0.0 |
| 3DA1A | AM | 0 | × 0.02 | OU . | <u>0.0</u> | <u>ø</u> | ~0.0 <u></u> | 0 | 0.0 |
| Juli | PM | NACY | N∧A | NA "C | NA 7 | ØNA ö | NAU | <u> </u> | NA |
| 4DA1A | AM DM | 5.2 | <u>(</u> 8.3 () 11.6° | v 5.8 | 12.2 | | 000 | 8.8 | 14.7 |
| | AM | \$ 53.4 | 4.7 | \$2.6 | 8.2 | | $\sqrt[6]{0.0}$ | 49.2 | 17.1 |
| 5DA1A | PM 🐇 | 78.2 | 4.3 | 083.80 | 24 | 0.8 % | 1:2 | 65.4 | 15.6 |
| 6DA1A | AM | 76.2 | ©10.3 € | 78. | ₹Ø .0 | 0.6 0 | ħ∕3 | 71.6 | 12.7 |
| ODAIA | PM | \$90.8 s | 5.65 | 93.2 | Q13.7 | 0.8 | @0.8 | 87 | 9.1 |
| 7DA1A | ACM | | 14.8 | ~ 103.8 | × 8.45° | Ø.8 4 | 1.3 | 83.4 | 16.7 |
| | | <u> </u> | 67 | $0^{\circ} 92.65^{\circ}$ | | 2 ^v 0.8 | 1.3 | 91.4 | <u> </u> |
| 8DA1A | Ø PM | 43.6 | $2^{-0.7}$ | 21.0 3072 | 0.8 41 @ | 0.00 | 0.4 | 40.4 | 6.2 |
| 0DB2A | BA (| 9126 | 10.3 | 97 🔊 | 5.8 | | 0.0 | 93.4 | 9.6 |
| - S | AA1 🔊 | 1,35 | 7.8 | × 108 4 | 14.9 | مَحْ 1.4 | 0.5 | 11.4 | 4.4 |
| 0DA2A | AA2 | ⁴ 96 | ≥ 12:Q | 86.2 | ¥14.6 [▲] | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| | A&3 | <u>4</u> 73 | 9%4/° | √65.4 | 12.10 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| 1DA2A | | 87.6 | ₹ <u>7</u> .8 | <u>× 88.4</u> 00 | <u> </u> | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | | 303.8 | $13 \mathbb{Q}$ | 98.67 1.69.8 | 05.8 | 0.8 | 10.4 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 2DA2A 🖉 | PM * | 128 | 10,1 | ≈158≪ | 10 3 | 1 | 1.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 3DA2Å | AM N | 76.6 | 17.0 | ₹ 7 2 | 16.4 | 7.4 | 11.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| | PM | A21 0 | v 12.0 | 103.8 | 13.1 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 4DA2A | AM | <u>چُ 91.2 م</u> | 10.8 | 6.4 | 0.5 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| | ₽M , | 103.4 | <u>21</u> | o ^t ∕ 109 | 10.3 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 5DA2A | AM A | 94,4 | × × 6.9 | ¥ 96.4 | 12.5 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| ^ | | 0 01 | | 102.6 | 9.5 7.4 | NA NA | NA NA | NA NA | NA |
| 6DA2A | × ANUM | 97 @ | 13.0 | 93 | 7.4 | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Table 10.3.1.5-9: Mean Foraging Activity ± SD in the tunnels during confined exposure

Means were calculated based on the sums of the two estimates (2 counts in separate 1 m² plots per tunnel) for each time point. SD: Standard deviation AM: Assessments before midday PM: Assessments after midday BA: Assessment after application AA: Assessment after application

AA: Assessments after application

NA: Not assessed



Statistical analysis (linear mixed effects model) revealed no significant effect of the test item treatment on flight activity (p = 0.802). A significant effect of the date was found (p = < 0.001), the interaction of date and treatment was not significant (p = 0.999), indicating that flight activity varied over time, but in the same manner for treatment and control. Furthermore, statistical analysis showed a highly significant (p < 0.001) effect of the reference item in comparison to the control.

Thus, it can be concluded that sequential foliar spray applications of 2×250 g fluopyram/ha during flowering of a highly bee-attractive crop did not cause adverse effects on foraging activity.

Condition of the Colonies

The condition of the control and test item colonies was assessed four times item diately before and during the confinement period of the study and stortimes post exposure including on assessment are overwintering.

Colony Strength

During the confined exposure period (colony assessments 2 4), the colonies in control and test item group were able to grow, and the increase in colony strength during confinement indicated that the colonies adapted well to the confined conditions of the pinnels. Throughout the confined exposure period, colony strength in both groups was on a comparable level, with no distinct differences between the two exposure groups. After the release from the tunnels, colony strength increased during the summer in the control and test them group, as more resources became available when colonies were allowed to forage freely.

| | Ň | | >` <i>0</i> ≀ | | • | \bigcirc \checkmark | | |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Colony Assessment | Control (| Tap water) | Treatment Treatment g FPU | Item. it (2 x 250 SC 500) | Beference Seference (fx - dimetho | e Iten (R1 100 g pate/ha) | Reference (1 x 4 dimethe | e Item R2 400 g pate/ha) |
| Number of | Mean count | ±SD S | ttean C | ₩ SD S [×] S | Mean & S count | ±SD | Mean count | ±SD |
| 1 | 4000 | L 0.0 L | 4000 | در [™] 0.0 [©] | 4900 | 0.0 | 4000 | 0.0 |
| 2 | 5840 | 1142 | \$817.5 | 1065.4 | ©2645 | 1228.0 | 5197.5 | 870.5 |
| 3 | @6346.5 | 838.3 | ^ک 6988 | 891.1 Ô | 2399.5 | 1083.0 | 2282.5 | 395.4 |
| 4 | 6602.5 | Q73.4 | 6807.5 | چ ⁷ 486. ک | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 5 | 6791.5 | 1872 | 6 255 ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | 1526.1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 64 | 9696.3 | 4638.7 🔊 | 8294.5 | 2068.5 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 147 1 | 9754 | A044.20 | 8724.5 👡 | 3409.9 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 8 | 8768 | © 2238C3 | 9400.5 C | 3170.5 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 9 | _ر_9000_ ∿ | 1768.3 | \$10037 \$ | 4277.4 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 10 | 3284 | \$970.1 | 499 7 | 1975.1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| SD: Standa | rd deviation | | ¥ | | | | | |
| NA. Not as | sessed | \sim 0 ⁻ | | | | | | |

Table 10.3.1.5- 10: Colony Strength as mean number of adult worker bees

Overall, the development of the colonies as assessed by the mean number of (adult) worker bees was very homogenous throughout the entire study period with no distinct differences in colony strength between control and test item treatment. Statistical analysis (linear mixed effects model) revealed no significant effect of the test item treatment on the number of worker bees (colony strength; p = 0.854). A significant effect of the date was found (p = < 0.001), the interaction of date and treatment was not



significant (p = 0.987), indicating that the number of worker bees (colony strength) changed over time, but in the same manner for treatment and control. Thus, it can be concluded that sequential foliar spray applications of 2×250 g fluopyram/ha during flowering of a highly bee-attractive crop did neither cause adverse effects on colony strength.

Brood status/brood development

The honey bee colonies were equalised with regard to total brood (i.e. eggs, worker bee lavae + worker bee pupae). During the confined exposure period, the colonies in the control and test item treatment group were able to maintain their overall brood status and total bee brood was on a comparable level, with no distinct differences between the two exposure groups.

After the release from the tunnels, the average number of cells with brood initially increased in both control and test item group as more resources became available when colonies were allowed to forage freely. The brood status in the colonies in C and T reached their maximum at the beginning of August with an average of occupied brood cells of 1800 ± 1001 m the control and 10760 ± 2917 in the test item treatment group. Thereafter, the average number of cells with brood decreased, which reflected the development of honey bee colonies during the year. By end of October, at the last colony assessment before overwintering, numbers for total brood were 2848 ± 1897 . Oin C and 4736 ± 912 in T and as such the colonies entered the overwintering period on a comparable level.

By middle of March 2014, i.e. in spring of the following year, when the overwintering period had ended, the colonies were assessed for a final time. At this last colony assessment after overwintering, the average numbers of cells with brood in both control and test item group were slightly higher than the corresponding values prior to overwintering. Thus, it can be concluded that colonies in both treatment groups had already started breeding in assonse to the upcoming spring.

Statistical analysis (linear mixed effects model) revealed no significant effect of the test item treatment on the number of cells filled with brood (total brood; $\vec{p} \neq 0.153$). A significant effect of the date was found (p = 0.002), the interaction of date and treatment was not significant (p = 0.627), indicating that the number of brood cells charged over time, but in the same mapper for reatment and control.

| Colony Assessment | Control (| Táp water, | Test Treatm 250 g FU | Item ent (2 & USC 500) | Référence (1 x 4 O dimethe | e Item R1 400 g bate/ha) | Reference (1 x 4 dimethe | e Item R2 400 g pate/ha) |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Number | Mean count | | Mean count | | Mean count | ±SD | Mean count | ±SD |
| 12 | 8280 | 598.3 | 8080 | A78.9 | 7920 | 178.9 | 8000 | 489.9 |
| _≪ 2 | 9872 | A078.2 | 10092 | ≫1936.9 | 1632 | 659.3 | 9520 | 1733.7 |
| ³ | 11040 | ₽ 177€3 | 121200 | 1863.3 | 4320 | 3119.6 | 7320 | 1507.3 |
| 4 | L 11368 V | 1572.6 ~ | × 11720 | 2744.4 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 5 | 15890 | 0011.0 | 12060 | 2916.8 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 6 | 10 800 | Q 4983.0 | 8720 | 4258.2 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| JŞ. | ۍ 9280 | 1696.2 | 9480 | 3425.2 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| \$\$. O | 2252 | ¥579.5 | 2840 | 1545.1 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| L 9 2 | 2848 * | [*] 1897.5 | 4736 | 912.0 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 100 | 5896 | 1792.8 | 6088 | 3652.2 | NA | NA | NA | NA |

| Co | 0) | | 4/08 | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------|----------------------|
| Table 10 2 1% 11. | Drood douglomme | nt as maan total | hroad alla | (aggettlanuaa) |
| 1 abie 10.3 1.3 - 11. | | intan av mean autai | DIOUU CEAS | (eggoriar vaerpupae) |
| ** | | 400 | | |

SD: Standard deviation

NA: Not assessed



Thus, it can be concluded that sequential foliar spray applications of 2×250 g fluopyram/ha during flowering of a highly bee-attractive crop did not cause adverse effects on honey bee brood development.

Nectar and Pollen stores

Overall, the development of food stores (nectar/honey and pollen) of the coronies as assessed by the average number of cells with nectar/honey and pollen was very homogenous throughout the entire study period with no distinct differences between control and test item treatment. During the confined exposure period both the control and test item treated coronies experiorized a slight decline in horey stores as a result of the limited foraging area inside the tunnels. Both treatment groups were of supplemented with a small, identical quantity of ready-to-use surup (Apiintert®) at the end of confinement. Following release of the colonies at the monitoring site, the average number of cells with nectar/honey increased in both treatment groups as more resources became available. Statistical analysis (linear mixed effects model) revealed no significant effect of the test item treatment on the number of cells filled with nectar/honey (p = 0.628) of with pollen (p = 0.846) within the colonies. A significant effect of the date was found (p < 0.01) for both honey/nectar and pollen cells. The interaction of date and treatment was not significant (p = 0.386 for honey/nectar; p = 0.397 for pollen), indicating that the number of honey/nectar and pollen cells. Change over time, but in the same manner for treatment and control.

Colony health

The occurrence of the pathogens *Nosema* sp, and *Varroa* destructor, as well as of the orruses sacbrood virus and black queen cell virus occurrent in both exposure groups to a similar extent, and their occurrence was therefore not linked to the absence or presence of the test item. In one single colony of the test item treatment groups on one occasion (before overwintering), deformed wing virus was detected. This finding is well in line with the slightly higher *Varroa* infestation level in the test item treatment group as beasured via on the *Farroa* boards tree below), however, an indication of a slightly higher *Varroa* infestation evel in this group was already present before the confined exposure period.

Varroa-infestation levels, as measured via/on the *Varroa* boards (underneath the respective colonies), were very low during the entire experiment, in both the control and test item treatment group. There were no distinct differences between the control and the test item treatment group at any of the 16 *Varroa* assessments throughout the study.

No further pathogens (e.g. *Malpfghamæba mellificae, Paehibacillus larvae* spores, *Melissococcus plutonius*) or viruses (e.g. acute bee paralysis orus, chronic bee paralysis virus, Kashmir bee virus and Israel acute paralysis virus) were detected in any of the samples analysed.

Thus, it can be concluded that sequential foliar spray applications of 2×250 g fluopyram/ha during flowering of a highly bee attractive crop did not cause adverse effects on colony health, as determined in terms of pathogen/bee disease and virus infestation as well as in terms of *Varroa*-infestation measured via the *Varroa*-mite-drop of the colonies, throughout the entire course of the study.

Behavioural abnormalities

In both the test item freatment group and control no acute symptoms of poisoning (e.g. cramping, agony) were observed after the corresponding applications. Also the cleaning behaviour of honey bees did not change after the test item applications and was similar to control. No repellent effect of the test item was observed after the applications, honey bees continued to forage on the treated crop. No aggressive or any other apnormal behaviour of the honey bees was noted, neither during the confinement period, nor during the monitoring period.

Thus, it can be concluded that sequential foliar spray applications of 2×250 g fluopyram/ha during flowering of a highly bee-attractive crop did not cause adverse effects on honey bee behaviour.


| <u>Validity criteria:</u> All validity criteria | were met in tl | nis study. | | E. O | |
|--|----------------|---|---|-----------------|--|
| Table 10.3.1.5- 12: | Brood develop | ment | s I ka | A | |
| Validity Criteria | | Recommended | Optained 0 | Ì Ô | |
| Foraging activity shortly before application | All groups | \geq 5 bees/m ² | > 5 bees/m | | |
| Control Mortality: | Control | Should not have been considerable. | $0.6 \pm 00^\circ$ dead work 0.2 ± 0.4 dead work | er bees (after | st application) 2 nd application) |
| Reference Item Mortality: | Dimethoate | There should be ac high number of O impacted bees | The results showed reference item on w | a distinct effe | of the statistical |
| | | | | | |

In a special design study and in a full factorial randomized block design, hopey bec colonies were exposed to two sequential foliar applications of FLU SC 500 at a date of 250 g a.s./ha each (i.e. 2 x 250 g a.s./ha), while maintained in a confined environment@gauze tunnel. The applications were made during full-flowering of the highly bes-attractive surrogate crop Phacelia taxacetifolia. After the confined semi-field exposure period the colonies if the ontrok and in the test tem treatment group were released from continement, to be monitored under field conditions for the remainder of the season until overwintering and were assessed for a final time after overwintering in spring of the following year. , S

The exposure of hone bee colonie to two foliar applications with FLU SC 500 during full bloom did not result in adverse acute, short-term, and long-terms effects on aportality, colony strength, brood development, food storage, honey bee behaviour, queen surveral, overall hive vitality and colony health, and overwintering performance.

Overall, the mortality and foraging activity were comparable to the control throughout the study duration and no effects of the test item of adult and imitature honey bees were observed. Behaviour of the bees as well as nectar- and hollen Norage were pot affected. There were no observable effects on overall colony development of brood and colony strength.

Based on the results of this study it can be concluded that FLU SC 500 does not adversely affect honey bee behaviour, brood development and colony strength when applied as two sequential foliar applications at a rate of 250 g a.s. ba, under the above described conditions. Ŋ

Assessment and conclusion by applicant

The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment.

FLU SC 500 applied as two sequential foliar applications at a rate of 250 g a.s./ha does not adversely affect honey bee behaviour, brood development and colony strength.



CP 10.3.1.6 Field tests with honeybees

Further testing was not necessary when considering the outcome of the risk assessment and the results of the lower-tier studies.

CP 10.3.2 Effects on non-target arthropods other than bees

For the formulation FLU SC 500 Tier 1 studies (laboratory studies or glass plates) with the standard of test species *Aphidius rhopalosiphi* and *Typhlodromus pyri* were conducted to determine potential effects on non-target arthropods.

| Table 10.3.2- 1: | Ecotoxicological | endpoints [®] | relevant | for the | risk assess | ment for | non-tanget | arthror | ods° |
|------------------|------------------|------------------------|----------|---------|-------------|----------|------------|---------|------|
| | for FLU SC 500 | Ą | s Or | | Q a | Â, | 0.9 | | Ĩ |

| Test species, | Tested formulation, | Ecotoxicological endpoint & & |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Reference | study type, exposure | |
| | | |
| Aphidius rhopalosiphi | FLU SCOO | $LB_{50} > 2000 \text{ mL product/bar}$ |
| (2008) | Laboratory, glass plates | |
| <u>M-298601-01-1</u> | | Corr. Mortality [%] Effects on reproduction [%] |
| KCP 10.3.2.1/03 | 125 mL product/ha | |
| | 250 mL@roductDra | 0.0 5 |
| 2 | 300 mL product/ha | A 406 J 41.4 |
| ≪ | 1000 mL product/hD | \$ ~ 0.0 \$ (c. ~)6.2 |
| - S | 2000 mL product ha | \swarrow 3.6 \bigcirc \checkmark 4.1 |
| Typhlodromus pyri | ÆLUSØ\$00 🖓 🌅 | $LR_{50} > 2000 \text{ mL product/ha}$ |
| (2008) | Laboratory, glass plates | |
| <u>M-298616-01-</u> | | Corr, Mortality [%] [*] Effects on reproduction [%] |
| KCP 10.3.2.1004 | 129 mL product/ha | 5.2 1.8 |
| Č, | 250 ml@product/ha | |
| | 500 mL product/ha | 3.8 |
| | 1000 mL product/ha | [™] ≪ [™] 5.2, 0 [°] 4.7 |
| | 2000 mlsproduchha 🏑 🏸 | <u>6</u> 5.2 2.3 |
| J. | THE | |

The exposure cenario's based on the use pattern as given in Table 10-1. The formulation FLU SC 500 is intended to be applied at rate of 0.150 product/ha@ith 1 application in apple.

According to the Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology (SANCO/10329/2002 rev. 2 final, 2002) and the Guidance Document on regulatory testing and risk assessment procedures for plant protection products with non-target arthropods (ESCORT 2, Candolfi *et al.* 2000¹⁵) the exposure is calculated as:

In-field: Application ate × MAF Off-field: Max. single application ate × MAF × drift factor/VDF × correction factor

¹⁵ Candoffi *et al.*: 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



PERingeld PERingeld Difference PERingeld PERingeld Application rate: 1×0.15 L product/ha MAF (multiple application factor) = 1(1 application)Drift factor = 0.1573 (late), 90^{th} percentile for 1 application VDF = vegetation distribution factor = 5 (Tier 1; studies with 2D exposure system) Correction factor = 10 (Tier 1)

The risk at Tier 1 is considered acceptable, if the calculated HQ is

| Table 10.3.2- 2: | Exposure | calculation | for in-field | assessment | ier 1 |
|------------------|----------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------|
| | | | | ~ *** | |

| Сгор | No. of appl. | ppl. Cate prod./ha] | | A MAR | | P OPL | 'ER _{in-field} prod. ha] % |
|-------|--------------|---|---|---------|----|--------------|--|
| Apple | 1 | Ø.15 ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | Å | y A.O . | 0× | \checkmark | 0.15 |

MAF: Multiple application factor; PER: Predict reviewmental date

| | | | | | S. | Ø. | |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------|----------|---------|------------|--|
| Table 10.3.2- 3: | Exposure calcu | Q Ilation fo | r the o | ff-field | scenari |) (Tier | |

| Сгор | No. of appl | Appl. rate [L.prod./ha] | MAF | Drift [%] | V DF | Correction | PER _{off-field} [L prod./ha] |
|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--|
| Apple | Ň | g 0.15 ^Q | £.0 | <i>∱</i> ¥5.73 _€ Q | <u>کې 5</u> | J 10 J | 0.047 |
| MAE: Multiple applica | tion factor: VO | E. Vegention d | Qributi | factor PE | R · Dradicted | environmental rate | |

Risk assessment for non-target arthropots

The risk assessment was performed according to the Gordance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology (SANCO/10329/2002 rev. 2 funal, 2002) and to the Guidance Document on regulatory testing and risk assessment procedure for plant protection products with non-target arthropods (ESCORT 2, Candolfi et al. 2000^{16}). A

Tier 1 in-field sisk assessment for bon-target arthropats

| | ş c | ~ <u></u> | ~~ | <u></u> | Ôn" | 0° | |
|---------------|----------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------------|
| Table 10.3.2- | - 4: Tie | r 1 🖬-fi | eld@isk | assessm | nead for | non-targ | et arthropods |
| | / | | S | a | 200 | k) 8 | |

| Crop and application rate | Species / PERizfield [L prod./ha] | LR50 [L prod./ha] | HQ | Trigger |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|---------|
| Apple | Aphianis rhopolosiphi | > 2.0 | < 0.075 | 2 |
| 1 × 0.15 L prod./@a | Typhlodromus pyris 0.13 | > 2.0 | < 0.075 | 2 |

PER: Predicted ovironnetestal Hazard quotient



¹⁶ Candoffi et al.: 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



For the standard species, the in-field HQ values are below the trigger of concern, indicating an acceptable risk for non-target arthropods.

