PEER REVIEW REPORT ON **CLOFENTEZINE** 27 04 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Identity, Physical and chemical properties, Details of uses and further information, Methods of analysis

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Section 1 Open points: ***4*** Points for clarification: ***0*** Data gaps: ***9***			Section 1 Open points: ***1*** Points for clarification: ***0*** Data gaps: ***4***
	Open point 1.1 RMS to amend the list of endpoints according to the new agreed template See reporting table 0(1)	-	RMS: 19.12.2008 Endpoints have been amended. Point closed.	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.
	Data gap 1.1 A lack of data on the purity, commercial availability of the starting materials has been identified. It should be noted that the data have been evaluated by the RMS, however according to Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 these data cannot be taken into consideration in the peer review. See reporting table 1(5)	As indicated in Column A, purity and commercial availability of **all starting materials** are mentioned in the addendum to DAR Volume 4 prepared by the RMS.	RMS: 19:12:2008 The RMS suggests that this information be handled as a point of clarification, rather than a data gap. This information is presented in the addendum to Volume 4 of the DAR (dated June 2007).	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap changed into a point of clarification. Point of clarification addressed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Data gap 1.2 A lack of data on the purity, commercial availability of the starting materials and a description of the manufacturing process possibly used in the second plant have been identified. See also 1(5) It should be noted that the data have been evaluated by the RMS, however according to Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 these data cannot be taken into consideration in the peer review. See reporting table 1(6)	As indicated in Column A, source of all starting materials and description of the manufacturing process in the China plant (similar to that used in the UK plant) are mentioned in the addendum to DAR Volume 4 prepared by the RMS. **Clarification** in response to AT comment 1(6) reporting table rev.1-2 (03.01.2008), page 25/110: Ethanol, acetic acid and toluene are not starting materials but solvents or reagents which are recycled at the end of the manufacturing process. Hence, the information for **all starting materials** is available in DAR addendum.	RMS: 19:12:2008 The RMS suggests that this information be handled as a point of clarification, rather than a data gap. This information is presented in the addendum to Volume 4 of the DAR (dated June 2007).	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap changed into a point of clarification. Point of clarification addressed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Data gap 1.3 A lack of data on the manufacturing process used in the second plant has been identified. See also1(6) It should be noted that the data have been evaluated by the RMS, however according to Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 these data cannot be taken into consideration in the peer review See reporting table 1(7)	As indicated in Column A, the manufacturing process in the China plant (similar to that used in the UK plant) is described in the addendum to DAR Volume 4 prepared by the RMS.	RMS: 19:12:2008 This information is presented in the addendum to Volume 4 of the DAR (dated June 2007).	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap changed into a point of clarification. Point of clarification addressed.
	Open point 1.2 RMS to clarify that the new source presented in Add. to vol. 4 is an additional one or the only source, as in C.1 is stated that the Addendum is replacing the previous Volume 4, Annex C, dated August 2005 See reporting table 1(7)	-	RMS: 19.12.2008 The source presented is an Addendum to the DAR and details an additional source of clofentezine and this is the current commercially manufactured source of clofentezine.	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Data gap 1.4 A lack of data on the a.s. content in the formulation has been identified. It should be noted that the data have been evaluated by the RMS however according to Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 these data cannot be taken into consideration in the peer review See reporting table 1(8)	**Clarification of existing study:** As indicated in the manufacturing process, the product is, in the final step, washed with acetic acid and then with water. Hence, drying is needed. Given that drying is a technical procedure without relevance to the chemical process and product quality, it was not specified as a step in the manufacturing process. Content of a.s. is always analysed after this drying procedure.	RMS: 19.12.2008 This information is presented in the addendum to Volume 4 of the DAR (dated June 2007).	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap changed into a point of clarification. Point of clarification addressed.
	Open point 1.3 RMS to present the assessment of equivalence for the two sources in an Addendum. See also open point 1(7) See reporting table 1(11)	-	RMS: 19.12.2008 The Addendum to Volume 4 (dated June 2007) contains an equivalence check (see Table C.6) Open point addressed.	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. New data gap proposed for formal reason, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	New data gap 1.10 identified at PRAPeR 61 meeting: New data gap to provide specification and supporting batch data.			Data gap open. Written procedure: Data gap open for formal reason Applicant to provide specification and supporting batch data. Data already submitted and presented in an addendum to Vol. 4 (June 2007), however not peer-reviewed in view of the restrictions concerning the acceptance of new (i.e. newly submitted) studies after the submission of the DAR to EFSA, as laid down in Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1095/2007
	Open point 1.4 Acceptability of the in-house method to be discussed in an expert meeting. See reporting table 1(20)	It should be noted that the results obtained by this in-house method were confirmed by those obtained with the EC method A10 (report R-21216, sent to the RMS): Clofentezine technical (99.7% pure) was shown not to be flammable under the conditions of the test. However according to Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007, these data are not supposed to be taken into consideration in the peer review.	RMS:19:12:2008 EEC A10 confirms clofentezine technical is non-flammable Open point addressed	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.
	Data gap 1.5 A lack of additional information about the method used for determination of the photochemical degradation has been identified.	**Clarification of existing study:** Concerning reporting table comment 1(23), borosilicate glass is often used as the standard material for test vessels used in aqueous photolysis experiments. In the study by Kelly	RMS:19.12.2008 See applicants case in the left hand column. Data point fulfilled.	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap changed into a point of clarification. Point of clarification addressed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	See reporting table 1(23)	(1985) no measurements of irradiance from the sunlight incident on the test solutions after passing through the borosilicate glass test vessels is reported. However, in many similar tests conducted at a CRO (Huntingdon Life Sciences) over the years where irradiance measurements from an artificial xenon light source (Suntest apparatus) have been made, borosilicate glass vessels have been shown to transmit light at wavelengths >290 nm. The radiation spectrum measured has been shown to be comparable to that of natural sunlight. Thus it is very unlikely that the test vessels used by Kelly were inappropriate and this would seem not to be a valid reason for rejecting the study. **Additionally**, it should be also noted that an aqueous photolysis study (R-18905) was recently conducted to meet a request from Japanese Regulatory Authorities. It includes further work on clofentezine photolysis in both natural water (relevant to JMAFF guidelines) and in buffer (relevant to EU guidelines) and experimental determination of the quantum yield. This study and a report on the real half-lives (R-18905a) have been sent to the RMS.		