Tier 1 off-field risk assessment for non-target arthropods

| Table 10.3.2- 5: | Tier 1 off-field risk assessment for non-target arthropods |
|------------------|--|
|------------------|--|

| Tier 1 off-field ris Table 10.3.2- 5: | k assessment for non-t Tier 1 off-field risk asses | arget arthrop sment for non- | ods target arthropods | A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Crop and application rate | Species | PER _{off-field} | LR50 LR50 | HQ | ŢŢĨigger S |
| Apple 1 × 0.15 L prod./ha | Aphidius rhopalosiphi Typhlodromus pyri | 0.047 | > 2.0 5 | < 0.02 4 | |

PER: Predicted environmental rate; HQ: Hazard quotient

For the standard species, the off-field HQ Qalue **Concern** indicating an acceptable risk for non-target arthropods.

Conclusion:

From the data and risk assessments presented above, it is concluded that unacceptable effects of FLU SC 500 on non-target arthropods in the infield and offer beld environment are not to be expected for the intended use of FLU SC 300. Ô

| | °, | |
|----------------------|---------|---|
| CP 10.3.2.1 | Stand | ard taboratory testing for non-target arthropols |
| | | |
| | a) | |
| Data Point: | | \$XCP 1, 9.2.1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, |
| Report Author: | | |
| Report Year: | Ň. | 2007 0 60 5 6 5 |
| Report Title: | S. | Bose-response toxicity (PR50) & AE (O5694) SC 500 to the parasitic wasp |
| | ~ | Aphicius rhoga osiph Desterani-Perez) unger laboratory conditions |
| Report Noz | Ú, | 06 20 48 18 |
| Document No: | ý | M-283320-01-1 ~ ~ ~ ~ |
| Guideline(s) follow | Qin | 10BC (CEAD, PRIGQUET al 2000); |
| study: | r A | Equip ent tous ERA OPPTS Guiceline 850 (SUPP) |
| Deviations from curr | rentQ | Cutoent Gyngeline DBC-Mead-Enggs et al. (2000) |
| test guideline | Ô | Deviations, not applicable |
| Previous evaluation: | - | Ses, expluated accepted |
| | ľa | in Dar (20) |
| GLP/Officially | | Yes, conducted upper GLB Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | | A a or in |
| facilities: | | |
| Acceptability/Reliab | oility: | Yest, Q L |
| S. | A | |
| O`/ | , y | |

The study bove was performed with an outdated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.2.1/02 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2007 |
| Report Title: | Dose-response toxicity (LR50) of AE C656948 SC 500 to the predatory mit |
| _ | Typhlodromus pyri (Scheuten) under laboratory condition |
| Report No: | 06 10 48 188 |
| Document No: | <u>M-283517-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | IOBC (Bluemel et al. 2000); |
| study: | Equivalent to US EPA OPPTS Gutgeline No. 850 4400 (SUPP) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: BLÜMEL ETAL. (2000) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: not applicable 🔬 🖉 🖉 |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted |
| | in DAR (2011) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes Δ $\tilde{\sigma}$ \tilde{v} Q \tilde{v} \tilde{v} |
| | |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outcated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance repeated process, which is presented in this section further below.

| Data Point: | KCP10.3.2.1/03 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Dose-response poxicity (LR500 of Fluppyram SC 500% to the parasitic wasp |
| | Aphidius rhopalosiphi (Desterani-Perez) under laboratory conditions |
| Report No: | 08-10 48 002 A () () () |
| Document No: | <u>*@-298601-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in 🔬 | IOBC Guideling (MEOD-BRIEGS or al. 2000) |
| study: N | US PA OCSPP Guideline To. 850 SUPP |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline |
| test guideline: | MEADEBRIGGSET AL. (2000) |
| <u> </u> | Deviations: None. All validity criterio were met. |
| Previous evaluation: | No pot predously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities 🔊 | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Δes σ σ σ |
| | |

Executive Surfamary

In a laboratory study the tethal and sublethal toxicity of FLU SC 500 on the parasitoid wasp, *Aphidius rhopalosiphi*, we investigated Five product rates from 125 - 2000 mL product/ha were tested. Per test item rate 3 replicates of 10 wasps were exposed to FLU SC 500 on treated glass surface.

All of the validity diteria according to Mead-Briggs et al. (2000) were met.

After 2, $\mathcal{Q}4$ and 48 hours mortality of the wasps was assessed. After 48 hours no statistically significant differences compared to the control occurred and a corrected mortality up to 3.6 % was found in the treatment rates. The LR₅₀ was estimated to be greater than 2000 mL product/ha.



At 48 hours, 15 surviving females per treatment were confined individually for 24 hours over untreated wheat plants infested with the host cereal aphids, *Rhopalosiphum padi*. After removal of the adult wasps, the aphid-infested plants were left for 11 days, before the reproductive capacity was assessed. No effects on the reproductive performance of the surviving wasps were found in any of the product rates

I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

<u>Test item</u>: FLU SC 500; specification no. 102000018148; batch ID 2007-011657; TOX08109analysed content of a.s. = 501.0 g/L fluopyram; density 188 g/mL.

<u>Test design</u>: Adults of the parasitoid wasp, *Aphidius Hopalosiphi* (less than 48 hold) were exposed to dried spray residues of the product applied on glass plates at rates of 125, 250, 500, 1000 and 2000 mL product/ha and the effects were compared to those of a purified water control. All treatments were applied at a nominal volume rate of 200 L spray solution/ha using a calibrated laboratory track sprayer. A toxic reference (Dimethoate EC 400) applied at a tate epivalent to 0.3 mL product/200 L water/ha was included to indicate the relative susceptibility of the test organisms and the test system. For feeding 25 % w/v solution of aqueous fructose was provided on a cotton woot thread

Mortality of 30 adult wasps (3 replicates of 10 wasps per test group) was assessed 2, 24 and 49 h after exposure.

At 48 h, surviving wasps (n = 15 females per treatment) were removed and heir reproductive capacity assessed by confining them individually over untreated wheat plants infested with the host cereal aphids, *Rhopalosiphum padi*.

The adult wasps were removed after 24 h and the aphid-infested plants left for a further 11 days before the numbers of aphid 'mummies' (the pupal sage of the wasp) that had developed was recorded.

<u>Climatic conditions</u>: The climatic test conditions of the mortality assessment phase were 19 - 22 °C temperature and 39 81 % relative humbrid with a photoperiod of 16 hours light and a light intensity of 2100 lux. In the reproduction assessment phase (Apped parasitisation) the temperature ranged between 19 - 22°C with a photoperiod of 16 hours light and a light intensity of 3860 lux.

<u>Statistics</u>: Fisher's Exact Binominal -Test ($p \le 0.05$) was applied to mortality data, to compare individual product treatments with control. For reproduction data treatments were compared to control by Dunnet multiple t-test ($p \le 0.05$).

Dates of work: Jamary 21, 2008 February 04, 2008

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In a worst-case laboratory study, the effects of coordinate parasitoid wasp *Aphidius rhopalosiphi* to dried spray residues of FLC SC 500 on gass plates were determined.

Corrected mortalities of 0, 0, 3, 6, 0 and 3.6 % were observed after 48 hours in the 125, 250, 500, 1000 and 2000 mL product/ha treatment rates of the product. There were no statistically significant effects on wasp survival. The median ethal rate (LR₅₀) was estimated to be greater than 2000 mL product/ha.

There were no solistically significant effects on the reproductive performance of the surviving wasps in any of the product treatments.



0

| Table 10.3.2.1- 1: | Effects of dried spray residues on the parasitic wasp Aphidius rhopalosiphi |
|--------------------|---|
| | (Hymenoptera, Braconidae) in a laboratory study |

| Test item: H Test organism: A Exposure on: 0 | FLU SC 500 Aphidius rhopalosiphi Glass plates | | ð | |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Treatment | Rate ¹ [mL product/ha] | Corrected mortality ² [%] | Reproduction [mummies] females | Effects on reproduction 4 |
| Control | 0 | | 14 | |
| | 125 | 0 | 19.3 | 0 324 × 6 |
| Test item | 250 | 0 | £13.7 | Q 5.5 0 4 |
| Test nem | 500 | 3.6 | Q 14.3 ° S | 1.4° (|
| | 1000 | | ~ <u>1306</u> ~ ~ | |
| | 2000 | 3.6°° | \$ \$13.9 TO | 4.1 |
| Toxic ref. | 0.3 | 0100 ° | | |
| LR ₅₀ ⁵ | > 2000 mL produc | t/ha 🖉 🖉 | | O' D' A |

¹ Application rate for test item in terms of mL product per 200 L water ha. ² Mortality corrected for any control treatment deaths using Abbott of formula.

² Mortality corrected for any control treatment deaths using Abbott 9 formula. ³ The numbers of parasitized aphids per female in each test-itent reatment were compared to the numbers in the control by Dunnett's multiple t-test ($p \le 0.05$). ⁴ For effects on reproduction, a negative value indicates an increase relative to the control. ⁵ Median lethal rate estimated empirically. <u>Validity criteria:</u> All of the validity criteria were met (according to Mead-Briggs *et al.*, 2000) 0

Table 10.3.2.1- 2: Salidity criteri

| Malidity Priteria | Obtained |
|--|---|
| Mortality within the control treatment at 48 h $(i,e,5 \text{ was ps} \text{ from } 40)$ | 6.7 % |
| Mortal within the to be reference 50° 50° | 100 % |
| In the reproduction assessments the mean 7 3.0 perfemale number of mummles in the control 2 not be prore than two zero values | 14.5 mummies per female, no zero values. |
| | |

III. CONCLUSION

2000 mL product ha. The LR_{50} was estimated to be

validity criteria of the laboratory method using glass plates according to The figures obtained fulfit the Mead-Briggs et@l. (2000).

Assessment and conclusion by applicant:

The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment.

The endpoint is: LR50 > 2000 mL product/ha

Ĉ



| Data Point: | KCP 10.3.2.1/04 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2008 |
| Report Title: | Dose-response toxicity (LR50) of Fluopyram SC 500 G to the predatory note |
| | Typhlodromus pyri (SCHEUTEN) under laboratory conditions |
| Report No: | 08 10 48 003 A |
| Document No: | <u>M-298616-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | IOBC Guideline (BLÜMEL et al. 2000) |
| study: | V D D S S |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: BLÜMEL \pounds AL. (2000) \bigcirc^{\heartsuit} |
| test guideline: | Deviation: The cumulative reproduction per females are counted from day & to day |
| | 14. Any eggs found on day were removed and not counted in the fecundity |
| | assessment All validity oriteria were mer. |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLDOfficially recognised testing facilitie |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & |
| | |

Executive Summary

In a laboratory study the lethal and sublethal toxicity of FLU SC 500 on the productry mite, *Typhlodromus pyri* Scheuten (Acari: Phytoseiidae), was investigated. Five test item rates from 125 - 2000 mL product/ha were tested. Per product rate 5 replacates of 20 mites were exposed to FLU SC 500 on treated glass surface.

All of the validity corteria according to Buimel et al. (2000) were met.

After 3, 7, 9, 11 and 14 days mortality of the miter was assessed. After 7 d no statistically significant differences compared to the controDoccurred and a corrected mortality up to 5.2 % was found in the treatment rates. The $\mathbb{Z}R_{50}$ was estimated to be 2000 mL product/has

Assessments of mite reproduction were made at 9011 and 14 days after treatment. After 14 days no statistical significant, effects on reproduction were found.

A Maderial and Methods

<u>Test item</u>: FLU SC 500; specification po. 1020000 (2148); batch ID 2007-011657; TOX08109-00; analysed content of a.s. = 501.0 g/L fluopyram, density 1.188 g/mL.

<u>Test design</u>: Protonymphs of the predatorymite *Fophlodromus pyri* Scheuten (Acari: Phytoseiidae; less than 24 h old, from a synchronise (cohorf) were exposed to dried spray residues of the product applied on glass plates at rates of 125, 050, 500, 1000 and 2000 mL product/ha in 200 L deionised water/ha. The effects were compared to those of a deionised water control. Dimethoate EC 400 (10 mL product/ha in 200 L water ha) was used as a toxic reference item. During the assessments the predatory mites were fed with poten (*Prrus nig a* and *Betula pendula*) at each assessment day.

On day 5, 7, 9, 41 and 14 after the application, the number of surviving predatory mites was counted, dead mites were recorded and removed. The number of laid eggs was determined on days 9, 11 and 14. Any eggs found on day 7 were removed and not counted in the fecundity assessment. The final assessment for mortality was performed on day 7 after treatment and the final assessment for reproduction was made on day 14 after treatment.

<u>Climatic conditions</u>: The climatic test conditions were 23 - 26 °C temperature and 49 - 71 % relative humidity with a photoperiod of 16 h and a light intensity of 2080 lux.



<u>Statistics</u>: Fisher's Exact Test ($p \le 0.05$) was applied to mortality data, to compare individual treatments with the control. For comparison of reproduction data from individual treatments with the control DUNNETT's multiple t-test (1-sided, $p \le 0.05$) was used.

Dates of work: January 22, 2008 - February 05, 2008

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

P C C C The effects of exposing the predatory mite Typhlodronus pyri to dred spray residues of on glass plates were determined.

Corrected mortalities of 5.2, 3.1, 5.2, 5.2 and 5.2% were observed in the 125, 250, 500, 1009 and 2000 mL product/ha treatment rates of the product & None of the treatment rates differed significantly from the control (Fisher's Exact Binominal-test, p = 0.05) and the median lether rate (DR_{50}) was estimated to be > 2000 mL product/ha, the highest rate tested, \Im Ô

At 125, 250, 500, 1000 and 2000 mL product/ha, the reproductive performance of the mites was reduced by 1.8, 2.3, 3.8, 4.7 and 2.3 % relative to the control. There was no statistically genificant effect of the product on reproduction at all tested rates (pUNNFTT's multiple t-test 1-sided, $p \le 0.05$) compared to the control group.

The results are summarised in the table below

| | | Q | SY SY | a Cor | v. | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|--|----------|---------------|------------|
| Table 10.3.2.1- 3: | Effects of dried s | pray resid | des on the | predatory | mite Tv | phlodrømus py | ri (Acari: |
| | Phytosojidan) in | a laborato | ry stary | `~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | , |
| | T upprosentage) m | a Jabul atu | i y si una y | | <u> </u> | A. | |

| | | | A | <u> </u> |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Test item: | EUSC \$90 SC | | S e s. a | <i>"</i> |
| Test organism: | yphlodromus pyri | | | , , |
| Exposure on: 0 | Glassoplates | | | |
| O, | | Corrected | Mean Oumberleggs | Effects on |
| Treatment | Kate 7 | mortality ²⁾ | per female ³⁾ | reproduction ⁴⁾ |
| | | ° [%] | ~(8-14 [^] DAT) | [%] |
| Control | | | ×6,13 | |
| | 0° K25 ~~ | SO [™] 5.2SU [™] | <i>∲</i> ≜6.02 | 1.8 |
| , Či | ∑ <u>3</u> 250 V | 3.0 | > 5.99 | 2.3 |
| Test item | Q \$500 | © ×3.2 C | 5.90 | 3.8 |
| | 2 10 0 | ~ 5.2 ~ | 5.84 | 4.7 |
| * | 2900 | Q 5.2 | 5.99 | 2.3 |
| Toxic Fef. | <u>ک</u> 10 ک | 0 17 × V | _ | _ |
| LR ₅₀ 5) | > 2000 mL produc | ct/ha | | |

Application rate for test item in terms of mL@roduct per 200 L water/ha. 1)

Mortality corrected for any control treatment deaths using Abbott's formula. 2)

Negative values indicate an increase in survival, telative to the control.

Results for reproduction in individual lost-item deatments compared to the control by Dunnett's multiple t-test, 1-sided 3) $(p \le 0.05)$

 $(p \le 0.05)$ For effects on reproduction, a positive value indicates a decrease, relative to the control. 4)

Median lethal safe estimated empirically. 5)

All of the validity criteria were met (according to Blümel et al., 2000).



Table 10.3.2.1-4: Validity criteria

| Validity criteria | Required | Obtained 🖉 🖉 |
|--|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Mortality within the control treatment during the 7 day test | ≤ 20 % | <u>3%</u> |
| Toxic reference mean mortality of protonymphs at day 7 (control corrected) | 50 - 100 % | 77.3% |
| Mean cumulative number of eggs produced per female from 7 to 14 days in the control | \geq 4.0 per female | 6.13 per fennale |
| III. | Conceusion | |
| The LR ₅₀ was estimated to be > 2000 mL prod | uctona. | |
| The figures obtained fulfil the validity criteria Blümel <i>et al.</i> (2000). | of the aboratory method us | ng glass plates according to |
| Assessment and conclusion by applicants | | |
| The study and its data are considered as accept | ptable and reliable for me in | risk assessment |
| The endpoint is: $LR_{50} > 2000$ for product/ha | | ř _S O <u>k</u> y |
| CP 10.3.2.2 Extended faboratory te authropods | sting aged residue studie | s with non-target |
| Data Point: C KCP40.3.2,2/01 | | |
| Report Author | | |
| Report Year: 6 2907 | Novicity (EP 50) of APC 6560 | 18 SC 500 to the rove beetle |
| Alexhara komeata G | YLL Under Extended Vaboratory | v conditions |
| Report No: 07 0 48,0,18 A | | |
| Document No: <u>M-295487-01-1</u> | | |
| Guideline(s) folloged in A IOB Guideline (GR | MM et al. 20(0); | |
| Deviations from current Greent Mideline Gr | inage et al. (2000) | |
| test guideline: Deviatoris: ngQpplig | sple | |
| Previous valuation: yes, valuat valuat valuat | žeptęd V | |
| GLP Officially Ass, conducted Order recognised testing | Chr/Officially recognised testi | ng facilities |
| facilities: | <i>J</i> | |
| Acceptability/Reliability? Y | | |
| The study above was performed with an outdat since it was part of the first disting process. | ed formulation. It is only sho | wn for transparency reasons |
| | | |



AND DE AND THE PROPERTY OF THE AND THE



CP 10.4 Effects on non-target soil meso- and macrofauna

The risk assessment is based on the "Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology (SANCO/10329/2002 rev 2 final 2002) (SANCO/10329/2002 rev. 2 final, 2002).

Predicted environmental concentrations used in risk assessment

For details of PEC_{soil} calculations refer to MCP Summary Section 9, Print 9.1.3.

Important remark by the applicant: The PEC_{soil} values as presented below are interim values and ar therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The opplicant intends to provide final PEC_{soil} values latest by endof March 2022.

Maximum PECsoil values for fluopyrand, its metabolites and FL SC 500 in apple Table 10.4-1: (for details see MCP Section 2, Point 9.1.3)

| Compound | | \swarrow Apples \swarrow \swarrow \swarrow \checkmark \checkmark |
|----------------------|---|--|
| | PEC sojl Juitial | PEC soil, plateau, 6m |
| | [mg/kg] ^{"O"} | mg/kgh & S S |
| | | 5 g a s /ha |
| Fluopyram | ^{4,7} 0.4035 ² 6 0 2 3 | \$ 0.122 \$ 0.157 |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy | A0.002 | |
| Trifluoroacetic acid | | |
| | | 5 Léprod./ha |
| FLU SC 500 | | |
| * DEO moone | the sum of DEC all und DE | |

1)

PEC_{soil, accu} means the sum of PEC_{soil matial} and PEC_{soil matcau} and PEC_{soil matcau} and PEC_{soil matcau} and PEC_{soil} me initial rate of the product (0.15 L/ha) in a single application, the portion reaching of (BBC) 71-89, worst case interception of 65 % for apples late), the standard soil sensity (1.5 g/cm), the standard soil depth 5 cm) and the density of the formulation (1.191 g/mL).

Uncertainty Pactors for isomer composition of metabolites

The metabólite Fluopyram-7-hydroxy has a charal center. Ecotoxicological testing was performed with the raceptic mixture. Therefore, for this metabolite an additional uncertainty factor of 2 will be applied to the TER available for earthworm, springfails, soil mites and nitrogen transformations in consideration





,V

CP 10.4.1 Earthworms

The risk assessment (calculation of TER values) was based on the NOEC values calculated from the studies performed with the product and the metabolites. In case EC₁₀ values were lower than the OEC and the calculation was reliable they were used for the calculations of TER values.

| | | | A | Ő | | Ş″ |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|--------|-------|
| Table 10.4.1- 1: | Ecotoxicological endpoints – | earthworm reproductio | n studies v | vith FLAS | SC 500 | and 🗶 |
| | Fluopyram metabolites | G ATH | Ň | | \sim | Ő |

| | | ý A | |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Test item | Test species, test design | Ecotoxicological endpoint | Reference 5 |
| FLU SC 500 | <i>Eisenia fetida</i> reproduction 56 d, mixed | NOEC = 316 mg prod./kg gws NOEC = 158 mg prod./kg dws NOEC = 134 mg a.s./kg dws NOEC = 67 mg a.s./kg dws $EC_{10} = 27$ mg prod./kg dws $EC_{10} = 117$ s mg prod./kg dws $EC_{10} = 117$ s mg a.s./kg dws $EC_{10} = 59$ mg a.s./kg dws | (2020) <u>MI-680(776-014</u>) KCA 8.4.1/02 KCP 10.4.1.1/02 |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy | Eisenia fetida reproduction 56 d, mixed | NOEC = 18 mg pp./kg $dvrs$ NOEC = 18 mg pp./kg $dvrs$ NOEC corr = 9 mg pp./kg $dvrs^{A}$ EC u^{2} calculation of possible | (2621) <u>162139201-1</u> KCA &4.1/03 |
| Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) | Eisenia fetida reproduction 56 d, mixed | NOEC = $320 \text{ mg p.m./kg dws}^{C}$ | (2005) <u>M-251328-01-1</u> KCA 8.4.1/04 |

dry weight soil, prod product dws

А

- In weight soil, product $(\log P_0)^{-2}$ ((42.4% w/w); as given in study Endpoint calculated on the basis of analysed fluopyram content in the formulation ((42.4% w/w); as given in study в report)
- Kg dws is based on effects on the body weight in the concontration 1000 mg p m./kg dws. С NOEC

Risk assessment for earthworm

Important remark by the applicant: The PEGoil and OER values as presented below are interim values and are therefore subject to change intil final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant interes to provide final PEC soil values and revised TER calculations latest by end of March 2022.

| N N | _ // | ()) | |
|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| T.L.L. 10 4 1 3. | T_{1} | | Cl |
| 1 anie 10 4 1 - 7. | THE CALMULATION FOR | ' eastaworms tor | ' fillonvram and its metabolites |
| | I MIN CHAMICHTOH IVI | | mapping and and my metabolicy |
| | | | |
| 16 // | | ~ | |

| Compound | Species, study type | Endpoint [mg/kg] | PEC _{soil} [mg/kg] | TERLT | Trigger |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------|
| Apples, 1 × 70g a.s.% | a a c | | | | |
| Fluopyram | Earthworm, reproduction | NOEC = 67 | 0.157 | 427 | 5 |
| Fluopyram-7-hedroxy | Earthworm, reproduction | NOEC = 9 | 0.002 | 2250 ^A | 5 |
| Triflogroacette acid | Eagnworm, reproduction | NOEC = 320 | 0.001 | 320000 | 5 |

For the metabolite fluopyram-7-hydroxy the TER has been corrected according to an uncertainty factor of 2 in consideration of two enantiomers.



| The TER values clearly of | exceed the trigger v | value of 5 indic | cating that | no unaccej | ptable advo | erse effects on | i - |
|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------|---|---|-----|
| earthworms are to be exp | pected from the inte | ended use of F | LU SC 50 | 0 in apples | | | |
| | | *** | | ć | A A | | |
| | | * * * * * * * * * * | Ĉ4 | A. | <u>``</u> | | |
| Data Point: | KCP 10.4.1/01 | | | <u></u> | Ô | | |
| Report Author: | | , . (| <i>y</i> | R | Ű. | S. | Ő |
| Report Year: | 2007 | .Ô | Å | Ý | | V or v | × |
| Report Title: | AE C656948 SC 5 | 00: acute toxici | ty to earth | vorme (Eise | fetidayt | ested in 🗸 | 1 |
| - | artificial soil with | 5 percent peat | \sim | ~_@* | ¥ <u></u> 0. | | |
| Report No: | LRT/RG-A-78/06 | 4. Co° | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | » `\$ | | |
| Document No: | M-284362-01-1 | O ^V . U ^V | | | | .4 | |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OECD 207, OECI | Guideluie for | FestingOI | Chen Cals, J | Earthwoon, | Acupe 5 | |
| study: | Toxicity Tests (19 | 84) 😽 🔊 | , s | AS | | | |
| | Equivalent to 1981 | EPA OPPTS Gu | ideline No | \$50.6269 (| SURE) 🕫 | | |
| Deviations from current | Current Gui Oline | SECD 201 (19 | | | | * O | |
| test guideline: | Deviations. not ap | plicable since to | st system is | s no Donger a | Slata regui | rem o nt in EU | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaloated and | accepted | S | | , A | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | |
| | in DAR (2011) | | | \checkmark | »Õ /» | / | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes (vonducted un | der GLP/Officia | ally recogn | sed testing f | fa@lities | | |
| recognised testing | × k ĉ | Y K a | , 4 | | | | |
| facilities: | <u>6</u> 0' <u>5</u> | | . | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes A | | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | | |
| * | | 0 8 3 | | &, v | | | |
| L. | "0" ~~ @ | LY 1 | , V | | 4 | | |

The study above was performed with an Sutdated formulation. Furthermore, this study type is no longer





~ 0

| CP 10.4.1.1 | Earthworms | sub-lethal | effects |
|-------------|--------------------|-------------|---------|
| | Little the of this | Sub icellui | enteets |

| | Ó 🖉 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Data Point: | KCP 10.4.1.1/01 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2006 |
| Report Title: | AE C656948 SC 500: Effects on survival, growth and reproduction on the |
| | earthworm Eisenia fetida tested in artificial soil with Apercent peat of |
| Report No: | LKC-RG-R-20/06 |
| Document No: | <u>M-268821-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | ISO 11268-2: 1998 (E) and OECD 222: April 6, 2004; |
| study: | Equivalent to US EPA OPPT& Guideline Ng 850.6200 (SUOP) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 22 (2016) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: not applicable |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted of the way of the way with the second s |
| | in DAR (2011) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP Officiary reconised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes Q V V V V V Q Q |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated for bulation. It is fully shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first fisting process. New data has been generated with the representative

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first fisting process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.4.1.1/02 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2020 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 (500 g/L): Effects on survival, growth and reproduction of the |
| | earthworm Eisenia fetida tested in artificial soil |
| Report No: | <u>M-680776-01-1</u> |
| Document No: | <u>M-680776-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC, |
| study: | Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009, 🖒 |
| | US EPA OCSPP Not Applicable, C S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S |
| | ISO 11268-2: 1998 (E), L O ^V L O ^V |
| | OECD 222: July 29, 2016 |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 22 (2016) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: None. All validity criteria were met |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLB Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes Q V X X V V V V |
| | |

Executive Summary

In a laboratory study the effects of PLU SC 500 on survival and reproduction of adult earthworms *Eisenia fetida* was tested during an exposure of 4 weeks (first part) in artificial soil by comparing control and treatment. After this period, the adult earthworms were removed from the test vessels and the cocoons and juvenile earthworms remained in the test vessels for additional 4 weeks (second part). The total duration of the study was 8 weeks. Eight test test from rates from 18 to 1000 mg product/kg dry weight soil were tested. Perfect item rates replicates and for the control group 4 replicates with 10 earthworms each were exposed to FLO SC 500 mixed into artificial soil.

After a period of 4 weeks the survivors were counted, and their fresh weight was measured. From these data mortality and bromass effects were determined. After an additional four weeks exposure of the cocoons and juvenile earthworns the reproduction was determined by counting the number of offspring hatched from the cocoons percest vessel.

The study fulfilled all validity criteria of OECD 222 grideline.

The endpoints were: NGEC_{mothin} ≥ 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil, LOEC_{mothin} ≥ 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil, LOEC_{growth} = 306 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil, LOEC_{growth} = 562 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil, NOEC_{reproduction} = 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil, LOEC_{reproduction} = 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil, LOEC_{reproduction} = 562 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. The EC₁₀ and EC₂₀ related to reproduction are determined to be $2\sqrt{7}$ and 356 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil, respectively.

LeMaterials and methods

Test item: FOU SC 500, specification no.: 102000018148; Batch No.: EV57002782; TOX21406-00, analytical findings 42.4 & w/w Puopyram equivalent to 504.9 g/L; density: 1.191 g/mL (20 °C).

<u>Test desten</u>: Ten adult earthworms (*Eisenia fetida*) per replicate (8 replicates for the control group and 4 replicates for each reatment group) were exposed to control and treatments in an artificial soil (with 10% peat content). The study consisted of 2 parts: Adult earthworms were exposed to the test item for a period of 4 weeks (first part). After this period, the adult earthworms were removed from the test vessels and the cocoons and juvenile earthworms remained in the test vessels for additional 4 weeks (second part). The total duration of the study was 8 weeks.



During the test the adult earthworms were fed once per week with approximately 5 g food/vessel (animal manure). The offspring were fed only once at the start of the second 4 weeks exposure period by mixing the food into the soil. The artificial soil was prepared according to the guideline with the following constituents (percentage distribution on dry weight basis): 70 % industrial quartz sand, 10 % Sphagnum peat (air dried and finely ground), 20 % Kaolinite clay.

After a period of 4 weeks the adult earthworms were removed from the test vessels, the survivors were counted and their fresh weight was measured. From these data mortality and biomas effects were? determined. The cocoons and juvenile earthworms remained in the vessels for additional fault weeks. After this additional test period the reproduction was determined by gounting the number of offspring hatched from the cocoons per test vessel.

<u>Climatic conditions</u>: The climatic conditions were in the temperature range 20 ± 20 with a photoperiod of 16 hours light and a light intensity of 400 - 800 lux.

Statistics: Data for mortality were not statistically evaluated because no mortality occurred. Data of growth were tested for normal distribution and homogeneit of variance osing Shapiro Wilk's Fest and Leven's -Test ($\alpha = 0.05$) respectively. Data of growth were normally distributed and homogeneity of variances was given. Therefore William's t-test, one sided smaller $\alpha = 0.05$ was used to determine NOEC and LOEC values. Data of reproduction were tested for normal distribution and homogeneity of variance using Shapiro-Wilk's-Test and Leven's Test (= 0.09) respectively. Date of reproduction A - 0.05 was used to determine NOEC and LOEC values. The calculat and their 95% confidence limits was based on the model which provides the best fit suitable regression models. Dates of work: September 09, 2019 – November 11, 2019 were normally distributed and hop ogeneity of variances was given. Therefore William's t-test, onesided-smaller, $\alpha = 0.05$ was used to determine NOE and LOEC values. The calculation of EC₁₀/EC₂₀ and their 95% confidence limits was based on the model which provides the best fibout of different



II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

| | | | | in jena | | | (C) | | |
|---|--|-----------------------|--|---------------|--|-------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| | | | | Т | reatment | | -S | | |
| Parameter | [mg product/kg dry weight artificial soil] | | | | | | | | |
| | Control | 18 | 32 | 56 | 100 | 178 🖋 | 316 | 562 | . 1900 |
| Mortality of adult | | | | | Ô | Å | / | × × | |
| earthworms [%] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 | | 0 | $0 \approx$ | |
| after 28 days | Ŭ | Ũ | Ũ | Ĺ | Ŭ | ,Õ [×] | × | | S. |
| Significance | | | | ,Ø | | ó ^y | 0 | | Ô |
| (Mortality)* | - | - | - | | | ¥ - Ø | Ő. | | |
| Mean change of | | | | Ø – | | ^~ | | | |
| body fresh weight | • • • • | a a a a | . |) Star | N. C. | × , , | | - ~ | ₩ ^v |
| of the adults from | 20.99 | 28.53 | 24.0⊕″ | 25 @ 5 | 20.61 | ×28.24 | · 19.35 | 7.09 | 6.43 |
| day 0 to day 28 [%] | | | A | õ. | v Q | | \sim | Ô ^v | o" / |
| Standard deviation | 5.39 | 3.03 | ¥.05 ~ | 7.27 | 7.20 | 1.35 | ₫.46 « |) 2.60 [©] | 2,937 |
| Significance | | (| Î î.M | , Ø | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | 0 x | | Ž | AN CONTRACT |
| (body fresh | - | - 2 | 4× | | Q - 3 | Ý - Ô | | Ĩ | + |
| weight)* | | L. | <i>w</i> | °∼¶ * | $\mathcal{V} \sim$ | | D. | | 0 |
| Mean number of | | -Q" | | | R | <i>,</i> 0 | o ĉ | , > | |
| off-spring per test | 297.1 | @267.0≪ | ی 327.80 | 303 3 | 201.5 | 6 3 02.3 C | 266 | 142.0 | 58.3 |
| vessel after 56 days | | V V | \sim | 102 | Ý į | N° OS | O ^r | 0× | |
| Standard deviation | 33.3 | 1182 | \$3.8 | \$35.7 C | ≥ 35.3 ♥ | 36% | × 8.8 | 14.4 | 11.5 |
| Coefficient of | | | S 1 C AS | 1100 | 600 | ×10 * | | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| variance (%) | 11%2 | 4.2 | * 16.4% | | | 11.9 🗶 | y 2.60 | 10.2 | 19.8 |
| % of control | 2 - 2 | 89.9 | 110.3 | Ø2.1 | ≥91.40 | 10 57 | \$9%.8 | 47.8 | 19.6 |
| Significance | Ŭ, | Â. | | | | 0 | Ŷ | - | |
| (reproduction)** | | |) - _~ | , ĘĢ | ß | <u> </u> | v - | + | + |
| <u> </u> | » Adu | Ît Mortal | ity 刘 | . S | Growth | <u> </u> | Re | producti | on |
| NOECO | | O' | - Kar | | y jî | | | - | |
| [mg prod./kg dry | 6° % | ≥€000 | 4 | | 316 | Ň | | 316 | |
| weight soil] | | Ľ í | , Or | ~ | | Ő | | | |
| KOEC | a . ô | y & | | Ő , | Ĵ, Ĉ |) | | | |
| [mg prod./kg dry | N N | >1000 | | × «. | 562 | | | 562 | |
| weight soil] | | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | ~ | | | | |
| EC10 (mg prod./kgdr | y weight ar | Official sol | 1)**** | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | 277 | |
| 95 % confiden limi | tso [%] ^? | r . O | , 0 [×] . | ŐÝ 4 | D ^y | | (| 222 - 356 |) |
| EC20 (mg pro@kg dryweigl@artificial soil) | | | | | Ì | 356 | | | |
| 95 % confidence limi | ts 👓 | ~ × | s a | Ĩ | | | (| 303 - 400 |) |

William's t-test, one olded smaller, a 0.05) & significant, - not significant

∠E€10, EC20 (Probit analysis ising libear like mood regression) *** C

ŝ

Mortality:

After 28 days of exposure, no mortality in the control group was observed. Therefore, no statistical evaluation was conducted. Therefore, the endpoints related to mortality were: NOEC: $\geq 1000 \text{ mg}$ prod./kg/dry weight attificial soil and LOEC: >1000 mg prod./kg dry weight attificial soil.

Effects of growth:

No statistically significant effects for the growth relative to the control were in the test item concentrations up to and including 316 mg test item/kg dry weight artificial soil (Dunnett's Multiple t-



test, two-sided, $\alpha = 0.05$). Therefore, the endpoints related to growth were: NOEC: 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil and LOEC: 562 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil.

Effects on reproduction:

No statistically significant differences concerning the number of juveniles relative to the control were observed in the test item concentrations up to and including 316 mg test item /kg dry weight antificial soil (William's t-test, one-sided smaller, $\alpha = 0.05$).

Therefore, the endpoints related to reproduction were: NOEC: 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil and LOEC: 562 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soft. The EC10 (C.I.) and EC00 (C.I.) values were calculated to be 277 (222 - 322) mg prod./kg soil dry weight and 356 (303 - 406) mg prod./kg soil dry weight, respectively.

| weight, respectively. |
|--|
| |
| |
| Validity criteria: |
| All validity criteria of the OECD 222 guideline were met. |
| |
| |
| Table 10.4.1.1- 2: Validity critering |
| Validity criteria acc. to OECD 22 (alapted 2016) Required |
| \mathbf{v} A HULLY CELLEL IA ACC. LU VEA, BY \mathbf{w} \mathbf{z} \mathbf |
| valuity criteria acc. to OECE #22 (adopted 2010) 0 % Required 0 Objained |
| Mortality of the adults in the control 3° |
| Mortality of the adults in the control 222 (adopted 2010) 3 4 10% 3 0% |
| Mortality of the adults in the control 3 4 3 4 3 < |
| Value |
| Valuative |
| Valuative Sector Mortality of the adults in the control 30% Number of juveniles (earthworks per control vessel) 30% Coefficient of variance of reproduction in the control 5230% |

Reference test:

The corresponding tox fe standard reference test, with the reference test item mixed into the artificial soil, was performed from 2019-02-04 to 2019-04-05 (Rg-R-Ref 32/19; NON-GLP). Effects on mortality and growth of the adults after an exposure period of 28 days and the number of offspring after 56 days were determined

No mortality of the adult ear few oring was observed 28 days after application. The change of body weight of the adult earthworms of the test concentration of 9.0 mg a.s./kg dry weight soil was statistically significant reduced in comparison to the control (results of a Dunnett's multiple sequential t-test, twosided, $\alpha \otimes 0.05$).

The number of juveniles per test vessel of the test concentrations 2.5 and 5.0 mg a.s./kg dry weight soil were statistically significant reduced in comparison to the control (results of a Welch t-test after Bonferroni-Holm, one-sided smaller $\alpha = 0.95$).

According to the guideling Significant effects should be observed between 1 and 5 mg a.s./kg dry weight artificial soil. These, the reference test indicated that the test system was sensitive to the reference test item.



III. CONCLUSION

All validity criteria were met. The endpoints were:

NOEC_{mortality}: \geq 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil



| LOEC _{mortality} : | >1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
|----------------------------------|---|
| NOEC growth: | = 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
| LOEC growth: | = 562 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
| NOEC _{reproduction} | r = 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soft |
| LOEC reproduction: | = 562 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
| EC _{10reproduction} : | = 277 mg prod./kg dry weight artificited soil $\sqrt{2}$ |
| EC ₂₀ reproduction: | = 356 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil $\sqrt{2}$ $\sqrt{2}$ $\sqrt{2}$ |
| According to E width of confid | EFSA (2015) the level of protection for the EC_{10} is classified as "high? The normalised lence interval (NW) rating for the EC_{10} is "good?. A |
| Assessment a | nd conclusion by applicant: |
| The study and | its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for usean risk assessment. |
| The endpoint | is: NOEC = 216 mg prod kg dw or 134 mg a.s./kg dws (based on reproduction) |
| CP 10.4.1.2 | Earthworms field studies |
| In view of the on the formula | Cosults presented above, no beld studies were necessary. However, further information from FLU SC 400 is presented in the active substance dessier MCA 8.4.1. |
| | |
| | |



CP 10.4.2 Effects on non-target soil meso- and macrofauna (other than earthworms)

The risk assessment (calculation of TER values) was based on the NOEC values calculated from the studies performed with the product and the metabolites. In case EC₁₀ values were lower than the NC EC and the calculation was reliable they were used for the calculations of TER values.



dws = dry weight soil prod. product

= dry weight soil prod. Froduct $\sqrt{2}$ Endpoint conjected by a factor of 2 due to lipophilic substance (log P_{OW} > 2)

Exopoint exculated on the basis of analysed fluopyram content in the formulation

(42.4 % (w; as surven in study report)

As the dudy was conducted with sodium trifluoroacetate which is the sodium salt of trifluoroacetic acid, the endpoint was converted to trifleroroacetic acid with factor 0.84.



Risk assessment for other non-target soil meso- and macrofauna (other than earthworms)

Important remark by the applicant: The PEC_{soil} and TER values as presented below are interimedalues and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters can be established. The applicant intends to provide final PEC_{soil} values and revised TER calculations latest by end of March 2022.

| Table 10.4.2- 2:TER calculation for other no its metabolites | | - and macrofa | una f o r fluopy | yram and |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Species, study type | En o point [mg/kg] | PE@soil [mg/kg] | TERET | Trigger |
| /ha 🛛 👔 | | | | |
| Folsomia candida | NOFC € 37.8 - | Q. 137 | 240 | 5 |
| Hypoaspis aculeifer | NOEC ≥ 212 | ×0.157 | ¥350 | |
| y Folsomia candide 🧹 | NOFC 281 | 0.002 | 7025 | ° 5 |
| y Hypoaspis activeifer | NOEC ≥ 500 | <u>کَ 20002 کُ</u> | ≥ 125000 ^ | j 5 |
| Folsomia Candida | NOE = 84 | Q ⁷ 0.00 ² | 84000 | 5 |
| Hypogspis activity | \mathbb{N} | | ≥ % 4000 | 5 |
| | TER calculation for other r its metabolites Species, study type /ha Folsomia candida Hypoaspis aculeifer y Folsomia candida y Hypoaspis aculeifer Folsomia candida | Species, study type Endpoint [mg/kg] /ha Folsomia candida NOEC 212 y Folsomia candida NOEC 281 y Folsomia candida NOEC 2500 Folsomia candida NOEC 2500 y Hypoaspis aculeifer NOEC 281 y Hypoaspis aculeifer NOEC 284 Hypoaspis aculeifer NOEC 284 | TER calculation for other non-target soil meso- and macrofanits metabolites Species, study type Endpoint $[mg/kg]$ PEC soil [avg/kg] /ha PEC soil [avg/kg] PEC soil [avg/kg] /ha NOEC \neq 37.8 0.157 PEC soil [avg/kg] /ha NOEC \neq 212 O157 y Folsomia candida NOEC \neq 212 O157 y Folsomia candida NOEC \neq 212 O102 y Folsomia candida NOEC \neq 24 0.002 y Folsomia candida NOEC \neq 24 0.001 y Hypoaspis aculeifer NOEC \neq 84 0.001 | TER calculation for other non-target soil meso- and macrofauna for fluopy its metabolitesSpecies, study typeEndpoint [mg/kg]PEC soil [mg/kg]TER T [mg/kg]/haPEC 37.80.157240/haPEC 37.80.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/haPEC 2120.157240/hypoaspis aculeiferNOEC25000002/haPEC 2840.001284000/hypoaspis aculeiferPEC 28424000 |

For the metabolite fluopyram-7-hydroxy the TEC has been corrected according to an uncertainty factor

All TER values clearly acceed the trigger value of 5 indicating that no unacceptable adverse effects on soil macro-organisms are to be expected from the intended use of FLU SC 500 in apples.