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Data gap 1.6 A lack of a fully validated method according to Sanco/825/00, including a confirmation method and an ILV for the determination of clofentezine and 4-hydroxy-clofentezine in animal tissues and products. (milk, eggs, muscle, liver, kidney and fat) has been identified. See reporting table 1(35) Continued: Data gap 1.6 A lack of a fully validated method according to Sanco/825/00, including a confirmation method and an ILV for the determination of clofentezine and 4-hydroxy-clofentezine in animal tissues and products. (milk, eggs, muscle, liver, kidney and fat) has been identified. See reporting table 1(35)	**Clarification of existing studies :** Clarification of the methods described in the DAR addendum (R-17532 and ILV R-20408) is provided in the **Attachment IRV1-01** to this table. This document shows that: - The method is designed to determine clofentezine residues in animal products **as defined in Reg (EC) No. 396/2005** (**=sum of all compounds containing the 2-chlorobenzoyl moiety expressed as clofentezine**). - Based on this residue definition, any new method would still require an acid hydrolysis step to ensure conjugated metabolites were accounted for. - It has been proved that the method converts clofentezine and metabolites into the analyte (2-CBA) with a molar conversion ratio of 1:1. - Since the method is highly specific (GC/MS using 3 fragment ions with an m/z > 100), confirmatory method is not necessary.	RMS: 19.12.2008 The data submitted by the applicant to address the outstanding data required, was correct with regards to the approach taken. However, there are a number of major issues associated with the acceptance of the method for the purpose of enforcement and with the associated validation data. a) The method is a common moiety method, which involves the hydrolysis of clofentezine to 2-chlorobenzoic acid. The issue here is that a number of other pesticides (i.e. clomazone, cumylone, flufenzine) contain this moiety and thus if present in the sample, would give a false positive/inflated result. b) The use of a derivatising agent in an enforcement method is strongly discouraged. The applicant has tried to address this concern by changing the derivatising reagent from diazomethane to MSTFA, however it is difficult to understand why the HPLC-MS/MS methods used in the environment methods were not modified and employed here (applicant had already shown that HPLC-UV could be used to analyse for 4-hydroxyclofentezine in	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap still open. Written procedure: Data gap still open Applicant to provide a fully validated method according to Sanco/825/00, including a confirmation method and an ILV for the determination of clofentezine and 4-hydroxy-clofentezine in animal tissues and products. It should be noted that some data were already submitted and evaluated in an addendum to Vol. 3 (June, 2007), not peer-reviewed in view of the restrictions concerning the acceptance of new (i.e. newly submitted) studies after the submission of the DAR to EFSA, as laid down in Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1095/2007