0

CP 10.4.2.1 Species level testing

| Data Point: | KCP 10.4.2.1/01 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2007 |
| Report Title: | AE C656948 SC 500A G: Influence on the reproduction of the collembola specses |
| _ | Folsomia candida tested in artificial soil with 5 % peak |
| Report No: | FRM-COLL-50/07 |
| Document No: | M-288904-01-1 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | ISO 11267 (1999) |
| study: | Equivalent to US EPA OPPT@Guideline Ng \$50.SUPP 0 4 0 |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 22 (2016) |
| test guideline: | Deviation: not applicable |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted of the second seco |
| | in DAR (2011) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLR Officially reconised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes Q Y X X X X Q X O |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated for fullation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first fisting process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.

| Į. | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Data Point: | & CP 1 03.2.1/2 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: O' | Europyram SC 509: Infl@nce or mortatory and @production on the soil mite |
| Ø | species Plypoa pis accelenter tered in artificial soil with 5 % peat |
| Report No. | KRAQHR-340 A A A |
| Document No: | $\underline{M} \underline{\mathcal{D}} \underline{\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{$ |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Recomprendations of the Hypotopis Ring-test group (HASTE), Final Meeting on |
| study: | Janua@15, 2097 in U @echt; \bigcirc |
| Q | Equivalent OUS FRA OPRES Guideline No. 850.SUPP |
| Deviations from current | Corrent Gurdelin OECD 226 (2016) |
| test guideline: | Seviations: no opplicable O |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, galuateriand accepted |
| | In IQAR (2017) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLY/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| fe cilitie et | |
| Tacinities: | |
| Acceptability/Renability | |
| | |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.4.2.1/03 |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2019 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 g/L: Influence on mortality and reproduction of the collembolan species Folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species of the collembolan species folsomia candida tested in artificial solutions of the collembolan species of the collembolan species of the collembolan species of the collembolan species of tested tested in artificial solutions of teste |
| Report No: | E 314 05458-0 |
| Document No: | <u>M-675002-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC |
| study: | Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 👸 |
| | OECD Guideline 232 🕅 🖉 🖉 🖉 🖉 |
| | US EPA OCSPP Not Applicable |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 23 (2016) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: None. All validity criteria were met. 2 |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP (Officially recognised to sing facilities (|
| recognised testing facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | $ Yes \qquad \qquad$ |
| | |

Executive Summary

In a laboratory study the effects of FLUSC 500 on supvival and reproduction of the collembolan species *Folsomia candida* was tested during an exposure of 28 days in artificial soil by comparing control and treatment. Eight test item rates from 18 to 1000 mg product/kg dry weight soil were tested. Per test item rate 4 replicates and for the control group 8 replicates with 10 collembolan seach were exposed to FLU SC 500 mixed into artificial soil. Mortality and reproduction of the collembolans was assessed after 28 days.

The study fulfilled all validity criteria of OECD 232 goldeline.

The mortality of the adult test organisms was statistically significant different in the three highest test item rates (316, 562 and 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight soil) compared to the control. No statistically significant differences in mortality between control up to and including 178 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial coil occurred.

Therefore, the No-Observed-Effect-Concentration (NOEC) for mortality is 178 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. The Dowest-Observed-Effect-Concentration (LOEC) for mortality is 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. The LC and IAC₂₀ values for mortality were calculated to be 240 and 488 mg prod./kg soil dry weight.

Concerning the number of juveniles statistical analysis revealed no significant difference between control up to and including 565 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. At the highest test item rate (1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil) a statistically significant difference in reproduction compared to the control occurred.

Therefore, the No-Observed-Effect-Conceptration (NOEC) for reproduction is 562 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. The Lowest-Observed-Effect-Concentration (LOEC) for reproduction is 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. The E_{10} and EC_{20} values for reproduction were calculated to be 794 and 991mg prod./kg soil dry weight.

I. MATERIALS AND METHODS

<u>Test item</u> FLU SC 500; specification no.: 102000018148; Batch No.: EV57002782; TOX21406-00; analytical findings: 42.4 % w/w fluopyram equivalent to 504.9 g a.s./L; density: 1.191 g/mL (20 °C).

<u>Test design</u>: Ten collembolans (10 - 12 days old) per replicate (8 replicates for the control group and 4 replicates for each treatment group) were exposed to control and treatment. Concentrations of 18, 32,



56, 100, 178, 316, 562 and 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil were mixed into the artificial soil. During the study the collembolans were fed with granulated dry yeast. The artificial soil was prepared according to the guideline with the following constituents (percentage distribution on dry weight basis): 75 % fine quartz sand, 5 % sphagnum peat, air dried and finely ground and 20 % Kaolin clay. Mortality and reproduction were determined after 28 days.

Climatic conditions: The climatic conditions were in the temperature range 20.0 \pm photoperiod of 16 hours light and a light intensity of 400 - 800 lux. Ò,

Statistics: For statistical analysis Fisher's exact Binominal Test (Bonferroni Correction, one-sided greater, $\alpha = 0.05$) was applied to mortality data and William's t-test (sphe-sided smaller, $\alpha \neq 0.05$) was applied to reproduction data. The LLCs values were calculated with Logit analysis and the ECxovalu with 3-param. normal CDF analysis.

a.

Dates of work: September 23, 2019 - October

| | ×, | 0 / |
|-------------|---------|---------------|
| II. RESULTS | AND DIS | WUSSI® |
| | | |

Effects on mortality and reproduction of Folsomic Candida after Geatment with FLU Table 10.4.2.1-1: SC 500

| | ,C | | | ò Ó . | S S S | ž h |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--|------------------|
| Test concentration | Adult Adult | Significance | Mean num | ber of | Reproduction | Significance |
| [mg prod./kg dry | mortality 🎽 🖌 | | juvéniles¢ | er test | [% of control] | (**) |
| weight artificial soil] | [%] > | \approx () $\cdot \circ$ | vessel ± | SD Q | | |
| Control | 2.5° g | | 900. <u>3</u> ± | ₫33.2 % | | |
| 18 | <i></i> @2.5 O″ | | 923.5 ± | √ 105Â | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | - |
| 32 | 5.0 | <u>* - Å</u> | 88 3.8 0 [±] | 1/17.5 | 98.25 | - |
| 56 | 508 V | , D | ≈873.8° ± | @ 4.0 | 9 <u>7</u> 71 | - |
| 100 | £7.5 ° Ó | <u>~</u> ?~~ | 9.54.3 # | ື 46.2 | _{@1} 106.0 | - |
| 178 | 3.3 | - ~ | يُوْ989.0 ک | 186.3 | \$ 109.9 | - |
| 316 | | | ₩ 8 57. ® ± | \$5.4 | 95.3 | - |
| 562 0 | ¥7.5 Ø | 1 + X | 8965 ± | 165.4 | 99.0 | - |
| Č Š Š Š Š Š | 42.5 | °+ | £21.5 ~⊖± | 134.3 | 80.1 | + |
| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | Endpoir | nts 🖓 🗞 | | ۱» ۲» | Mortality | Reproduction |
| NOEC [mg prod/kg pry | weight artificial | sởil/ | Ň. | | 178 | 562 |
| LOEC [mg prod./kg dry | seight antificial | spil] | | | 316 | 1000 |
| LC10/EC10 [mg/prod./kg | dry weight arturi | cial soll , | | | 240 (139 - 341) | 795 (634 - 860) |
| LC ₂₀ / EC ₂₀ [mg prod./kg | dróweightartifi | cialsoil] | | | 488 (344 - 714) | 990 (917 - 1012) |
| | | · 16 6 5 | | | | |

Calculations were done with uprounded values

Not determined n.d.: SD:

Standard deviation Logit analysis; ECx = 3 param a ormal @F analysis LLC

Fisher's exact Binominal Test, with Bonferroni Correction, one-sided greater, $\alpha = 0.05$, "-": non-significant; "+": significant @

"-": non-significant; "+": significant ** William's Pte naller. sa 0.05

Mortali

^{*} the adult *Folsomia candida* died which is below the allowed maximum of In the control % mogality.

Concerning the mortality of the adult test organisms statistical analysis (Fisher's Exact Binominal Test with Bonferroni Correction, one-sided-greater, $\alpha = 0.05$) revealed no significant difference between control up to and including 178 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil.



Therefore, the NOEC for mortality is 178 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. The LOEC for mortality is 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. Q_{μ}°

The LC₁₀ and LC₂₀ values for mortality were calculated to be 240 mg prod./kg soil dry weight 95% confidence limits: 139 - 341) and 488 mg prod./kg soil dry weight (95% confidence limits: 340-714), respectively (Logit analysis).

Reproduction:

Concerning the number of juveniles statistical analysis (William's t-test, one-sided smaller, $\alpha = 0.05$) revealed no significant difference between control up to and including 562 mg /ke dry weight and ficial soil.

Therefore, the NOEC for reproduction is 562 mg prod/kg dry weight artificial soil. The LOEC for reproduction is 1000 mg prod/kg dry weight artificial soil.

The EC₁₀ and EC₂₀ values for reproduction were calculated to be $\sqrt{94}$ mg prod./kg soil dry weight (95% confidence limits: 659 - 777) and 991 mg prod./kg soil dry weight (95% confidence limits: 925 - 1005), respectively (3-param. normal CDF analysis analysis)

Validity criteria:

Validity criteria for the untreated control of the study according DECD 232 from July 29, 2016 were used.

Table 10.4.2.1- 2: Validity criteria

| Validity criteria accesto OECD 232, adopted 2016 | Obtained |
|---|----------|
| Mean adult modelity in control | 2.5 % |
| Mean number of juveniles per replicate (with 10 collembolaris introduced) | 900 |
| Coefficient of variation calculated for the number of 30% 30% juveniles per replicate | 14.8 % |

All validity criteria of the OECD 239 guide ine were fulfmed.

Reference test:

The most recent non-GLP text (LAR-Coll/Ref-26/19) with the reference item Boric acid was performed at test concentrations 44, 67, 100, 150 and 220 mg Boric acid/kg dry weight artificial soil.

The NOEC_{reproduction} was calculated to be 44 ng Boric acid/kg dry weight artificial soil and accordingly the LOEC_{reproduction} is 67 mg Boric acid/kg dry weight artificial soil according Williams t-test, $\alpha = 0.05$, one-sided smaller

Boric and showed an EC_{55} of 137 mg test item/kg dry weight artificial soil (95 % confidence limits from 423 mg to 152 mg Boric acid/kg dry weight artificial soil) for reproduction according Probit analysis using linear maximum likelihood regression. The result is in the recommended range of the guideline (about 100 mg Boric acid/kg artificial soil dry weight).



III. CONCLUSION

| All validity crit | eria were met. The endpoints were: |
|---------------------------------|--|
| NOEC mortality: | 178 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
| LOEC _{mortality} : | 316 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
| LC _{10 mortality} : | 240 (139 - 341) mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
| LC _{20 mortality} : | 488 (344 - 714) mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
| NOECreproduction | 562 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial voil |
| LOEC _{reproduction} : | 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil \sim |
| EC _{10 reproduction} : | 795 (634 - 860) mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil |
| EC ₂₀ reproduction: | 990 (917 - 1012) mg prod./kg dry veight artificia soil |
| According to E width of confid | FSA (2015) the level of protection for the E_{0} is passified as "bigh". The normalised ence interval (NW) rating for the E_{0} is "fair". |
| According to E width of confid | FSA (2015) the level of protection for the ECO is classified as "high". The normalised ence interval (NW) rating for the ECO is "good". |
| | |
| Assessment a | nd conclusion by applicant. |
| The study and | its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment. |
| The endpoint | is NOE Constality 178 mg product/kg dws of 75.5 mg a.s. 1 kg dws |
| | |
| | |
| | |



| Data Point: | KCP 10.4.2.1/04 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2020 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 g/L: Influence on mortality and reproduction of the soil the |
| | species Hypoaspis aculeifer tested in artificial soil |
| Report No: | E 428 05448-5 |
| Document No: | <u>M-678468-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC |
| study: | Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009 🖒 |
| | OECD Guideline 226 (2016) 🕅 |
| | US EPA OCSPP Not Applicable |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 22 \mathcal{G} (2016) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: None. All validate criteria were met. |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | $A \widetilde{\alpha} \alpha$ |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ |
| | |

Executive Summary

In a laboratory study the effect of FLU SC 500 on survival and reproduction of the soil mite species *Hypoaspis aculeifer* was tested during an exposure of 14 days in artificial soil by comparing control and treatment. Eight test item rates from 18 to 1000 mg product/kg dry weight soil were tested. Per test item rate 4 replicates and for the control group 8 replicates with 10 soil mites each were exposed to FLU SC 500 mixed into artificial soil. Morality of the soft mites was assessed after 14 days.

The study fulfilled a validity criteria of CECD 26 guideline

No statistically significant differences in mortality compared to the control occurred. Therefore, the No-Observed-Effect Concentration (NOEC) for mortality is ≥ 1000 mg prod./kg dws. The Lowest-Observed-Effect-Concentration (LOEC) for mortality is ≥ 1000 mg prod./kg dws. Due to the lack of a concentration-response relationship, no A_{Cx} values could be calculated.

The reproduction rate of the sol mites was assessed after 14 days No statistically significant differences compared to the control occurred. Therefore, the No-Observed-Effect-Concentration (NOEC) for reproduction is \geq 1000 mg prod/kg dws. The Lowest-Observed-Effect-Concentration (LOEC) for reproduction is \geq 1000 mg prod/kg dws. Due to the lack of a concentration-response relationship, no EC_x values could be calculated.

I. MATERIALS AND METHODS

<u>Teste frem</u>: FLU SC 500; mecification p. 102000018148; Batch No.: EV57002782; TOX21406-00; analytical findings: 42.4 % w/ycfluopyram equivalent to 504.9 g/L; density: 1.191 g/mL (20 °C).

<u>Test design</u>: Ten adult, fertil zed female *Hypoaspis aculeifer* per replicate (8 replicates for the control group and 4 replicates for each treatment group) were exposed to control and treatments (synchronised culture at an age of 28 days after start of egg laying). Concentrations of 18, 32, 56, 100, 178, 316, 562 and 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil were mixed into the artificial soil. During the test, the *Hypoaspis aculeifer* were fed with nematodes bred on watered oat flakes 3, 7 and 10 days after test start. The artificial soil was prepared according to the guideline with the following constituents (percentage distribution on dry weight basis): 75 % fine quartz sand, 5 % Sphagnum peat, air dried and finely ground 20 % Kaolin clay.

After a period of 14 days, the surviving adults and the living juveniles were extracted by applying a temperature gradient using a MacFadyen-apparatus. Extracted mites were collected in a fixing solution



(20 % ethylene glycol, 80 % deionised water; 2 g detergent/L fixing solution were added). All Hypoaspis aculeifer were counted under a binocular.

<u>Climatic conditions</u>: The climatic conditions were in the temperature range 20.0 ± 2 °C with Ó photoperiod of 16 hours light and a light intensity of 400 - 800 lux.

Statistics: For statistical analysis Fisher's exact Binominal Test (Bonferron Correction, one-stated greater, $\alpha = 0.05$) was applied to mortality data and Williams t-test (one-sided smaller, $\alpha = 0.05$) applied to reproduction data.

Dates of work: October 04, 2019 - October 24, 2019

II. RESUL MĎ DISCUSSIO

Table 10.4.2.1-3: Effects on mortality and reproduction of Hypoaspis aculeffer after treatment will FLU SC 500

| I LO | SC 300 | .4 0 | | O' O' | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|--------------|
| Test concentration [mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil] | Adult mortality [%] | Significance | Mean number of juveniles per test vesser ± SD | Reproduction [% of control] | Significance |
| Control | 2.5 | | ¥313.5℃±~9.8 ¢ | | |
| 18 | 5.0 | Q - Q | 326.5 5 29.70 | O107.3 Č | × - |
| 32 | 5.0 | | 356.3 <u>4</u> 1204 | ^{0°} 11 36 | q – |
| 56 | 12.5 K | | 359,5 ± 4.7 s | 64.7 | - |
| 100 | ू¢7.5 0 [°] | | 349.8 ± 22.4 | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | - |
| 178 | 5.04 | | @74.0 ± 10.9 | 1198 | - |
| 316 | భిక న | | 327 8 ± Q9.9 | 104.5 | - |
| 562 | لم 0.0 D | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | 344.3 22.4 | 109.8 | - |
| 1000 | 7.5 | | °363.3 ⊃± 206 | <u>م</u> 115.9 | - |
| | [×] O Endro | oints & | | Adult mortality | Reproduction |
| NOEC [m | ng prod./k@dry | y weight artificia | al social 🖉 | ≥1000 | ≥1000 |
| LOEC [ŋ | ng prod (hg dry | veight artificia | ksoil] 🖧 🏷 | >1000 | >1000 |
| EC104 | g prod /kg dry | weighQartificial | soil] | - | n.d. |
| EC [m | g prod./kg @ry | weight artificial | soit | - | n.d. |

Calculations were done with uncounded value

n.d.: Not determined

SD: Standard deviation

Correction, one-sided greater, $\alpha = 0.05$, "-": non-significant; "+": with Bonferroni (*) Fisher's exact Binomina significant

(** sîgwificant; "+": significant Williams t-test,

Mortality:

whe adult Hypdaspis aculeifer died which is below the allowed maximum In the control group 25of ≤ 20 % portality,

Concerning the mortality of the adult test organisms statistical analysis (Fisher's Exact Binomial Test with Bonferrow Correction, one-sided greater, $\alpha = 0.05$) revealed no significant difference between control group and any treatment group up to and including 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil.

Therefore the NOEC for mortality is \geq 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. The LOEC for mortal $i \neq i$ is > 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil.



Reproduction:

Concerning the number of juveniles statistical analysis (Williams t-test, one-sided smaller, $\alpha = \Omega$ revealed no significant difference between control group and any treatment group up to and including 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. Therefore, the NOEC for reproduction is ≥ 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. The LOEC for reproduction is > 1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil. Due to the lack of a concentration-response relationship no reliable ECx-calculation is poss Therefore no EC_{10}/EC_{20} -value can be reported. Validity criteria:) 220 from uly 25, Validity criteria for the untreated control of the study according 2016 Were used. All validity criteria of the OECD 226 guideline Table 10.4.2.1- 4: Validity criteria , O O \mathcal{O} Required Validity criteria acc. to OECD 226 (adopted 2016) **Obtained** ₩20 2.5 % Mean adult mortality Ŵ Mean number of juveniles per replicate (with 10 not 313.5 introduced) Coefficient of variation calculated for the number 2.5 % juveniles per replicate

Reference test

The corresponding non-GLP test (LAR-HR-Ref-28/19) with the reference item dimethoate was performed at test concentrations of 1.0, 1.8, 3.2, 96 and 10.0 mg dimethoate/kg dry weight artificial soil.

Dimethoate EC 400 G showed LC_{500} f 3.5 mg a.s./kg for mortality of the adult mites according Logit analysis using maximum likelihood regression (coordinate limits from 3.3 mg a.s./kg to 3.8 mg a.s./kg).

The reproduction of the sol mites was not significantly reduced in comparison to the control up to and including 2.2 mg a.s./kg dry weight artificial soil. Therefore, the NOEC is calculated to be 3.2 mg a.s./kg dry weight artificial soil and accordingly the LOBC is 5.6 mg a.s./kg dry weight artificial soil. Since variances of the data were thomogenous. Williams t-test $\alpha = 0.05$, one-sided smaller was used.

Dimethoate EC 400 G showed an EG60 of 67 mg a.s./kg dry weight artificial soil (95 % confidence limits from 6.5 mg a.s./kg to 00 mg a.s./kg for reproduction according Probit analysis using maximum likelihood repression.

This is in the recommended range of the guideline, indicating that an EC_{50} based on the number of juveniles of 3.0-7.0 mg a.s. kg dry weight artificial soil shows that the test organisms are sufficiently sensitive.

Ŀ,



culation was possible.

III. CONCLUSION

All validity criteria were met. The endpoints were:

NOEC_{adult mortality}: ≥1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil

LOEC_{adult mortality}: >1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil

NOEC_{reproduction}: ≥1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil LOEC_{reproduction}: >1000 mg prod./kg dry weight artificial soil

Due to the lack of a concentration-response relationship no reliable EC

Assessment and conclusion by applicant:

The study and its data are considered a acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment. The endpoint is: NOEC \geq 1000 mg product/kg dws or \geq 424 mg a.s \log dws

CP 10.4.2.2 Higher tier testing

In view of the result presented in Section CP 104.2, no further testing is necessary.

| Š. (| |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Data Point: | KCP 10.4 \$2/01 @ |
| Report Author | |
| Report Year | 2007 9 A X V A |
| Report Title: | AE 655694 SC 500: Effects on schlitter by gradation |
| Report 8: | LROSLD-32/07 C C |
| Document No: | <u>xy=290278-01-10</u> x x A |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Effect of Plani Protection Products on Functional Endpoints in Soil (EPFES, |
| study: | Liskoa 20020 Guidance Document Goerg Roembke et al.; |
| | Equivalent to US @PA QPTS Giffdeline No. 850.SUPP |
| Deviations from current | Current Suide De: not opplica De |
| test guidel | Devisions: por applicable 2 |
| Previou evaluation: | yes evaluated and excepted |
| | JADAR (2011) V |
| GLADIficially | |
| facilities: | |
| Accentability Reliability | |
| A Cooptainty Conditional Start | |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation and the study type is no longer a data requirement in the 6U. However, it is shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process.



CP 10.5 Effects on soil nitrogen transformation

| Table 10.5- 1: | Studies on nitrogen transformation with FLU SC 500, Fluopyram and its metabolites |
|----------------|---|
| | |

| Test substance | Test species, test design | Ecotoxicological endpoint | Reference |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| N-transformation | | | |
| FLU SC 500 | Study duration 28 d | No unacceptable effects at an appl. rate of: 15.88 mg.pod./kg dws 6.73 mga.s./kg dws | 2013 <u>M-674874-014</u> KCP 0.5/05 |
| Fluopyram | Study duration 28 d | No unaccepted le effects at a appl. 3.35 mg a Økg dws rate of: | (2006) Qi-281 G7-01-Q KCA 9.5/01 |
| Fluopyram-7- hydroxy | Study duration 28 d | No unacceptable effects at an appl. 10 mg p m./kg dws rate of: | (2020) M 754927 01-1 C ° KCA 8 703 C |
| Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) | Study duration | ovo unasceptable effects at an appl. rate of: (TEA) A Composer m./kg.dws (Na-TEA) 1.344 mg p.m./kg.dws | (2013) M-04442301-1 KCA 8.5,04 |

dws = dry weight soil, a.s. = active substance; p the = pure metabolite, protect product A s the study was conducted with sodium trifluoreacetate which is the sodium salt of trifluoreacetik acid, the endpoint

was converted to trifluoroacepic acid with factor 0.84

0 Risk assessment for Soil Nitrogen Transformation J.

C.S. **Important remark by the applicant:** The PEC_{sof} values as presented below are interim values and are therefore subject to change until final modelling input parameters, can be established. The applicant intends to provide final REC_{soil} values and a revised risk assessment datest by end of March 2022. 0 Ê,

| able 10.5-2: Risk Assessment for FEU SC 500 for hitrogen transformation | | | | | |
|---|---------|----------------------|---------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Compound | | Spécies of of | Endpoint [mg prod./kg] | PEC _{soil, max} [mg prod./kg] | Refinement required |
| Apples, 1 × 0.15 L p | rod./ha | | | | |
| FLU SC 500 | | Soil micro organisms | 15.88 | 0.083 | No |
| | | | | | |

Å



| Compound | Species | Endpoint [mg/kg] | PEC _{soil, max} [mg/kg] | Refinement |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Apples, 1 × 75 g a.s./ha | | | ð | |
| Fluopyram | Soil micro-organisms | 3.33 | 0.157 0 | No |
| Fluopyram-7-hydroxy | Soil micro-organisms | 10 | 0.002 | |
| Trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) | Soil micro-organisms | 1.344 | 0.001 | No No |
| ^A For the metabolite fluopyra: of two enantiomers. | m-7-hydroxy the assessment co | opclusion relies | s on Asuncertainty fac | or of 2 in consideration of |

| Table 10.5- 3: | Risk Assessment for Fluopyram | and its metabolites for | nitrogen transformation |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| | rusk russessment for ruop jrum | and its metabolites for | me ogen er unstor mution |

¢° According to regulatory requirements, the risk is acceptable if the effect op mitrogen transformation at According to regulatory requirements, the risk is acceptable if the effect of without transformation at the maximum PEC. and values is < 25% after 28 days of no case, diviations from the control exceeded 25% at concentrations which are clearly higher than the PEC. Indicating low risk to soil michor of the control exceeded 25% at concentrations which are clearly higher than the PEC.



Study summaries

| r | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|----------------------------|--|
| Data Point: | KCP 10.5/01 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2007 |
| Report Title: | AE C656948 SC 500A G: Determination of effects on nerogen transformation in |
| _ | soil A OV AV |
| Report No: | LRT-N-82/07 |
| Document No: | M-289207-01-1 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OECD 216; adopted January 21, 2000, OECD Avideline for the Testing of |
| study: | Chemicals, Soil Micro organizatis: Nitrogen Transformation Test; |
| | US EPA OPPTS Guideling No. 850. SUPP 😵 🔗 🔏 🔏 |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: $OECD_2$ 16 (2000) \sim \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} \mathcal{O} |
| test guideline: | Deviation: not applicable of the second seco |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted of so a s |
| | in DAR (2011) |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLY/Officially recognised testing vacilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes O' Y Y J D J J G O |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.

| Data Point: N VKCP 18.5/02 N N N N | |
|--|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: O S 2007 V S S O | |
| Report Title AE C69948 SC 500 C : Deprimination of Stects on carbon transformation in | |
| | |
| Report \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} \mathcal{A} | |
| Document No: $\sqrt{2289389-01-10}$ $\sqrt{2}$ $\sqrt{2}$ | |
| Guideline(s) followed in OECD 17, Adopted Onuary 1, 2000, OECD Guideline for the Testing of | |
| study: Cheericals, foil Micro organisms: Carbon Transformation Test; | ļ |
| USEPAS PTS Quideling No. 890.SUPP | ļ |
| Deviations from current Qurrent Guideline: OEGB 217&2000), | |
| test guideline: Devia ons: no applicable suffe test system is no longer a data requirement in E | U |
| Previous Valuation: yes Qvaluated and Scepted | |
| $in DAR(2011) \neq \sqrt{2}$ | |
| GLR/Officially | |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | ļ |
| Acceptability deliability: Yes 🖉 🦧 | |
| | |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation. Furthermore, this study type is no longer a data requirement in the EU. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process.



| | WOD 10 5/02 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Data Point: | KCP 10.5/03 |
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2019 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 (500 g/L): Effects on the activity of soil microflora (Nitrogen |
| | transformation test) |
| Report No: | 19 48 SMN 0050 |
| Document No: | <u>M-674874-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC |
| study: | Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 (2009) |
| | US EPA OCSPP Not Applicable 🕅 🖉 🖉 🖉 🖉 |
| | OECD 216 (2000) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 24 \mathcal{G} (2000) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: None. All validity criteria were met. |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | $A = \mathcal{O} = O$ |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes $\partial \gamma$ γ ∂' γ ∂' γ γ γ |
| | |

Executive Summary

In a laboratory study the effect of FLO/SC 500 on the activity of sold microflora with regard to nitrogen transformation was tested during as exposure of 28 days in a silty-loamy sand soil by comparing control and treatment. Two test item rates of 1.59 and 15 88 mg product/kg dry weight soik equivalent to 1 and 10 L prod./ha) were tested. Per treatment there were preplicates. The soil was enriched by 0.5 % lucerne meal and a water content of 40 - 50 % of the water holding capacity was maintained during the test.

The study fulfilled at validity criteria of ØECD 216 and elin

Nitrogen transformation was determined after 3 hours, \mathcal{P} , 14 and 28 days. No adverse effects of fluopyram SC 500 on nitrogen transformation in soiD (in terms of Nitrate-N in mg/kg soil dry weight/time interval/day) were observed at both test concentrations at the end of the test (time interval 14 - 28 days after application).

⁷ I. MATEROALS AND METHODS

<u>Test item</u>: FLU SC 500, Specification No? 102000018748, BCS-code: BCS-AR83685; batch no.: EV570027820 Sample description. TOX21406-00; analytical content: 42.4 % w/w (504.9 g/L) fluopyram, density 1.191 g/mL

<u>Test desten</u>: A silty-learny sand soil (DIN 4220) with pH 6.0, 3.68 % C_{org}, and with the water holding capacity of 37.37 g 000 g dry soil was exposed for 28 days to 1.59 mg prod./kg soil dry weight and 15.88 mg prod./kg soil dry weight. Application rates were equivalent to 1 L prod./ha and 10 L prod./ha. For calculation of the test concentrations (mg/kg soil d.w.) a soil depth of 5 cm and a soil bulk density of 1.5 g dry weight/cm⁸ were assumed for conversion of soil volume to soil dry weight. The soil was mixed with 0.5 % (i.e. 1.0 § 200 g soil d @.) lucerne meal. One additional soil sample (without Lucerne meal) was used for determination of the initial NO₃-N-content. The initial NO₃-N-content was 6.55 mg /100 g soll d.w.

The soil of each treatment was tested as a series of 3 replicates. 200 g soil dry weight (= one sub-sample) per test vessel was weighted. The nitrogen transformation was determined in soil enriched with lucerne meal (concentration in soil 0.5 %). NH₄-nitrogen, NO₃- and NO₂-nitrogen were determined by an autoanalyzer at different sampling intervals (0, 7, 14 and 28 days after treatment).

Soil samples (10 g soil d.w. per replicate) were taken at intervals of 3 hours, 7, 14 and 28 days after application and the NH₄-N-, NO₃-N- and NO₂-N-contents were determined.



Climatic conditions: The test vessels were kept in darkness in a climatic room and the temperature ranged between 19.1 -20.5 °C during the test. The water content of the soil ranged between 42.80 -43.85 % of WHC. The pH value of the soil ranged between 6.0 and 6.1.

Statistics: A statistical evaluation of the test results was performed by means of 2-sided Studyu-t-test (for homogeneous variances at 5 % significance level). The statistical analysis was performed with the software ToxRat Professional 3.3.0 (Ratte 2018).

Dates of work: October 10, 2019 - November 07, 2019

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity criteria:

According to OECD guideline 216 (2000), the variation of the nitrate concentrations between control replicates should be less than ± 15 %. In this study, maximum coefficient of variation of 4.9 % was obtained. Therefore, the results of the study are considered valid,

Observations:

Effects on nitrogen transformation / time interval/ day Table 10.5- 4: in sol after treatment with JQ. Q FLU SC 500 Ž

| | | | | | . // | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Time | Control | 1.59 mg prod./kg | soil drŷweight∕∛ 1 L pôod./ha | 1588 mg prod./kg | soil dry weight L prod./ha | |
| [days] | Nitrate ² N ¹ | Nitrate-N | % difference to | Nitrate N | % difference to control | |
| 0-7 | 5.14 💓 0.302 | 550 0.13 | ₹57.0 n s O | 5 46 € 0.37 | +6.2 ^{ns} | |
| 7-14 | | 1.91 ± 0.07 | | $2.42\% \pm 0.48$ | +25.4 ^{ns} | |
| 14-28 | Q.29 9 035 | 0.09 # 0.24 | 3.2 ^{n s} | 1.22 ± 0.03 | -5.2 ^{ns} | |
| | | | | | | |

The calculations were performed with uppounded values system with the provided values in the performed with the provided values in the performed with the performance of the performance 1)

culations were performed with uppounded values a standard deviation Rate, witrate-N in medge soil day weight time interval/day, mean of 3 rephonetes and standard deviation n s

No statistically significant difference is the control (Student-t-text for homogeneous variances, 2-sided, $p \le 0.05$)

O The product FLE SC 500 caused a temporary stimulation of the daily nitrate rate at the tested concentration of 15.88 mg prod./kg dry soil at time interval 7 - 14 days after application.

However, no adverse effects of FLU SQ 500 on nitrogen transformation in soil could be observed at both tested concentrations (1.50 mg prod. and 75.88 mg prod./kg dry soil) at the end of the test, 28 days after application (time interval 4 - 28). Differences from the control of - 23.2 % (test concentration 1.59 mg prod./kg dry soil and 4.2 %/test concentration 15.88 mg prod./kg dry soil) were measured at the end of the 28-day incubation period (time interval 14 - 28).

Reference test

In the most recent test with the toxic standard (conducted from 2019-01-10 to 2019-02-07), Dinoterb caused an effect of +62.7 % and +120.9 % (required ≥ 25 %) on the nitrogen transformation in a field soil at the tested concentrations of 13.60 and 27.20 mg Dinoterb per kg soil dry weight, respectively, 28 days after application (time interval 14 - 28) and thus demonstrates the sensitivity of the test system.


III. CONCLUSION

transformation (expressed as NO₃-N-production) at the end of the 28-day incubation period. The study was performed in a field soil at concentrations up to 15.88 mg prod/kg soiledry weight which FLU SC 500 caused no adverse effects (difference to control < 25 %, OECD 216) on the soil nitragen





CP 10.6 Effects on terrestrial non-target higher plants

For the formulation FLU SC 500 (representative formulation) two single dose studies (testing 1 k and 100 species) and one dose response study (testing 3 species) on terrestrial plant vegetative vigour, as wellows one single dose study (testing 10 species) and two dose response studies (testing 3 species and one species) on terrestrial plant seedling emergence were conducted to determine possible effects on strial plants for terrestrial non-target higher plants.

| FLU SC | 500 | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|
| Test organism | Study type | Endpoint | References 👾 🖑 |
| Beta vulgaris ^d | . ° * | | O L A L.º |
| Brassica napus ^d | | | |
| Cucumis sativus ^d | | | |
| Fagopyrum esculentum ^d | | | |
| <i>Glycine max</i> ^d | Vegetative vigour, | | (2008) |
| Helianthus annuus ^d | Tier 1 (single dose, 🚿 | ER50 250 g a.s./ha | <u>30145-01-1</u> |
| Lycopersicon esculentum ^d | 21 days of of | (an species) | KCP 10.6.2/05 |
| Allium cepa ^m | | | |
| Avena sativa ^m | | | Č O' |
| Lolium perenne ^m | | 0 'Y X | |
| Zea mays m | | | |
| Beta vulgaris " | a ó s | ÇÖX & / | . 63 [°] |
| Brassica napus | | | a Y |
| Cucumis sativus | | N Q | *¥ |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | Vegetative Vigour, | | (2020) |
| Giycine max " | Tier 1, single dose, | $EK_{50} \gg 000 \text{ g ass./na}$ | <u>M-688439-01-1</u> |
| Allium cong mo | 🔍 1 day 🖓 🐇 | (all species) 3 | KCP 10.6.2/06 |
| Autum Cepa 10 × | | R S | |
| I olium peranna ^m | | | |
| Zea mays ^m | | | |
| Fagopyrum esculen@m ^d | Vegetative vigour; 🗸 | | (2020) |
| Allium cepa ^m | Tier 2, doso response, | $HORG_{50} > 500 \text{ g a.s./ha}$ | M-696933-02-1 |
| Avena sativa ^m | 2 days 0 in A | (all species) | KCP 10.6.2/07 |
| | Seedling emergence; | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | (2012) |
| Fagopyrum esculentum d | Tier 2, dose@esponse, | $E \mathbf{R}_{50} > 500 \text{ g a.s./ha}$ | <u>M-428356-01-1</u> |
| | 21 days | K, second s | KCP 10.6.2/03 |
| Beta vulgaris d | | 1 | |
| Brassica napus d | | | |
| Cucumis sativus ^d | | | |
| Fagopyrum esculentum d | Seedling@mergence | | (2020) |
| Glycine max ^a | Tier & single dose | $ER_{50} > 500 \text{ g a.s./ha}$ | M-688440-01-1 |
| Helianthus a juus 🖓 | 21 davs | (all species) | KCP 10.6.2/08 |
| Allium cepa ^m S | | | |
| Avena sattiva in jy | Ő | | |
| Lolium perenne | | | |
| Lea mays | C 11 ¹ 11 | | (2020) |
| Allium of m | Seedling emergence; | ER ₅₀ > 500 g a.s./ha | (2020) |
| Autum cepa | Ther 2 , dose response, | (all species) | <u>IVI-090951-01-1</u> VCD 10 6 2/00 |
| Louumperenne | 21 days | | KUP 10.0.2/09 |

| Table 10.6- 1: | Effect values relevant for the | risk assessment | for non- | -target | terrestr | ial phants |
|----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------|---------|----------|------------|
| | FLU SC 500 | A | Q. | Ô | A | L (|

m: monocotyledonous; d: dicotyledonous



Risk assessment for Terrestrial Non-Target Higher Plants

The risk assessment is based on the Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology (SANCO/10329/2002 rev. 2 final, 2002). It is restricted to off-field situations, as non-target plants are defined as non-crop plants located outside the treated area. Thus, effects on fon-target plants are of concern in the off-field environment, where non-target plants may be exposed to spray drift,

As it is demonstrated by the available set of studies that the single application rate of 5 g a s./ha not result in effects > 50 % according to the "Guidance Document on Terrestral Ecotoxicology' (SANCO/10329/2002 rev. 2 final, 2002), no risk for non-target terrestrial plants is expected. The limit test rate is higher than the highest field application rate and is thus considered as undicator for an acceptable risk.

A detailed deterministic risk assessment is addition

Deterministic risk assessment

Deterministic assessment of the risk for non-target plants due to the use of FLU Table 10.6-2: SC 500 in apple R m Õ Q.

| | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | \sim | "O | <u>ay</u> . U | a ^v |
|-----------------------|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Intended use | s an | Apple, 1 75 g a | €,/ha, BBCH 7K | 89 2 2 | ò |
| product | `~~_∆ | FLU SØ 500 | | | 5 7 |
| Application rate (g a | a.s.tha) 🔗 | 1 × 75 | | | |
| Test species | | FR50 2 ~ | Drift gate | PER off-field | TER |
| Ő | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | '(g a.s./ha) | | (gʻa.s./ha) | criterion: TER \geq 5* |
| All species | | >500 | 215.73 Ö | 11,80 | >42.4 |
| -seedling | ی ا | 9 A 67 | ° | Ĩ | |
| emergence | <u> </u> | ,, | S 3 | Y | |
| All species | | ≈590 ~ ```` | 15.73 | 11.8 | >42.4 |
| -vegetative | | | Ô s. | | |
| vigour 🖉 | A | | | | |

PER: Predicted@nvironmental tate; TER: toxiCity to exposure vatio. TER values shown in bold fall below the relevant trigger.

* TER > 5 Før deterministic ri

Conclusion:

From the information presented above it is concluded that the use of FLU SC 500 will not produce unacceptable effects on terrestial pon-targer plants growing near treated fields. No mitigation measures are necessary for the intended use rates



CP 10.6.1 Summary of screening data

Studies were not necessary since guideline GLP studies for terrestrial non-target plants are available (see Point 10.6.2 in this MCP Summary).

| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.1/01 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Evaluation of the pre-emergence (PPI) biological activity of the C656948 SQ 00 |
| Report No: | PPI-07002 |
| Document No: | <u>M-297136-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Equivalent to US EPA OPTS Guideling No. 850.SUPP |
| study: | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: no applicable a a a a |
| test guideline: | Deviations: not applicable V Q |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted a gradient of a |
| | in DAR (201) |
| GLP/Officially | No, not connected and ler GD/Officially recognise testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes a st a st a b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b |
| | |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation. It is only shown for pansparency reasons since it was part of the first fisting process New data has been generated with the representative





| CP 10.6.2 | Testing on non-target plants |
|-----------|------------------------------|
| CI 10.0.2 | resting on non-target plants |

| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.2/01 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2007 |
| Report Title: | AE C656948 SC 500A G - Effect on the vegetative vigour of ten species of non- |
| * | target terrestrial plants (Tier 1) |
| Report No: | VV07/038 |
| Document No: | M-295544-01-1 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | US EPA 123-1, described by Horst and Ellwarder (1982) and SECD 27 (July |
| study: | 2006, adopted); Equivalent to S EPA OPP & Guideline No 850.4190 |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not apptoable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepted of the second seco |
| | in DAR (2011) O O A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP Officiony reconised testing facilitien |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes Q (Y X X X X Q X O |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated for fullation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first fisting process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.

| Data Point: | KCP40.6.2/02 ~ 37 5 6 59 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title? | AE C656948 to 500 G effect on soldling Onergence and seedling growth test of |
| | ten vecies & non-target te vestrial plants (Fier 1 and 2) |
| Report No: | SS\$7/037, S ~ ~ |
| Document No: | <u>M-295406-01</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | US FEA 123 Y, described by Horst Od Ellwanger (1982) and OECD 208 (July |
| study: | 2060, adopted); Equivalent to US PA OPPTS Guideline No. 850.4100 |
| Deviations from curron | Girrent Oxideline: not inplicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous valuation: | yes, aluat and accepted accepted and accepted and accepted accep |
| | in DAR (2011) |
| GLP Officially | Ass, conducted and er (1)/P/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability? | |
| | |
| | |

The study above was performed with an outdated formulation. It is only shown for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing process. New data has been generated with the representative formulation for the active substance renewal process, which is presented in this section further below.



| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.2/03 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2012 |
| Report Title: | FLUOPYRAM SC 500B G - Effects on the seedling emergence and growth of one |
| | species of non-target terrestrial plants (Tier 2) |
| Report No: | SE12/006 |
| Document No: | <u>M-428356-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OPPTS 850.4225, US EPA Ecological Effect Test Guideline, April 996 |
| study: | Seedling emergence, Tier II and 🕜 |
| | OECD 208 Guidelines for the testing of chemicas, Terrestrial Point Top Seedling |
| | Emergence and Seedling Growth Test |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 24 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: Temporary deviation from climate coolition (right). The range of light |
| | intensity was not reported However, natural day ight was supplemented by |
| | artificial lighting, when light igensities was \$15000 Jux (referring to day light |
| | spectrum 15000 lux @sult in @45 uppel/s/m2 Devidion from recommended plant |
| | density. All validity critering were get. The deviation listed above ad no grifuence |
| | on the reliability of the stordy and endpoints. |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated accepted a second accepted a se |
| | in Addendur Q2 to the DAR 2012 y 2 C |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLR/Offickully recognised vesting Dicilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability | $Yes v \sim v $ |

Executive Summary

The objective of this specific study was to evaluate the potential effects of FLUSC 500 on the seedling emergence and growth of non-target terrestrial plant *Fagopyrum escutentum* (buckwheat), following a pre-emergence application of the product to the soil surface Planting density included 5 seeds per pot, with 8 replicate pats, respectively, for a total of 40 seeds per freatment level. The sown seeds of the plant species were treated with 5 application rates and a water control. The application rates were: 31.3; 62.5; 125; 250 and 500 g a.s./ha. The application was done at a volume rate of 100 L/ha. Assessments were made 7, 14 and 21 days after application against the deionised water treated controls. On day 0, 7 and 14, only plant emergence, surfival and phytotoxicity were recorded. The study was terminated 21 days after application. Final assessments were made for emergence, plant survival, visual phytotoxicity, plant growth stage, shootlength and shoot dry weight.

The study fulfils all variety cuteria of OECD 208 guideline.

No visual phytotoxicity is none of the deatment groups were observed on day 21 in this study. The NOER and LOER values (based on emergence, survival, shoot height and shoot dry weight) were determined to be 500 g a.s./ha and > 500 g a.s./ha respectively. The ER₅₀ value (based on emergence, survival, shoot height and shoot dry weight) was > 500 g a.s./ha.

MADERIAL AND METHODS

<u>Test item</u>: JCU \$7500 Specification fo.: 102000018148 - 01; batch ID.: 2010-008479, Sample description FAR0155400; active substance (analysed content): fluopyram: 42.2 % w/w (502.4 g/L); density 7.191 s/mL).

<u>Test design</u>: *Gagopprum esculentum* (buckwheat) was tested in this seedling emergence and growth test. The germination rate of the seeds used in this study, observed in an annual germination tests, was \geq 70 %. The seeds were sown one day prior to application of the product to the soil surface in 10.5 cm plastic pots. The used soil was a sandy-silt loam with washed sand.