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Continued: Data gap 1.6 A lack of a fully validated method according to Sanco/825/00, including a confirmation method and an ILV for the determination of clofentezine and 4-hydroxy-clofentezine in animal tissues and products. (milk, eggs, muscle, liver, kidney and fat) has been identified. See reporting table 1(35)		animal products). c) The enforcement method was only validated for clofentezine, whereas the residues definition is clofentezine and its metabolite 4-hydroxyclofentezine and no validation data were submitted on kidney. However, the ILV data covered both clofentezine and 4-hydroxclofentezine and kidney, although there is an issue that the ILV data, which did not address the amount of 2-chlorobenzoic acid produce by the two components. In the case of clofentezine, the molecule contains two 2-chlorophenyl groups whereas 4-hydroxyclofentezine contains only one, with the other 2-chlorophenyl ring having an OH group in the 4 position (no indication was give as to whether this would be removed on hydrolysis, which appears unlikely). Therefore, if the OH group is not removed, the retention time may be different and the ions produced during determination by MS may also be different and as SIM is being used, would not be picked up. The result of this would be if 4-hydroxyclofentezine is present in significant amounts and the calibration is based on clofentezine, the residue in the sample would be significantly lower than the true value.	

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
			Therefore the RMS recommends that a HPLC-MS/MS is developed (along the lines of the environment methods) and validated for clofentezine and its metabolite 4-hydroxyclofentezine (including ILV data) for animal products (milk, eggs, muscle, liver, kidney and fat). Data gap still open.	
	Data gap 1.7 A lack of data to address the accuracy of the method for determination of the a.s. in the PPP in accordance with guidance document SANCO 3030/99 rev 4 has been identified. See reporting table 1(38)	**Clarification of existing studies:** As given in Table B 5.1 of the DAR (Vol. 3, p 46), 5 determinations of accuracy were reported. The mean (n = 5) was 99.7% for TGAI and 99.8% for the product. The %RSD of these measurements was 0.28% for both TGAI and product and was reported as the precision in the Table B.5.1.	RMS: 19.12.2008 See applicants case in the left hand column. Data gap fulfilled.	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap changed into a point of clarification. Point of clarification addressed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Data gap 1.8 A lack of an acceptable confirmatory method for determination of clofentezine in commodities with high water content has been identified. See reporting table 1(40)	It should be noted that a fully validated confirmatory method (GC-MS/MS) was submitted in Germany in May 2008 (report R-22236, sent to the RMS). However according to Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007, these data are not supposed to be taken into consideration in the peer review.	RMS: 19:10.2008 Validated confirmatory method (LC-MS/MS) for the determination of clofentezine in commodities with high water content – See addendum 2 Data gap fulfilled.	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap still open. Written procedure: Data gap still open Applicant to provide an acceptable confirmatory method for determination of clofentezine in commodities with high water content It should be noted that data have already been submitted and evaluated in an addendum to Vol. 3 (December, 2008); however not peer-reviewed in view of the restrictions concerning the acceptance of new (i.e. newly submitted) studies after the submission of the DAR to EFSA, as laid down in Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1095/2007

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Data gap 1.9 A lack of confirmatory methods for the determination of clofentezine in liver, muscle and kidney and the ILV for the enforcement animal method have been identified. It should be noted that the data have been evaluated by the RMS however according to Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 these data cannot be taken into consideration in the peer review. See reporting table 1(52)	See above data gap linked to reporting table 1(35).	RMS: 19:10.2008 'Data gap' (See Addendum 1 – B.5.4.1)	PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap still open. Written procedure: Data gap still open. See data gap 1.6
	New open point 1.5 RMS to amend the list of endpoints according to the discussions during the PRAPeR 61 meeting. (Refer to Discussion table)			PRAPeR 61 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled

2. Mammalian toxicology

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Section 2 Open points: ***6*** Points for clarification: ***0*** Data gaps: ***2***			Section 2 Open points: ***0*** Points for clarification: ***0*** Data gaps: ***2***
	Open point 2.1 Oral absorption value to be agreed on in a meeting of experts. See reporting table 2(1)	**Clarification of existing studies:** The notifier agrees that the 50% figure used is a conservative estimate and absorption is likely to be higher. The notifier draws attention to the fact that, due to rounding of the AOEL (0.01 mg/kg bw/day), the correction for absorption is, in reality even lower at 37%.	RMS : 19.12.2008 The RMS agrees with the Notifier.	PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.
	Open point 2.2 The potential for bio-accumulation of clofentezine to be discussed in a meeting of experts. See reporting table 2(4)	-		PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.
	Open point 2.3 RMS to submit a metabolism scheme in an addendum. See reporting table 2(6)	**Clarification of existing studies:** This is shown in the DAR, section B.7.2, Figure 7.2.2, page 236. It has been copied in the DAR addendum under section B.6.1 to meet the NL request. See also point of clarification 3.2	RMS:19.12.2008 See Addendum 1 – proposed metabolism of clofentezine in animals.	PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Open point 2.4 The skin sensitisation potential of clofentezine to be discussed in a meeting of experts. See reporting table 2(8)	**Additional information on the existing study:** According to reporting table 2(8), clarification of batch used is needed since purity of clofentezine technical (batch CR20099/8) was not recorded in the report. This information has been found in the raw data of the study (See **Attachment IRV2-01**): **The purity** for batch CR20099/8 in January 1982 was **99.7%.** Thus this study is also valid and acceptable. Since this additional information is from raw data of the existing study, it can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to the document prepared by EFSA in November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 dated 15 Nov. 2007. This information was also provided to the RMS in September 2006 as part of the answer to data requirement 4.1.6 (DAR, vol.1, page 87).	RMS 19.12.2008 The RMS notes comments from Notifier, which resolves this issue.	PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.
	Data gap 2.1 Applicant to submit a new Ames test. [It should be noted that the study has already been	As indicated in Column A, the study (report R-17812) has been already submitted in September 2006. It has been evaluated by the RMS and described in the DAR addendum. It shows that clofentezine was not mutagenic at up to 5000 µg/plate.	RMS: 19.12.2008 The RMS confirms the 'data gap'. The Notifier submitted these data and it has been evaluated by the RMS in Addendum 1 (Section B.6.4).	PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Data gap open, however it is a requirement at MS level only. Written procedure

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	submitted.] See reporting table 2(11)			Still data gap at MSs level only
	Open point 2.5 Pending on confirmation from the residue experts' meeting, the toxicological relevance of clofentezine metabolites 2-chlorobenzonitrile (and its degradation products 2-chlorobenzoic acid, 2-chlorobenzylalcohol, 2-chlorobenzaldehyde) and (2-chlorobenzoic acid (2-chlorobenzylidene) hydrazide) has to be discussed in a meeting of experts. See reporting table 2(14)	**Clarification of existing studies:** A document from the notifier on the toxicological relevance of the plant metabolites is provided (See **Attachment IRV2-02**, submitted with this Evaluation Table). The given clarifications further support the conclusion in the DAR that the residue definition for food and feed of plant origin should be clofentezine only. This document is based on the existing studies already described in the DAR. Hence it can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to EFSA document dated 15 November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007.	RMS: 19:12:2008 The main residues in fruit crops are the parent clofentezine, and metabolite 2-chlorobenzonitrile. The levels of 2-chlorobenzonitrile found were <0.05 mg/kg, which was approximately a tenth of those of the parent residue. Based on a residue of 0.05 mg/kg and intakes figures for apples (which are the highest values of the proposed crops), potential consumer intakes of 2-chlorobenzonitrile would be < 0.0007 mg/kg bw/day (>4% of the ADI). The issue of the degradation products of 2-chlorobenzonitrile appears to have arisen from their mention in a static study on photo degradation in the Physical Properties Section. In the grape metabolism study they were measured as a total 'polar fraction' (i.e. total sum of all degradation products of 2-chlorobenzonitrile). At the field rate application the sum of all degradation products of 2-chlorobenzonitrile amounted to 0 005 mg/kg or 1.4% of the TRR. Overall it is considered by the RMS that	PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
			2-chlorobenzonitrile or the degradation products of 2-chlorobenzonitrile are of no toxicological significance at these levels, and should not be included in the residue definition. RMS has provided a brief summary of the Notifers case in Addendum 2.	
	Open point 2.6 Operator exposure to be agreed on in a meeting of experts. See reporting table 2(19)	-		PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.
	Data gap 2.2 Applicant to submit an equivalence analysis of the batches used in tox studies compared to the currently proposed specification. [It should be noted that the information has already been submitted.] See reporting table 2(21)	**Additional information on existing studies:** The equivalence analysis of the batches used in toxicity studies compared to the currently proposed specification was submitted to the RMS in Sep. 2006 to meet data requirement 4.1.6 (DAR, vol.1, page 87) and described in the addendum to the DAR Volume 4. The provided information included the following documents: • Two tables summarising the information known on the test compound used for each toxicity test. • A copy of the detailed certificate of analysis of batch number CR20099/12 used in many toxicity studies, • A statement (R-20188b – should	RMS: 19:10.2008 'Data gap' (see also open point 1.3 above). See Addendum to Volume 4.	PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Data gap open for formal reason. Equivalence of the batches tested in the mammalian toxicology to the representative specification is missing. Written procedure Still data gap