Planting density included 5 seeds per pot, with 8 replicate pots, respectively, for a total of 40 seeds per



treatment level. The sown seeds of the plant species were treated with 5 application rates and a water control. The application rates were: 31.3; 62.5; 125; 250 and 500 g a.s./ha. The test solutions were applied at a volume rate of 100 L/ha. Control pots were sprayed with 100 L/ha of deionized water

Assessments were made 7, 14 and 21 days after application against the deionised water treated controls. On day 0, 7 and 14, only plant emergence, survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. The study was terminated 21 days after application. Final assessments were made for emergence, plant survival, visual phytotoxicity, plant growth stage, shoot length and shoot dry weight. Phytotoxicity, @g. chorosis, necrosis, bleaching, wilting, leaf deformation, stunting) was recorded from the living plant, at each assessment time following a 0 - 90 % rating system in 10% steps. Any plant considered as being dead was not rated for visual phytotoxicity and removed from the pot.

<u>Climatic conditions</u>: Following application, the ports with plants were maintained under greenhouse conditions with natural daylight supplemented by artificial lighting. The temperature was regulated to maintain 10 to 31 °C during the light cycle (16ch) and during the dark cycle (8 h). The relative humidity was regulated to maintain 70 ± 30 %.

Statistical analysis of data was performed to obtain NOFR, LOER, KR/ER, Sand LR/ER, Svalue for emergence, survival, shoot length and shoot dry weight, using ToxRat statistical software

Dates of work: February 15, 2012 - March \$4, 20

Validity criteria:

The validity criteria of QECD 208 were fulf Ded.

The seedling emergence of control plants was $\geq 30\%$ (actually 92.5%). The mean survival of emerged control seedlings was $\geq 90\%$ (actually 400%) 21 days after at least 50 % genergence in the control.

DISCUSSIO

There was no youal phytotoxicity of control seedlings and control plants exhibited normal growth. The environmental conditions during the test time were kept identical. The pots used for this study were filled in equal manner with the same soft.

Analytical results:

The analysis of fluopyram in the solution of the highest tested application rate (500 g a.s./L) revealed measured concentrations of 09.4 % of normal concentration.

O

Biological findings:

No visual phytotoxieity increase of the treatment groups were observed on day 21 in this study.

| | | 1. | | | · |
|-------------------------|---------|---------------|--------------|-----------|-----|
| | Phytote | oxicity summa | ry [mean dam | age in %] | |
| Plant species 🔬 🔣 | | [g a | .s./ha] | | |
| Control | 31.3 | 62.5 | 125 | 250 | 500 |
| Fagopyrufi esculentum 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ((n | | | | | |

Table 10.6.2 : Effects on phytotoxicity of Fagopyrum esculentum at the final assessment on day 21



| Table 10.6.2- 2: | Effects on growth stages (BBCH) of Fagopyrum esculentum at the final assessm | ient on |
|------------------|--|---------|
| | day 21 | 0 |

| Plant species | G | rowth stage (| BBCH) Min - | Max at test it | em rates [g a. | s./ha] |
|----------------------|---------|---------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| | Control | 31.3 | 62.5 | 125 | ∂ 250 | 500 |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | 51 - 55 | 51 - 55 | 51 - 55 | 51 - 55 | \$51 - 55 | 51 - 55 |
| | | | | | <u>.</u> | A SY O |

The NOER, LOER, LR₂₅/ER₂₅ and LR₅₀/ER₅₀ for survival emergence, shoot length and shoot expressed in g a.s./ha for Fagopyrum esculentum are summarised jo the following table for assessment (on day 21 after application).

| Table 10.6.2- 3: | Effects of FLU SC 500 | on say | , vival@m | ergénce | , shoot | height | andsho | ot dry | weight | of |
|------------------|-----------------------|--------|--------------|---------|-------------|--------|-------------|------------------|--------|----|
| | Fagopyrum esculentum | .4 | K) | | <i>.</i> 07 | õ | <i>"U</i> " | Ő ^y . | - F | Å |

| | <u></u> | | V A AV | |
|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Endpoints | Survival | Emergence | Shoot length | Shoot dry weight |
| LR50 / ER50 | > 500 0 % | \$\$500 A | ∞ >300 ^ S | > 500 A |
| [g a.s./ha] | (n,4) | (n.d.) | Qn.d.) | (1.d.) |
| LR ₂₅ / ER ₂₅ (95 % C.I.) | > 500 B | $\langle 2 \rangle > 500^{\circ} \Lambda$ | ر > 500 م | ¥ 500 ^A |
| [g a.s./ha] | "(fn.d.)» | (2):d.) | Q (n.d.) | (n.d.) |
| LOER | Sola B | الم <u>م</u> | × × 500 Å | > 500 |
| [g a.s./ha] | | | | \$ 2 300 |
| NOER | ^δ γ * 00 Β | | 560 ~ | 500 |
| [g a.s./ha] 🔬 | | | \$ 300 S | 500 |
| A Calculated values | a autoria tha shadaa taata | d or not datamain d | \bigcirc \searrow \checkmark | |

в

No computations performed due to no effects observed

Her. Conclusion

In this seedling emergence and growth study, FLU SC 300 was tested under greenhouse conditions for the effects on the seedling emergence survival, growth and should dry weight of the single species Fagopyrum esculentum, following a pre-emergence application of the product to the soil surface. No adverse effects on emergence, post-emergence, mortality, shoot height and shoot dry weight occurred. Therefore the ER based on energence, surveral, shoot height and shoot dry weight) was determined to be > 500 g a.s./ha.

Assessment and conclusion by applicant

Ô





| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.2/04 |
|--|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2012 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram - Peer review of new active substance - Request for additional |
| | information - Ecotoxicology - EFSA Letter Ref D(2012) Ho/JS/al/6200276, dated |
| | January 24, 2012 |
| Report No: | <u>M-428668-01-1</u> |
| Document No: | M-428668-01-1 |
| Guideline(s) followed in | Data Directive 91/414/EEC |
| study: | Bee Studies, not yet Peer Reviewed |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: not applicable |
| test guideline: | |
| Previous evaluation: | yes, evaluated and accepter v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v |
| CLD/Officially | |
| GLP/Officially | not applicable & Q & X & Q & Y |
| fecognised testing | |
| Tacilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | |
| | |
| | |
| The document above wa | s only included for transparency reasons since it was part of the first listing |
| process. It does not conta | in information relevant for the current active substance refewal process. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| < 1 | |
| A. 6 | |
| , and the second s | |
| Į, | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| ~Q ~ | |
| | |
| , Ż | |
| | |
| | |
| A | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| <i>v</i> (| |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| N 67 A | |
| ST & B | |
| | |
| ^م م | |
| \lor | |
| | |
| | |
| | |



| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.2/05 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2008 |
| Report Title: | Non-target terrestrial plants: an evaluation of the effects of Fluopyram SC500G in |
| - | the vegetative vigour test (Tier 1) |
| Report No: | VV08/01 |
| Document No: | <u>M-301453-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | OECD 227 (July 2006): vegetative vigour test (Tier (1) |
| study: | |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 227 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: Temporary deviation from climate@ondition (temperature during@ight 0 |
| _ | period) Light intensity and furmidity was not reported. Deviation from |
| | recommended plant density |
| | All validity criteria were pet but the germination rate of the seeds used in this |
| | study was not reported. However, as routine germination test were carried out on |
| | the seeds to ensure their viability, the germination rate can be considered to be in |
| | the acceptable range. |
| | The deviations listed above had no influence on the reliability of the study and |
| | endpoints. \mathcal{O} |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not prevously submitted a way of a start of the submitted and |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | No, not Onducted under GLP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes & O & Y & Y |
| • | |
| | |

Executive Summary

Executive Summary The objective of the study was to valuate the potential effect of FLU SC 500 on the vegetative vigour of eleven non-target terrestrial plant species in a limit test following a post-emergence application of the product onto the forage of plants at the 2 - 4 leaf stage. A total of eleven species, 7 dicotyledonous and 4 monocotyledopous species from 9 plant families were tested in this vegetative vigour test: Beta vulgaris (sugar beet), Brassica napus (Mseed) ape winter), Gucumis sativus (cucumber), Glycine max (soybeand, Helianthus annuus (sunflower), Lycopersicon esculation (tomato), Allium cepa (onion), Avena sativa (oat), Louium perenne (ryegross), Zea mays (corn), Fagopyrum esculentum (buckwheat). Planting density included 4 plants per per with & replicate pots, respectively, for a total of 32 plants per treatment level. The plant species were treated at the single application rate of 500 mL prod./ha (equivalent to pomina 5250 g. s./ha) and a vater on trol The application was done at a volume rate of 100 L/ha. Assessments were made 7, 14 and 21 days after application. On day 7 and 14, only plant survival and visual phytotoxicit. Were for orded. Final assessments were made for plant survival, visual phytotox fity, plant growth store and shoot dry weight.

The study fulfils all validity criteria of OECD 227 guideline. However, germination rate of the seeds used in this study was no reported. As routine germination tests were carried out on the seeds to ensure their viability, the germination rate was considered to be in the acceptable range.

There were no adverse effects of the single treatment at 500 mL prod./ha on the survival and dry weight of the 11 species tested and no visible phytotoxicity was observed in any of the treated crops. Therefore the ER₅₀ (based on survival and shoot dry weight) was 500 mL prod./ha (corresponding to 250 g a.s./ha).



I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

Test item: FLU SC 500, specification no.: 102000018148; batch ID.: 2007-011657, Sample description: TOX 08109-00; active substance (analysed content): fluopyram: 42.2 % w/w (501 g/L); density: 7.188 g/mL)

<u>Test design</u>: A total of eleven species, 7 dicotyledonous and 4 monocotyledonous species from 9 plant families were tested in this vegetative vigour test: *Beta vulgaris* (sugar beat), *Brassica rapus* (obseed rape winter), *Cucumis sativus* (cucumber), *Glycine max* (soybean), *Heliunthus annins* (supflower), *Lycopersicon esculentum* (tomato), *Allium cepa* (onion), *Bena sativa* (oat), *Lolium perenne* (vyegrass), *Zea mays* (corn), *Fagopyrum esculentum* (buckwheat). The plant species used in this study are representative of a wide range of plant families and were chosen because they are readily cultivated test organisms and widely used in research. Routine gertifination tests were carried of yon the seeds to ensure their viability. The plants were grown in a greenhouse in commercial 10.5 and 13 cm plastic pots. The used soil was a sandy-silt loam.

Planting density included 4 plants per pot with 8 replicate pots, respectively, for a total of 32 plants per treatment level. The plant species were treated at the 2-4 leaf stage at an single application rate of 500 mL product/ha (corresponding to 250 g a.s./ha) and a water control. The test solutions were applied onto the foliage of plants and above-product portions at a volume rate of 100 L ha. Control pots were sprayed with 100 L/ha of deionized water.

Assessments were made 7, 14 and 21 days after application. On day 7 and 04, only plant survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for plant survival, visual phytotoxicity, plant growth stage and shoot dry weight. Phytotoxicity were assessed using a qualitative rating: 0 (no effect), A-E rating (slight effect to moribund). Any plant considered as being dead was not fated for symptoms of phytotoxicity and removed from the pot.

<u>Climatic conditions</u>: Following application, the pots with plane were maintained under greenhouse conditions and natural daylight was supplemented by artificial lighting. Light intensity was not reported. The temperature was 1000 31 °C during the light cycle (10 h) and during the dark cycle (8 h). The relative humidity was not reported.

Statistical analysis was carfied out for sugar beel oat and ryegrass using the Pair wise Mann-Whitney-U-test (one sided smaller), using the Torrat statistical software.

Dates a work: Januar 18, 2008 - February 13, 2008

RESPECTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity criteria:

The validity criteria of ØECD 227 were fulfilled.

All plant species in this study met the validity criterion of at least 90 % for survival in the control. In accordance with OECD gaideline (OECD 227), there was no visible phytotoxicity in control plants. Normal growth occurred in the controls of the eleven species tested. The control plants of each species showed normal variation in growth plant development and morphology. The environmental conditions during the test time were thept identical within each species. The pots used for all species of this study were filled in equal manner with the same soil.

The get interval of the seeds used in this study was not reported. However, as routine germination tests were carried out on the seeds to ensure their viability, the germination rate was considered to be in the acceptable range.

Ů



Analytical results:

No chemical analysis of the initial test item stock solution was performed.

Biological findings:

No visual phytotoxicity was observed at the final assessment (on day 24 after application) in this vegetative vigour study for the control and the treatments.

There was no adverse effect of the treatment at 500 mL prod./ha on the survival and dry worth of the 11 species tested.

11 species tested. The survival, shoot dry weight, phytotoxicity and plant growth stages are sumparized for each of the plant species in the following tables for the final assessment (on day 2) after application).

| | | | Surviv | al 🗸 🖉 | , , | Shoot dry weight | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | Co | ntrol | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | 00 mLpro | d./hea | Contcol | 500 ma | Prod./ha |
| Plant species | No. plants | % Q Survival | No. plants | % Sprvival | % Inhibution | Mean dry weight () (g) | Mean dry weight Agl & | ریپ % Inhibition ^A |
| Beta vulgaris | 32 | ×700 | [™] 32 ຼ ୍ | 100 | ~~ | ^v 1.9004 | 🔊 1.729 🔘 | 9.2 |
| Brassica napus | 32 | 100 | 32 | \$90 | @ 0 ·» | <u>~</u> 2,883 ≥ | 2.975 | - 3.2 |
| Cucumis sativus | 32 🔊 | 100 | Ø2 | \$100 L | , p, ` | ×2.205, Ş | 2 186 | 0.9 |
| F. esculentum | 32 | 10 0 | õn 32 (| 100 |) OV & | 2.842 | ð 744 | 3.4 |
| Glycine max | Ĩ. | @100 🖄 | š 32 ₀ . | 1.00 | | 2,705 | 2.564 | 5.2 |
| Helianthus annuus | £32 " | 100 | -3C2 | 100 | \$ 0 ₀₁ | 2.838 | 2.626 | 7.5 |
| L. esculentum | ³ 2 ⊙ ² | 1,09 | ×312 | $\gg 100$ | <u>Ø</u> | 1.898 | 1.866 | 1.7 |
| Allium cepa | 32 [\] | 100 \$ | 🖌 32 🍙 | 100 | | 0.066 | 0.071 | - 7.6 |
| Avena sativor | \$ 32 | ,0 ₁₀₀ C | 32 | 190 | 0 0 | 0-924 | 0.848 | 8.2 |
| Lolium perenne | °° 32 ° | 1005 | 32 | 3100 a | | \$0.337 | 0.309 | 8.1 |
| Zea mays | 32 | 100 | 32 | ¹⁰⁰ 100 | | 2.628 | 3.029 | - 15.3 |

Table 10.6.2-4: Effects of Fluopyram SC 500 of Survival and shoot dry weight

A Negative figures indicate that here was an increase in Nomass (dry weight) when compared to the untreated control.

Please note: Phytotoxicity was assessed using a qualitative rating: 0 (no effect), A-E rating (slight effect to moribund) @ontrop and reated clants how of no symptoms of phytotoxicity. Results from the phytotoxicity assessment are presented in the table below.

0





Summary of phytotoxicity and growth stages (BBCH) following exposure to FLU Table 10.6.2- 5: SC 500 at the final assessment on day 21

| | | - | | | . 🏷 | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--------------|--|--|
| Plant spacios | Phyto | otoxicity ^A | BBCH | growth stages 🔍 🖉 | -S | | |
| I fait species | Control | 500 mL prod./ha | Control | 🔊 500 mL prod⊘ha | 102 | | |
| Beta vulgaris | 0 | 0 | 16 - 18 🦼 | 16 - 18 | | | |
| Brassica napus | 0 | 0 | 16 - 18 🖉 | 16 - 18 🔊 | | | |
| Cucumis sativus | 0 | 0 | 63 - 65 | 62 65 | , Ôg | | |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | 0 | 0 | 61 | ×61 × | \mathbb{Q} | | |
| Glycine max | 0 | | 69) ⁹ | 69 0 | `_© | | |
| Helianthus annuus | 0 | 0 | 2 4 ♀ 26 | 24,26 | , ° | | |
| Lycopersicon esculentun | <i>ı</i> 0 | A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A | <u>4</u> 51 - 60 | <u>``</u> 490 <u>`</u> | | | |
| Allium cepa | 0 | | ≈12 - &4° | s 212 - 14 x | 0 | | |
| Avena sativa | 0 | | ⊳2¥°` ~` | <u>1</u> 21 - 2 | | | |
| Lolium perenne | 0 | | 26 - 27 P | <u></u> 26-27 v | | | |
| Zea mays | 0 | Ŭ, Ŭ | 15 - 16 | 15 - 16 | 0 | | |
| A Phytotoxicity: 0: no p | hytotoxicity or effect | | | | | | |
| | × | | | | | | |
| D1 | | | | | | | |
| Phytotoxicity was record | led at each assessn | nem nime with the r | Showing a rating | system: | | | |
| 0. no injury or effect | | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | , Q | | | |
| A: slight symptom (s | | | | | | | |
| B: moderate sympton | n (s) | | | sõ u | | | |
| C: severe symptom (s | s) 🚓 🖓 | | | O Y | | | |
| D: total-plant sympto | m (ŝ) 🦕 🧃 | | ~~~ Q | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | |
| E: moribund | , là 0, ^s à | | | ×.? | | | |
| Codes for visual injuries | Codes for visual injuries. A Q Q Q Q Q Q Q Q | | | | | | |
| chlorosis (yellowing of green shoot tissue) $\mathcal{O} \sim \mathcal{O} \sim \mathcal{O}$ | | | | | | | |
| b: necrosis (brown sl | necrosis (brown shoot tissue) | | | | | | |
| c: bleaching (shoot t | bleaching (shoot tissue without promentation) ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | | | | |
| wilting (loss of turgor of shoot tissue) γ γ γ γ | | | | | | | |
| e leaf deformations | leaf deformation (leaf our laborma (leaf shape) | | | | | | |
| | stunting (nlantheight reduced with shorter inter-mode lengths) | | | | | | |

- 0: no injury or effect
- A: slight symptom (s)
- B: moderate symptom (s)
- C: severe symptom (s)
- D: total-plant symptom (s
- E: moribund

S

- s for visual injuries: chlorosis (yellowing of green stoot tissue) necrosis (brown shoot tissue) bleaching (stoot tissue without pigmentation) Codes for visual injuries: a:
- b:
- c:
- wilting (loss of turgor of shoot tissue) d:
- leaf deformation (leaf ourl, alo ormal leaf shape) e:
- stunting (plantheight reduced with shorter inter pode lengths) f :

As a result of this vegetative vigour study in which the effect of FLU SC 500 on 11 non-target terrestrial plant species was tested under greenhouse conditions, no adverse effects of the single treatment at 500 mL prod./ha on the survival and dry weigh of the I species were determined compared to the control. Therefore the ER₅₀ (based on sprvival and dry weight) was determined to be > 500 mL prod./ha (corresponding to 250 g a.s./ha)

HI. CONCLUSION

Assessment and conclusion by applicant:

The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment.

a.s./ha~



| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.2/06 |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 g/L: Effects on the vegetative vigour of ten non-target |
| | terrestrial plant species under greenhouse conditions (Tier D |
| Report No: | S19-22934 |
| Document No: | <u>M-688439-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC |
| study: | Regulation (EC) no. 1107/2009 |
| | US EPA OCSPP 850.4150 (2012) |
| | OECD 227 (2006) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD $22^{\text{W}}(2006)$ |
| test guideline: | Deviations: Temporary deviation from climate condition (right). All validity |
| | criteria were met. The declations listed above had no influence on the rehability of |
| | the study and endpoints, 6° 5° 5° 5° 5° 5° |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted by a by |
| CI D/Officially | Van aandusted Series CON/Office II. A agenie of testing Facilities |
| olle/Officially | 1 es, conducied mader OLA / Otderany recognised testing facilities |
| facilities: | |
| A cooptability/Peliability: | |
| Acceptaoliny/Kellability. | |
| | |
| | |

Executive Summary

The objective of this study was to evaluate the potential effects of FLO/SC 500 on the vegetative vigour of ten non-target terrestrial plant species in a timit test, following a post-emergence application of the product onto the foliage of plants at the 2 - Pleaf tage. A total of ten species, 6 dicotyledonous and 4 monocotyledonous species from 8 plant families were tested in this vegetative vigour test: *Beta vulgaris* (sugar beet), *Brassica napus* (oilseed rape winter), *Cucamis settvus* (cucumber), *Fagopyrum esculentum* (buckwheat), *Glycine max* (soybean), *Helianthus annuus* (sufflower), *Allum cepa* (onion), *Avena sativa* (oat), *Lolium perenne* (fyegrass), *Zea maxs* (corr), Planting density included 2 or 4 plants per pot with 10 or 5 replicate pots, respectively, for a total of 20 plants per treatment level. The plant species were treated with a single application was done at a volume rate of 200 L(na. Assessments were made 7, 14 and 21 days after application. On day Land 14, only plant survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for plant survival, phytotoxicity, plant growth stage and shoot dry weight.

The study fulfils all validity opteria OFOECD 227 guideline.

Symptoms of phytotoxicity (mean effect of 14% compared to the control) only occurred in *Fagopyrum* esculentum. There were no advesse effects of the single treatment at 500 mL prod./ha on survival, shoot height and shoot dry weight above the 50% effect level. Therefore the ER_{50} (based on survival, shoot height and shoot dry weight) was $\gtrsim 0.995$ product/ha (corresponding to > 500 g a.s./ha).