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Continued: Data gap 2.2 Applicant to submit an equivalence analysis of the batches used in tox studies compared to the currently proposed specification. [It should be noted that the information has already been submitted.] See reporting table 2(21)	be treated as confidential business information) giving the historical background to product specification and batch analyses. The tables summarising the information known on the test compounds used in the toxicity studies show that the technical material used was of very high purity (98%, often >99%) all along the years. Only one certificate of analysis including the impurity profile has been found in the archives. It concerns the batch CR 20099/12 used in 8 studies covering all animal species and all type of studies including the most important ones (2-year rat; 18-month mouse; teratology rabbit; 2-generation rat; mutagenicity). The analysis shows that this batch, even from a pilot plant, complies with specifications of the product at that time and it should be considered chemically equivalent to the material being produced today. The document R-20188b demonstrates that: - the active substance has been produced to a very high purity all over the years, - the impurity profile has remained identical all over the years, - the impurities concentrations have remained very similar all over the years.		

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Continued: Data gap 2.2 Applicant to submit an equivalence analysis of the batches used in tox studies compared to the currently proposed specification. [It should be noted that the information has already been submitted.] See reporting table 2(21)	**The material being manufactured today is clearly representative of the material used to assess the toxicity of clofentezine in the 1980's and consequently all end-points should be considered valid for use in risk assessment as appropriate.** This additional information is based on batch analysis information found in the raw data of the existing toxicity studies already described in the DAR and on clofentezine declared specification all over the years. Hence, this information can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to the document dated 15 November 2007 prepared by EFSA on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007.		
	Question from the residue section (PRAPeR 65 meeting) regarding the proportion of 4-hydrohyclofentazine in renal and subcutaneous fat.			PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Answer: It is not unexpected to find this metabolite present in renal fat. It is also expected that renal fat would contain slightly higher amount of the metabolite than in the epidermal fat because of the proximity to the kidneys.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Message from fate section (PRAPeR 62 meeting) regarding: relevance of metabolites 2-clorobenzonitrile and 2-chlorobenzoic acid as well as for residues in food a potential groundwater issue may arise.			PRAPeR 64 (21-23 January 2009) Answer: Limited toxicological information on metabolites 2-chlorobenzoic acid and 2-chlorobenzonitrile was reported in the addendum 2 to the DAR. However, this was considered not sufficient to conclude on the toxicological relevance of the metabolites, as well as on specific trigger values.