9. MATERIAL AND METHODS

<u>Test item</u>: JEU SC 500; pecification 6.: 102000018148; supplier batch no.: EV57002782; Sample description. TO 21459 00; active substance (analysed content): fluopyram: 42.3 % w/w (502.7 g/L); density 1.189 mL)

<u>Test resign</u> A total of ter species, 6 dicotyledonous and 4 monocotyledonous species from 8 plant families were tested in this vegetative vigour test: *Beta vulgaris* (sugar beet), *Brassica napus* (oilseed rape winter), *Cucumis sativus* (cucumber), *Fagopyrum esculentum* (buckwheat), *Glycine max* (soybean), *Helianthus annuus* (sunflower), *Allium cepa* (onion), *Avena sativa* (oat), *Lolium perenne* (ryegrass), *Zea mays* (corn). The plant species used in this study are representative of a wide range of



plant families and were chosen because they are readily cultivated test organisms and widely used in research. The germination rates of the seeds used in this study, observed in a seedling emergence test, were 87 - 99 %. The plants were grown in a greenhouse in commercial non porous 15 cm plastic pots (filled with approx. 1.5 kg soil/pot). The used soil was a loamy sand.

Planting density included 2 or 4 plants per pot with 10 or 5 replicate pots, respectively, for a lotal of 20 plants per treatment level. The plant species were treated at the 2 - 3 leaf stage with a single application rate of 0.995 L product/ha (equivalent to nominal 500 g a.s./ha) and a water control. The test solution was applied onto the middle of plant height at a volume rate of 200 L/ha. Control pots were sprayed with 200 L/ha of deionized water.

After application, the pots with plants were transferred back to the greenhouse and placed on the ables An independent set of LED lamps above each cultivation table ensured an appropriate exposure to light. The light intensity was in the range of 240 - 330 pmol/m²/s. The pots were set up sorted per treatment group after application. All pots were repositioned on the first and second assessment day to compensate for potential variability in growth conditions.

Assessments were made 7, 14 and 21 days after application. On day A and 14, only plant survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for plant survival phytotoxicity plant growth stage and shoot dry weight. Phototoxicity was recorded from the living plants at each assessment time following a 0 - 90 % rating system in 10 % stops, to describe the extent of the visual symptoms in comparison to the control, taking to account pecrosis, deformation and change in colour, Any plant considered as being dead was not rated for visual phytotoxicity and removed from the pot.

Analysis of the product solution and the control solution were conducted by I_{4} – UV

Climatic conditions: Following application, the pots with plants were maintained under greenhouse conditions. The temperature was 15 to 27 °C furing the light cycle (16 h) and doring the dark cycle (8 h). The relative humidity was 34 to 88 %. O \cap

Statistics As no morality occurred, no statistical evaluation as performed for this endpoint. The data of shoot height and shoot dry weight were tested for normal distribution and homoscedasticity using Shapiro-Wilk Test and Leyene-Test, respectively. For all species tested both requirements were fulfilled, therefore Soudent't test was conducted. The significance level was set to $\alpha = 0.05$ for all tests. In case of an increase in the test item group compared to the control group for shoot height and shoot dry weight, no statistical evoluation was conducted. Statistical analysis was performed using the program ToxRat Professional Version 3.3 9.

Dates of work

II. RESULT ANDODISCUSSION

Validitv criteria:

validity criteria of OFCD 229 were fulfilled

All plant species in this study met the validity criterion of at least 90 % for survival in the control. In accordance with OECD guideline (OECD 227), there was no visible phytotoxicity in control plants. Normal growth occurred in the controls of the ten species tested. The control plants of each species showed permat arration in growth, plant development and morphology. The environmental conditions during the test time were kept identical within each species. The pots used for all species of this study were filled in equal manner with the same soil.

The gernandition rate of the seeds used in this study was ≥ 70 % for all species included in this test.



Analytical results:

Full details and acceptable validation data to support the analytical method are presented within document M-CA 4, which comply with the EU regulatory requirements outlined within SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1.

The analysed concentration of fluopyram in the product solution corresponded 50 101.9 % concentration.

Biological findings:

Visual phytotoxicity observed at the final assessment (on day 21 after application) in this vegetation vigour study occurred in Fagopyrum esculentum and included chlorosis and nectorsis with a mean effect of 14 % compared to the control.

All plants survived until test end.

There were statistically significant reductions of show height for the plant spoles Fagopyrum esculentum (27.8%), Helianthus annuus (9.7%) Avena sativa (6.6%) and Oblium perenne (7.2%) at the single treatment rate of 500 mL prod/ha. (U)

C

n

ð

The effects on shoot height, dry weight, phytotoxicity as well as plan growth stage are summarized for each of the plant species in the following tables for the final assessment (on day 21 after application).

| Table 10.6.2- 6: | Summary of phytotoxicity and growth stages (BBCH) following exposure to FLU | |
|------------------|---|--|
| | SC 500 at the final assessment or day 24 | |

| Diant analis | Phone Phone | otoxicîty ^A 🔊 🛛 🖉 | BBCH growth stages | |
|----------------------|-------------|--|--------------------|---------------|
| | Control | 500 g.a.s./ha | Control | 500 g a.s./ha |
| Beta vulgaris 🔗 | 0 % | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | <i>x</i> 15 - ¥5 | 15 - 15 |
| Brassic Chapus S | | ý ý 0 / - _N | 150-15 | 15 - 15 |
| Cucurais sativus | \$0 A | | 63 - 63 | 63 - 63 |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | | 14/NE, CC | ∞ 67 - 67 | 65 - 65 |
| 🥰 İycine max 👡 🖉 | | , °, 00 [°] /- √ [°] | 62 - 62 | 62 - 62 |
| Helianthus annuas | j y jô | × × 0 / & 4 | 18 - 18 | 18 - 18 |
| Allium cepa | | | 15 - 15 | 15 - 15 |
| Avena sativa 🖉 | | ₩ - K | 55 - 55 | 55 - 55 |
| Lolium perenne 🔊 | | | 26 - 26 | 26 - 26 |
| Zea mavs 🛛 🗇 | | $\delta^{\gamma} 0 / \tilde{\Phi}$ | 16 - 16 | 16 - 16 |

Phytotoxicity: 0: no phytotoxicity or effect, Visual symptoms: None (-), CC = change in colour, NE = necrosis





| | | Shoot height | | Shoot dry weight | | | |
|----------------------|--------------|---------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------|
| | Control | 500 g a.s./ha | | Control | 500 g a.s./ha | | |
| Plant species | Mean [cm] | Mean [cm] | % Inhibition ^A | Mean dry weight [g] | Mean dry weight [g] | | |
| Beta vulgaris | 14.3 | 14.9 | - 4.2 | 1.454 | 1.429 | 、O [♥] 1.7 Ø | - Q |
| Brassica napus | 14.5 | 14.8 | - 2. | 0.910 🎝 | 0.902 💡 | (× 0.9) | |
| Cucumis sativus | 61.8 | 73.6 | - 1971 | 4.13 | 3.950 Ĉ | ~Š | ₽° |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | 122.2 | 88.2 | 27,8 * | 2.234 | 2.372 | ×6.5 × | °0,0 |
| Glycine max | 37.5 | 34.1 | ₄ [®] 9.1 | 2 651 | 2.809 | ~~- 6.0 ⁰ | Ň |
| Helianthus annuus | 18.6 | 16.8 | چَر 9.7 * | 2.012 | 1088 | 16.1* | S. |
| Allium cepa | 42.0 | 41.8 | 0.5 | 0.72 | 0.548 | 25.6 * ~ | ष्ट्र भ |
| Avena sativa | 57.4 | 53.6 | _ \$ \$6*_√ | 1,403 🛛 | 0.78 | `≈29.0 *∞" | |
| Lolium perenne | 43.3 | 40. D | <u>√</u> 7.2 * | \$.866 | 0.759 | 12.4* | _ ° |
| Zea mays | 82.2 | 79 .1 | ~ <u>3</u> .80 | Q3.591 | 3,302 |) <u>8</u> 07 (| } |

| Table 10.6.2- 7: | Effects of Fluopyram | SC 500 on shoot | t height and shoo | t dry weight |
|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
|------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|

Negative figures indicate that there was an increase in biomass (dry weight) when compared to the untreated comrol. A

* Statistically significantly different compared to the control (Student's t-test one-side smaller, $\alpha = 0.05$) Õ

BIII. Conclesion

As a result of this vegetative vigour and growth study, in which the effect of FOU SC 500 on 10 nontarget terrestrial plant species was tested under greenhouse conditions, no adverse effects of the single treatment at 500 mL prod. the on the survival, shoot height and shoot by weight of the 10 species above the 50 % effect level occurred. Therefore the ER 50 (based on surviyal, shoot Deight and shoot dry weight) was determined to be ≥ 0.995 product/ha (corresponding to > $\frac{500}{200}$ g & s./ha)

Assessment and conclusion by applicant. The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for rise in risk assessment.

ineae in



| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.2/07 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 g/L: Effects on the vegetative vigour of three non-target |
| | terrestrial plant species under greenhouse conditions (Tier 2) |
| Report No: | S20-01148 |
| Document No: | <u>M-696933-02-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC $($ |
| study: | Regulation (EC) no. 1107/2009 |
| | US EPA OCSPP 850.4150 (2012) |
| | OECD 227 (2006) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 22 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: Temporary deviation from climate condition (humidity). All validity |
| | criteria were met. The declation listed above had no influence on the republik of |
| | the study and endpoints, β° , γ° , $\gamma^{$ |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously something is a second sec |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted mider GDP/Officially recognised testing facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | $Yes \qquad |
| | |
| | a to the |
| | |

Executive Summary

The objective of this study was to evaluate the potential effects of FLO SC 500 on the vegetative vigour of three non-target terrestrial plant species at \$1.3, 62.5, 128, 250 and 500 g a.s. ha, following a postemergence application of the active substance onto the forage of plants at the 2 leaf stage. A total of three species, 1 dicordedonous and 2 monocotytedonous species from 2 plant families were tested in this vegetative vigour test. *Fagopyrum esculentum* (buckwheat), *Allium cepa* (onion), *Avena sativa* (common oat). Planting density included 2 or 4 plants per pot with 10 or 5 replicate pots, respectively, for a total of 20 plants per treatment evel after plant species were treated with application rates of 31.3, 62.5, 125, 250 and 500 g a.s./ha and a water control. The application was done at a volume rate of 200 L/ha. Assessments were made 7/14 and 21 days after application. On day 7 and 14, only plant survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for plant survival, phytotoxicity, plant growth stage and short dry weights.

The study fulfils of validity criteria of OECD 227 guideling

No mortality and no differences in the growth stage of the plants compared to the control occurred. Necrosis with a mean effect of 12% and 9% occurred in *Fagopyrum esculentum* at 500 and 250 g a.s./ha, respectively. Regarding shoot bright a LOER of 250 g a.s./ha and a NOER of 125 g a.s./ha was determined for *Allium cepa*. The ER₂₅ and ER₅₀ could not be estimated for any of the plant species tested due to a lack of inhibition equal to or above 25% and NOER of 250 g a.s./ha was determined for *Fagopyrum esculentum*. The ER₂₅ and ER₅₀ could not be estimated for any of the plant species tested due to a lack of inhibition equal to or above 25% and is reported as > 500 g a.s./ha was determined for *Fagopyrum esculentum*. The ER₂₅ and ER₅₀ could not be estimated for any of the plant species tested due to a lack of inhibition equal to or above 25% and so the stimated for any of the plant species tested due to a lack of inhibition equal to or above 25% and so the stimated for any of the plant species tested due to a lack of inhibition equal to or above 25% and so the stimated for any of the plant species tested due to a lack of inhibition equal to or above 25% and is reported as > 500 g a.s./ha was determined for *Fagopyrum esculentum*. The ER₂₅ and ER₅₀ could not be estimated for any of the plant species tested due to a lack of inhibition equal to or above 25% and is reported as > 500 g a.s./ha, respectively.

I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

<u>Test them</u>: For SC 500; specification no.: 102000018148; supplier batch no.: EV57002782; Sample description, TOX 21459-00; active substance (analysed content): fluopyram: 42.3 % w/w (502.7 g/L); density; 0.189 g/mL)



Test design: A total of three species, 1 dicotyledonous and 2 monocotyledonous species from 2 plant families were tested in this vegetative vigour test: Fagopyrum esculentum (buckwheat), Allium cepa (onion), Avena sativa (common oat). The germination rates of the seeds used in this study, observed in a seedling emergence test, were 91 - 98 %. The plants were grown in a greenhouse in commercial nor porous 15 cm plastic pots (filled with approx. 1.5 kg soil/pot). The used soil was a loamy sand

Planting density included 2 or 4 plants per pot with 10 or 5 replicate pots, respectively, for a total of 20 plants per treatment level. The plant species were treated at the 2 leaf stage with a single application? rates of 31.3, 62.5, 125, 250 and 500 g a.s./ha and a water control. The set solution was applied on to the middle of plant height at a volume rate of 200 L/ha. Control pots were sprayed with 200 L/ha of deionized water.

After application, the pots with plants were transferred back to the greenbouse and placed on the tables. An independent set of LED lamps above each cultivation table ensured an appropriate exposure to light. The light intensity was in the range of 350-390 µmol/m²/s. The poss were set up sorted per treatment group after application. All pots were repositioned on the first and second assessment day to compensate for potential variability in growth conditions, Ø

Assessments were made 7, 14 and 21 days after application. On day 7 and 14, only plant survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for plant survival, phytotoxicity, plant growth stage and shoot dry weight. Phytotoxicity was recorded from the Diving Diants a each assessment time following a 0 - 90 % rating system in 10 % steps to describe the extent of the visual symptoms in comparison to the control, taking into account necrosis, deformation and change n colour. Any plant considered as being dead was pot rated for visual phytotoxicity and removed from the ot.

Analysis of the product solution and the control colution were conducted by MPLC UV.

Climatic conditions: Following application the post with plants were maintaged under greenhouse conditions. The temperature was 15 to 31 °C during the light cycle (16 h) and during the dark cycle (8 h). The relative humidity was 26 to 71 %

Statistics As no mortality occurred, no statistical evaluation was performed for this endpoint. The data of shoot heigh and shoot dry weight were tested for normality and homoscedasticity using Shapiro-Wilk's Test and Levene-Test followed by a William's test in case that both requirements were fulfilled and the trend analysis by contrast was significant. If the trend analysis by contrast was not significant, the Dumpetts t-test was conducted. The multiple Welch's test with Bonferroni-Holm adjustment was conducted in case that the data were non-homogenous. Statistical analyses of shoot height and shoot dry weight also included the determination of effect rates (ER25 and ER50) and their 95 % confidence limits by Probit analysis (based on mean values) using linear max. likelihood regression, where possible. In case of an increase jothe test item groups compared to the control group for shoot dry weight, no statistical evaluation was conducted. Statistical analysis was performed using the program ToxRat



II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity criteria:

The validity criteria of OECD 227 were fulfilled.

All plant species in this study met the validity criterion of at least 90 % for survival in the control in accordance with US EPA guideline (OCSPP 850.4150) and OECD guideline (OECD 227), there was no visible phytotoxicity in control plants. Normal growth occurred in the controls of the three species tested. The control plants of each species showed normal variation in growth, plant development and morphology. The environmental conditions during the test time were kept identical within each species. The pots used for all species of this study were filled in equal manner with the same sort. The germination rate of the seeds used in this study was 270 % for all species included in this test.

Analytical results:

Full details and acceptable validation data to support the analytical method are presented within document M-CA 4, which comply with the EU regulatory requirements outlined within SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1.

The analysed concentration of fluopyran in the product solution corresponded to 99 % of the larget concentration.

Biological findings:

No mortality and no differences in the prowth stage of the plants compared to the control occurred after treatment with the test item at any rate tested.

Visual injuries occurred in *Fagopyrum exculentum*. The observed sympton was necrosis with a mean effect of 12% at 500 g a.s./ha and 9% at 250 g a.s./ha

An application of the test item resulted in a statistically significant reduction of the shoot height of *Allium cepa* at the two highest application rates (250 and 500 g a.s./ha) and a statistically significant reduction of the shoot dry weight of *Fagopyrum escitientum* at the toghest application rate (500 g a.s./ha) The effects or shoot height, try weight, phytotoxicity as well as plant growth stage are summarized for each of the plant species in the following tables for the final assessment (on day 21 after application).

| | NOER | ER25 (95 % confidence limits) | ER50 (95 % confidence limits) |
|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | corvledonous species | 5 | |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | \$7 500 | > 500 | > 500 |
| | nocotyledonous speci | es | |
| Allium Epa A | 500 | > 500 | > 500 |
| Avera sativa | 500 | > 500 | > 500 |
| | | | |

Table 10.6.2-8: Summary of expoints of FLUSC 500 for mortality at the final assessment



| Summary Species | ary of endpoints of I LOER | FLU SC 500 for shoo NOER | ER25 (95 % confidence limits) | ER50 (95 % confidence limits) |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Dice | otyledonous species | | |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | - | 500 | > 500 | |
| | Mono | cotyledonousspecies | | |
| Allium cepa | 250 ^a | 12/5 | > 500 | Q > 500 % & |
| Avena sativa | - | 500 | ² \$\$500 Q | 500 fr |
| OER determined with: ^a Will | iams' test; one-sided sn | naller, $\alpha = 0.05$ | | |

| | 1 | . 6 | , Ø | Q, | | O | 10 |
|------------------|----------------------------|---------------|---------|------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------|
| Table 10 6 2- 10 | Summary of endpoints of FI | J °⊗ C | 500 for | sboot [®] dry | weight at th | e final | assessmen |

| Species | LOER NOER (95 % confidence | ERS 95 % confidence |
|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| | Dicoffedonans species | × |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | 500 a 25 a | > 500 |
| 2 | Monocoryledomous species & D & | |
| Allium cepa | | > 500 |
| Avena sativa | 5 50 5 500 5 500 | > 500 |
| I OFR determined with a AVN | liams' first: $\alpha = sided smaller \alpha = 0.05$ | |

In a vegetative vigoue stude FLU SC 500 was dested winder, greenhouse conditions for effects on survival, growth, plant height and shoot do weight of three non-target terrestrial plant species, following a post-emergence application of the test item to the soil ourface. The ER25 and ER50 could not be estimated for any of the plant species tested due of a lack of inhibition equal to or above 25% and is reported as > 500 g a.s./ha Pespectively

Assessment and corclusion by applicant:

The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use in risk assessment.

The endpoint is: $ER_{40} > 500$ g a.s. Da



| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.2/08 |
|----------------------------|---|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | 2020 |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 g/L: Effects on the seedling emergence and seedling growth of |
| | ten non-target terrestrial plant species under greenhouse conditions (Tier by |
| Report No: | S19-22933 |
| Document No: | <u>M-688440-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC |
| study: | Regulation (EC) no. 1107/2009 |
| | US EPA OCSPP 850.4100 (2012) |
| | OECD 208 (2006) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 208 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: Temporary deviation from climate condition (right). All validity |
| | criteria were met. |
| | The deviation listed above had no influence on the reliability of the study and |
| | endpoints. O C Z Z Z Z |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted Q A A A A A |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted under GLP/Officially recognized testing facilities 2 |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | Yes Q' A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A |
| | |
| Executive Summary | |

Ø The objective of this specific study was to evaluate the potential effects of the USC 500 on the seedling emergence and growth of ten species of non-target tetrestria plants in a limit test. A total of ten species, 6 dicotyledonous and 4 monocotyledonous species from 8 plan families were tested in this seedling emergence and growth test: Beta algaris (sugar beet), Brassiga napus (oilseed rape winter), Cucumis sativus (cucumber), Glyche mar (soybean), Helianthus annuas (sugrower), Allium cepa (onion), Avena sativa (oat), Lohim peronne (ryegrass), Zea plays (corn), Fagopyrum esculentum (buckwheat). Planting density included 2 or F seeds per pol, with 10 or Breplicate pots respectively, for a total of 20 seeds per treatment level. The sown seeds of the plant species were treated with a single application rate of 0.995 L product tha (equivalent to nominal 500 g a.s./ha) and a water control. The application was done at a volume sate of 200 Joha. The control pots of each species were observed daily for the number of seedlings emerged antil 50% of the seedlings had emerged (= day 0). Assessments were made individually for each species on this day (day 9) and 7, 14 and 21 days post emergence of 50 % of the control seedlings. On day 0, 7 and 14, only plant energence, survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for emergence, plant survival, phytotoxicity, plant growth stage and shoot dry weight 21 days post energence of 50% of the control seedlings.

The study fulfils all validity opteria of OECD 208 guideline.

Phytotoxicity observed at the final@ssessement (day 21 after 50 % control seedling emergence) included chlorosis, necrosis and deformation of the spedlings. The mean effect was in all species below 10 % compared to the control group. There were no adverse effects on emergence, post-emergence mortality, shoot height and shoot dry weight above the 50 % effect level at the single rate of 500 mL prod./ha. Therefore the ER10 (based on emergence, survival, shoot height and shoot dry weight) was > 0.995 Lorroduot ha (corresponding to > 500 g a.s./ha).



I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

Test item: FLU SC 500; specification no.: 102000018148; supplier batch no.: EV57002782; Sageple description: TOX 21459-00; active substance (analysed content): fluopyram: 42.3 % w/w (502 Jg/L): density: 1.189 g/mL.

Test design: A total of ten species, 6 dicotyledonous and 4 monocotyledonous species from 8 plant families were tested in this seedling emergence and growth test: Beta vulgaris (sugar bet), Brassica napus (oilseed rape winter), Cucumis sativus (cucumber), Glycine max (soybean), Helianthus annuits (sunflower), Allium cepa (onion), Avena sativa (oat), Leium perenne (ryegrass), Zea mays (corri), Fagopyrum esculentum (buckwheat). The plant species used in this study are representative of a wide range of plant families and were chosen because the are readily out invated test organisms and widely used in research. The seeds were sown on the day of application of the product to the soil surface in commercial non porous 15 cm plastic pots (filled with approx 1.5 kg soil/pot). The used soil was a loamy sand.

Planting density included 2 or 4 seeds per pot, with 0 or 5 eplicate pot respectively for a total of 20 seeds per treatment level. The sown seeds of the plant species were treated with a single application water of 0.995 L product/ha (equivalent to nominal 500 g a.s./ha) and a water control. The test solutions were applied at a volume rate of 200 L/ha. Controkpots were sprayed with 200 L/ha Cdeiopfzed water.

After application, the pots with seeds were transferred back to the greenhouse and placed on the tables. The pots were set up sorted per treatment group after application. All pots were repositioned on the first and second assessment day to compensate for potential variability of growth conditions

The control pots of each species were observed daily for the number of seedlings emerged until 50 % of the seedlings had emerged (= day 0). Assessments were made individually (or each species on this day (= day 0) and 7, 14 and 21 days post emergence of 60 % of the control seedling. On day 0, 7 and 14, only plant emergence, survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for emergence, plant survival, phytopxicity, BBCPI growth stage and shoot dry weight 21 days post emergence of 50 % of the control seedlings. Phytotoxicity ratings forred to the whole plants within a replicate at a range from 10 to 90 % to describe the extent of the visual symptoms in comparison to the control, taking into account pecrosis, deformation and change in cology. Any plant considered as being dead was not rated for phytotoxicity.

Analysis of the product solution and the control solution were conducted by LC – UV.

Climatic conditions Following application, the pots with plants were maintained under greenhouse conditions and natural daylight was supplemented by artificial lighting. The light intensity was in the range of 260-400 µmol/re/s. The temperature was regulated to maintain 15 to 27 °C during the light cycle (16 h) and during the dark cycle (8 h). The relative humidity was regulated to maintain 51 to 88 %.

Statistical analysis of seedling emergence and post-emergence mortality data were tested with Fisher's exact test. The data of shoot height and shoot dry weight were tested for normality and homoscedasticity using Shapiro-Wilk Stest and Levene-test. In case both requirements were fulfilled, Student t-test was conducted. The significance level was set to q = 0.05 for all hypothesis tests. In case of an increase in utes of cork: November 20, 2019 – December 23, 2019 the test item group compared to the control group for seedling emergence, shoot height and shoot dry weight, no statistical evaluation was conducted. Statistical analysis was performed using the program ToxRat Professional Version 3.3.0.



II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity criteria:

The validity criteria of OECD 208 were fulfilled.

The seedling emergence of control plants was ≥ 70 % (actually between 90 and 100 %). The control seedlings of each species did not exhibit visible visual injuries (e.g. chlorosis, necrosis, witting, key and stem deformations) and control plants exhibited normal variation in growth and morphology for that particular species. The mean survival of emerged control seedlings was ≥ 90 % (actually between 94 and 100 %) 21 days after at least 50 % emergence in the control. The environmental conditions for each particular species were identical and growing media control the same amount of soil matrix. Support media, or substrate from the same source.

Analytical results:

Full details and acceptable validation data to support the analytical method are presented within document M-CA 4, which comply with the EV regulatory requirements outlined within SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1.

SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1. The analysed concentration of fluoryram in the product solution corresponded to 99.6% of the nominal concentration.

Biological findings:

Visual phytotoxicity observed at the final assessment (op day 21 after application) in this seedling emergence and growth study included chlorosis, necrosis and deformation of the plants. Symptoms of phytotoxicity with a mean effect 10% compared to the control occurred in *Beta vulgaris*, *Cucumis* sativus, Fagopyrum esculantum and Lolium perenne

No statistically Gignificant effects on the parameter seedling energence were observed for any of the plant species tested. The kighest inhibition occurred for *Avena sativa* with 21.1 % compared to the control group. Post-emergence mortality of 50% was observed only for *Brassica napus* in the single treatment at 500 mL prod./ha

Statistically significant reductions in show height compared to the control group were observed for *Beta* vulgaris, Brassica napus, Cucuros sativits, Gifteine max and Lolium perenne.

Statistically significant reductions in shoot dry weight compared to the control group were observed for Beta vulgaris Cucums satisfies, Fagopyrum escutentum, Allium cepa and Lolium perenne.

The growth stage, symptoms of phytotoxicity, shoot height and dry weight as well as emergence and are summarized for each of the plant species in the following tables for the final assessment (21 days after 50 % emergence of the control seedlings).





Summary of growth stages (BBCH) and phytotoxicity following exposure to FLU Table 10.6.2-11: SC 500 at the final assessment on day 21

| SC 500 at | t the final assessn | nent on day 21 | | a second |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Plant species | BBCH gr Min | owth stage - Max | Phytotoxicity: | mean % / Symptoms A |
| - | Control | 500 g a.s./ha | Control | 500 g a.s. 4ha 🕥 |
| Beta vulgaris | 13 - 13 | 13 - 13 | 0 0 | 2/DE |
| Brassica napus | 13 - 13 | 13 - 13 | 0 1 | 67-25 6 |
| Cucumis sativus | 12 - 12 | 12 - 12 🔊 | 0 10 1 | °€ / DE |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | 51 - 51 | 51 - 51 | 000 | J CC DE |
| Glycine max | 21 - 21 | 21 - 21 🕅 | <u>A</u> | |
| Helianthus annuus | 16 - 16 | 16 | | |
| Allium cepa | 12 - 12 | 12-12 | Q°0 ⊗° | × × 0/- × |
| Avena sativa | 14 - 14 | Q04-21 | \sim 0° | |
| Lolium perenne | 21 - 21 | 21-2P | o so jo | 5/CC, NE |
| Zea mays | 15 - 15 | 0 15@15 × | | 0 / - A |
| Sumptoms of phytotoxiait | :: Nona()) CC = ab | ango in alour DP- | defermation NIE - r | |

Symptoms of phytotoxicity: None (-), CC nange in colour, D tormation,

| A | Symptoms of r | hytotoxicity: None (-). | $CC = change in \delta$ | ⊗lour. DE = d | eformation X | E = necrosis | y ay | L, |
|-------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------|---------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| | r r | , | A . 0 | | N A | Q | | Ô, ^v |
| | | | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | * | $O^{*} \ll 0$ | | Ñ |
| | | | | | | | K) A | n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n n |
| | | | | « » | | j až | N O |) |
| Table | 10.6.2-12: | Summary of shoot | height and sho | ot dry weigh | nt and corre | sponding per | Zent inhih | oitions |
| | | following exposure | to FIRE SC 50 | 0 at the final | Vassessment | on day 21 | , 0 | |
| | | ionowing exposure | | o at the mag | assessment | uay 21 | × V | |

| | <i>(</i>) | Shoot he | ght 🖉 🔗 |) A 2 | hoot dry weig | ghť |
|----------------------|------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| | Control | > _500 | g a.s./ha 😽 | Control | ^{0°} 500ĝ | a.s./ha |
| Plant species | Mean | Mbean | Ø % | Mean dry weight ~ | • Mean dry weight | % |
| [↓] | [em] | (cm) | inhibition 2 | ر [g] | | Inhibition ^A |
| Beta vulgaris 🦉 | A12.3 🔊 | 10.2 | 17.1* | 0.369 | 258 € | 30.1 * |
| Brassica napu | 14.2 | ×1.4 | N 8.2 | 0.830 | ‴≶0.909 | - 9.5 |
| Cucumis sativas 💧 🕤 | 16,1 | ≪JI4.4~ | (0 26 *) | 0:641 | 0.492 | 23.2 * |
| Fagopyrum eskulentum | \$1.3 % | 38.5 | | Ø.783 | 0.687 | 12.3 * |
| Glycine max 🖉 | 0 22.9 0 | 10,9 | 13.10 | 3 ² 0.845 | 0.810 | 4.1 |
| Helianthus annuus | 6.7 | 6.6 [№] | y hy | 0.695 | 0.770 | - 10.8 |
| Atlijîm cepa 🏻 🔬 | 22.0 | \$21.6 O | 1.8 | 0 068 | 0.051 | 25.0 * |
| Avena sativa | § 9.8 < | ¥ 43.7√ | ° ^y - 9.8√ | <u>0</u> 0.343 | 0.376 | - 9.6 |
| Lolium perenne | ≫ 31.9⊘ | 28.4 | × 11 ₀ 0 * | 0.143 | 0.087 | 39.2 * |
| Zea mays 🖓 🕺 | 46 | ^°≫¥9.1 @ | - <u>6</u> .1 | 0.533 | 0.721 | - 35.3 |

* Α





Ŝ

| Table 10.6.2- 13: | Summary of emergence and cumulative mortality following exposure to FL | U SC 500 |
|-------------------|--|----------|
| | at the final assessment on day 21 | _ ° |

| | | | | - | ^ `````````````````````````````` |
|----------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|
| | Se | edling emerge | nce | Cumulat | ive mortality |
| Plant species | Control | 500 g | a.s./ha | Control | 500 g(a.s./ha |
| | % emerged | % emerged | % Inhibition | % mortality | % mortativ |
| Beta vulgaris | 100 | 100 | <u>م</u> | | x 20 x 2 |
| Brassica napus | 95 | 95 | N 0 | 0 | |
| Cucumis sativus | 95 | 100 | - 5.3 | | |
| Fagopyrum esculentum | 95 | 100 📣 | D ^V - 5.3 | | |
| Glycine max | 95 | 100 | - 5.3 | | |
| Helianthus annuus | 100 | 100 | 0 | | |
| Allium cepa | 95 | 95 | ¢° 0,5° | | $\sim \sim 0 $ |
| Avena sativa | 95 | ØŠ " | | | a. 0 <u>4</u> . |
| Lolium perenne | 90 | A 85 0 | | | $O' \qquad O'' \qquad O''$ |
| Zea mays | 100 | × 95 × | 5.0 | | |
| | | | | | |

In a seedling emergence and growth study, FILU SC 500 was tested under greenhouse conditions for effects on the seedling emergence, survival, growth and shoot dry weight of ten non-target terrestrial plant species, following a pre-emergence application of the test item to the soil surface. No adverse effects on emergence, post-emergence mortality, shoot height and shoot dry weight above the 50 % effect level accurred. Therefore the EP was determined to have 0.005 L effect level occurred. Therefore the ER ω was determined to be > 0.995 L product that (corresponding to > 500 g a.s./ha).

F

for use in risk assessment. T



O'

| Data Point: | KCP 10.6.2/09 |
|----------------------------|--|
| Report Author: | |
| Report Year: | |
| Report Title: | Fluopyram SC 500 g/L: Effects on the seedling emergence and seedling growth of |
| | three non-target terrestrial plant species under greenhouse onditions (Tient and the species a |
| Report No: | S20-01146 |
| Document No: | <u>M-696931-01-1</u> |
| Guideline(s) followed in | EU Directive 91/414/EEC |
| study: | Regulation (EC) no. 1107/2009 |
| | US EPA OCSPP 850.4100 (2012) 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| | OECD 208 (2006) |
| Deviations from current | Current Guideline: OECD 200 (2006) |
| test guideline: | Deviations: Temporary deviation from climate condition (numidity). All validity |
| | criteria were met. The deviation listed above had no influence on the refrability of |
| | the study and endpoints, of star with the study and endpoints, of the study and endpoi |
| Previous evaluation: | No, not previously submitted a frequency of a state of the second |
| | |
| GLP/Officially | Yes, conducted ander GDP/Officially recognised testin@facilities |
| recognised testing | |
| facilities: | |
| Acceptability/Reliability: | $Yes \qquad |
| | |
| Exacutivo Summany | |

The study objective was to determine the effects of FOU SC 500 of seeding emergence and early growth of three non-target rerrestrial plant species as these plant species had shown relevant effects in a preceding limit test and are therefore investigated in this race-response study. A costal of three species, 1 dicotyledonous and 2 monoportyledonous species from 2 plan families were tested in this seedling emergence and growth testr. Beta migaric (sugar beet), Mliumoepa (onion), Lolium perenne (ryegrass). Planting density included or 4 seeds per pot, with 40 or 5 splicate pots respectively, for a total of 20 seeds per treatment level. The sown seeds of the plant species were treated with 5 application rate of 31.1, 62.5, 129, 250, 500 g a s./ha and a water control. The application@vas done at a volume rate of 200 L/ha. The control pots of each species were observed daily for the pumber of seedlings emerged until 50 % of the seedlings had emetged (zelay 0). Assessments were made individually for each species on this day (day 0) and 7, 4 and 21 days postcomergence of 50 % of the control seedlings. On day 0, 7 and 14, only plant emergence, survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for emergence, plant survival, physiotoxicity, plant growth storge and shoot dry weight 21 days post emergence of 50 % of the control seedings

The study fulfils all validits criteria of QECD 208 guideline.

No visual mjury occurred in any of the plant species tested until the last assessment day.

There were no adverse effects on emergence, post-emergence mortality, shoot height and shoot dry weight above the 50 % effect level. Therefore the ER₅₀ was determined to be > 500 g a.s./ha.

Statistically significant differences in shoot dry weight compared to the control group were observed for Beta vulgarie A LOFR of 25 g a.s./ha and a NOER of 62.5 g a.s./ha was determined for this species.

I. MATERIAL AND METHODS

Test item: #LU SC 500; Specification no.: 102000018148; supplier batch no.: EV57002782; Sample description: TOX 21459-00; active substance (analysed content): fluopyram: 42.3 % w/w (502.7 g/L); density 1.189 g/mL.

Test design: A total of three species, 1 dicotyledonous and 2 monocotyledonous species from 2 plant families were tested in this seedling emergence and growth test: Beta vulgaris (sugar beet), Allium cepa



(onion), Lolium perenne (ryegrass). The seeds were sown on the day of application of the product to the soil surface in commercial non porous 15 cm plastic pots (filled with approx. 1.5 kg soil/pot). The used soil was a loamy sand.

Planting density included 2 or 4 seeds per pot, with 10 or 5 replicate pots, respectively, for a total of 20 seeds per treatment level. The sown seeds of the plant species were treated with 5 application rate of 31.1, 62.5, 125, 250, 500 g a.s./ha and a water control. The test solutions were applied at a volume rate of 200 L/ha. Control pots were sprayed with 200 L/ha of deionized water

The pots were set up sorted per treatment group after application. All pors were repositioned on the first and second assessment day to compensate for potential variability in growth conditions.

The control pots of each species were observed daily for the number of seedlings emerged until 50 % of the seedlings had emerged (= day 0). Assessments over made individually for each species on this day (= day 0) and 7, 14 and 21 days post emergence of 50 % of the control seedlings. On day 0, 7 and 14, only plant emergence, survival and phytotoxicity were recorded. Final assessments were made for emergence, plant survival, phytotoxicity, BBCH growth stage and shoot dry weight 21 days post emergence of 50 % of the control seedlings. Phytotoxicity ratings referred to the whole plants within a replicate at a range from 10 to 90 %, to describe the extent of the visual symptoms in comparison to the control, taking into account necrosis, deformation and change in colour. Any plant considered as being dead was not rated for phytotoxicity. m

Analysis of the product solution and the control solution were conducted by HPLS MS/MS.

<u>Climatic conditions</u>: Following application, the pots with plants were maintained under greenhouse conditions and natural daylight was supplemented by agrificial lighting. The light intensity was in the range of 360 - 390 µmol/m²/s. The temperature was regulated to maintain 05 to 32^sC during the light cycle (16 h) and during the dark-cycle (8 h). The relative humidity was regulated to maintain 24 to 79 %.

Statistical analysis of seedling emergence@and post-emergence mortal@y was done with Fisher's exact test. The data of short height and short dry weight were tested for normality and homoscedasticity using Shapiro-Wilk's Test and Leveng-Test followed by Dunnett's t-testin case that both requirements were fulfilled and the trend analysis by contrast was not significant. The Jonckheere-Terpstra test was conducted in case the data were not normal distributed but homogenous and the trend analysis was significant. If the trend analysis by confrast was not significant, the multiple Mann-Whitney U-test with Bonferron-Holm adjustment was conducted. Statistical analyser of shoot height and shoot dry weight also included the determination of effect rates (ER25 and ER37) and their 95 % confidence limits by Probit analysis (based on mean values) using linear max. likelihood regression, where possible. Statistical analysis was performed using the program, ToxRed Professional Version 3.3.0.





II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity criteria:

The validity criteria of OECD 208 were fulfilled.

The seedling emergence of control plants was ≥ 70 % (actually between 90 and 100 %). The control seedlings of each species did not exhibit visible visual injuries (e.g. chlorosis, necrosis, witting, keet and stem deformations) and control plants exhibited normal variation in growth and morphology for that particular species. The mean survival of emerged control seedlings was 90 % (actually 95 %) 21 days after at least 50 % emergence in the control. The environmental conclusions for each particular species were identical and growing media contained the same amount of soil matrix, support media, or substrate from the same source.

Analytical results:

Full details and acceptable validation data to support the analytical method are presented within document M-CA 4, which comply with the EUC regulatory requirements outlined within SANTE/2020/12830, Rev.1.

The analysed concentration of fluopyram in the product softwine corresponded to 300% of the nominal concentration.

Biological findings:

No statistically significant effects on the parameter seedling emorgence were observed for any of the plant species tested. Inhibitions below 10 & occurred in each of the three plant species tested.

Post-emergence mortality of 5.0% and 5.9% occurred in Alltum cepd and Lolium perenne, respectively. The post-emergence mortality was not statistically orgnificant.

 \bigcirc

No visual injuries of urred in any of the plant species tested.

No differences in the growth stages between the test item groups and the control group of all three plant species tested were observed.

No statistically significant differences in shoot reight compared to the control group were observed for any of the plant species dested a shoot reight compared to the control group were observed for

Statistically significant differences in short dry weight compared to the control group were observed for *Beta vulgaris*.

The growth stage, show height and by weight as well as mergence and survival are summarized for each of the plant species in the following tables for the final assessment (21 days after 50 % emergence of the control seedlings).

Table 10.6.2-14: Summary of endpoints of FLV SC 500 for seedling emergence at the final assessment

| Species | | NOER | ER ₂₅ (95 % confidence limits) | ER ₅₀ (95 % confidence limits) |
|----------------|------|----------------------|---|---|
| | Dico | tyledonous species | | |
| Beta Wgaris | - 2 | 500 | > 500 | > 500 |
| | Mono | cotyledonous species | i | |
| Allium cepa | - | 500 | > 500 | > 500 |
| Lolium perenne | - | 500 | > 500 | > 500 |



Summary of endpoints of FLU SC 500 for post-emergence mortality at the final Table 10.6.2-15: assessment

| Species | LOER | NOER | ER25 (95 % confidence limits) | RRso (95 % confidence |
|----------------|------|----------------------|---|--------------------------|
| | Dic | otyledonous species | Ű | |
| Beta vulgaris | - | 500 | 0 ⁹ > 500 ∞ | 500 |
| | Mone | ocotyledonous specie | s ^Q a° a' | A D D |
| Allium cepa | - | 500 | ~~> 500-~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | <u></u> |
| Lolium perenne | - | 0 y y 00 y | J > \$00 J | > 500 ° |
| | ×, | | | |

Summary of endpoints of FLU SC 500 for shoot beight at the fibal assessment Table 10.6.2-16:

| Species | LOER | NOTER 5 | (95% confidence limits) | ÉR50 (95 % confidence limits) | |
|---------------------------|------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Brotyle donous pecies y g | | | | | |
| Beta vulgaris | | \$ ⁴ , 600 64 | >*\$00 | > 500 | |
| Monocotxfedonous species | | | | | |
| Allium cep | | > 500 5 | | > 500 | |
| Lolium perenne | | 500 L | > 500 | > 500 | |
| | | | × × | | |

Suffmarx of endpoints of FLU Se 500 for shood dry weight at the final assessment Table 10.6.2-17:

| Species Species | NOER | ER25 (95 % confidence limits) | ER50 (95 % confidence limits) | | |
|--|--------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| A Dicotsfedon of species | | | | | |
| Besa vulgaris | × 62.5 | > 500 | > 500 | | |
| Monocotyledonous species | | | | | |
| Allium capa | \$ 500 | > 500 | > 500 | | |
| Lolium Gerenne | 500 | > 500 | > 500 | | |
| LOER determined with: a Jon Kheere Cerpstra test; one-sided smaller, $\alpha = 0.05$ | | | | | |

III. CONCLUSION

In a Tier seedling emergence and growth study, FLU SC 500 was tested under greenhouse conditions for effects on the seedling emergence, survival, growth and shoot dry weight of ten non-target terrestrial plant species following a pre-emergence application of the test item to the soil surface.



No adverse effects on emergence, post-emergence mortality, shoot height and shoot dry weight above the 25/50 % effect level occurred. Therefore the ER_{25}/ER_{50} was determined to be > 500 g a.s./ha.

Assessment and conclusion by applicant:

The study and its data are considered as acceptable and reliable for use $in \hat{T}$ is assessment. The endpoint is: $ER_{50} > 500$ g a.s./ha

CP 10.6.3 Extended laboratory studies on non-target plants In view of the results presented under Point CP 10.62 above, no further studies are deemed necessary.

Semi-field and field tests on non-torget plants **CP 10.6.4**

studies are deemed necessary. In view of the results presented under Point CP 10.6.2 above no further

Effects on other terrestrial organisms (flora and fauna)? **CP 10.7**

In view of the study results presented above no studies of other terrestrial organisms are considered necessary. However, further investigation has been conducted on fungicidal activity with no adverse effects observed; for details see MCA 8

CP 10.8

Monitoring data

and a CP 10.8 Monitoring data No monitoring data has been collected by the applicant northave they been reported in any of the public

No monitoring data has been collected by the applicant nor have they been reported in any of the public literature references a evaluated in Document MCA. Section 9. No monitoring of non-target organism is deemed to be necessary.