3. Residues

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Section 3 Open points: ***9*** Points for clarification: ***2*** Data gaps: ***2***			Section 3 Open points: ***2*** Points for clarification: ***0*** Data gaps: ***5***
	Open point. 3.1 Storage stability of clofentezine residues to be discussed in expert meeting – Information on procedural recovery in the submitted studies would help discussion. See reporting table 3(2)	**Clarification of existing study:** Information on procedural recovery has been summarised in the **Attachment IRV3-01** submitted with this evaluation table. The figures provided in this document come from the study reports already listed in the DAR. Hence, they can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to EFSA document dated 15 November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007.	RMS: 19:12:2008 Procedural recovery data were available for peaches and almonds and showed recoveries of 73 – 100% for peaches and 62-83% for almonds. In the case of peaches the procedural recoveries associated with the 246 day sample were recoveries were low (61%), the procedural recovery was 91%. For the almond nut meal 3 and 24 month samples which gave recoveries of 49-61% and nd-34%, procedural recoveries were 72-114% and 62-69%. The RMS still considers that the studies indicate stability after 21 months for peaches and 12 months for nut meal Open point addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled.
	Open point 3.2 RMS to check whether NC 22505 was actually as reference compound in lemon peach and grape metabolism studies.	**Clarification of existing studies:** A clarification from the notifier to address this point is provided (See **Attachment IRV3-02**, submitted with this Evaluation Table). This document demonstrates that the	RMS: 19:12:2008 See applicants case in the left hand column, which RMS considers addresses the open point. Open point addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	See reporting table 3(3)	compound NC 22505 reported as a plant metabolite by Warner (DAR, p 207-209) was an artifact of the TLC analysis used in the study. This was proven to be the case in a later study reported by Leake and Arnold, 1983a (DAR, p 289-290). Therefore, it can be concluded that NC 22505 is not a plant metabolite. As not expected to be a genuine metabolite, the reference substance NC 22505 was not used in later plant metabolism studies, and is not included in the plant metabolism scheme. Since the Attachment IRV3-02 is based on existing studies already described in the DAR, it can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to EFSA document dated 15 November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007. **Important footnote:** *NC 22505 is reported as a plant metabolite in the present discussion. Hence, the comment about the Vol 4, confidential information, in Column 3 of the reporting table point 3(3) is inadequate and the notifier requests that* ***this comment should be deleted***		

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		(sanitised) *from any documentation prior to publication of the final peer review report.*		
3.1	Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to propose a metabolic pathway in fruits as complete as possible on the basis of available information. See reporting table 3(4)	**Clarification of existing studies:** A metabolism pathway in fruits is proposed on the basis of existing studies already described in the DAR. The scheme is provided in **Figure 1** of the above mentioned **Attachment IRV3-02** submitted with this Evaluation Table. This scheme can replace that given in Figure 7.1 of the DAR (page 228). This better reflects the results of the plant metabolism studies summarised in both the dossier and DAR. Attachment IRV3-02 clarifies the route of degradation in plants but does not in any way alter the primary conclusion that the definition of the residues for both risk assessment and monitoring in plants should be clofentezine only (see DAR, page 237).	RMS: 19:12:2008 Updated pathway in Addendum 2 Point addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Point of clarification addressed.
	Open point.3.3 RMS to report in tabular form the results of metabolism studies. This should include TRR, % of the TRR which is extractable and not extractable, % age of radioactivity accounted for each identified metabolite,	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 Table in Addendum 2 for the cattle study (hen study already contains the required table) Open point addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled. New open point proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	indication of eventual partial conjugation, % age of extracted radioactivity only characterised for chromatographic properties (number of individual fractions…) and any other useful information for assessing validity of studies and appropriateness of the residue definition. See reporting table 3(5)			
	New open point 3.10 RMS to provide a complete assessment of the available metabolism studies in ruminants (from the mammalian toxicology and residue sections) in order to depict a complete metabolism pathway of clofentezine in ruminants.			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point open. RMS: 17.02.09 Information added to Addendum 3. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled
	Open point. 3.4 MS to examine the discrepancy of renal and subcutaneous fat radioactive content in cattle metabolism study.	**Clarification of existing studies:** A clarification from the notifier on discrepancy of renal and subcutaneous fat radioactive content in cattle metabolism study is provided to answer comment 3(6) of the reporting table (See **Attachment IRV3-03**), submitted with this Evaluation Table).	RMS: 19:12:2008 See applicants case in the left hand column, which RMS considers addresses the open point. Open point addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled. (see answer to Message 2 from the mammalian toxicology section).

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	See reporting table 3(6)	The 10-fold difference in TRR observed in renal fat and subcutaneous fat 16 hours after the last of 3 oral doses of [^{14}C]clofentezine to a cow reflects the proximity of the renal fat samples to the main organs of excretion. The only major residue in the renal fat was 4-hydroxyclofentezine which is also the major product excreted in urine. Other studies in rats provide evidence that the residue is likely to be rapidly eliminated and does not bioaccumulate in this tissue. This document is based on the existing studies already described in the DAR. Hence it can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to EFSA document dated 15 November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007.		
3.2	Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to propose a metabolic pathway in livestock based on objective findings in livestock studies. Introduction of expectations from the rat metabolism does not allow a	**Clarification of existing studies:** A scheme of metabolism pathway in livestock is provided as **Attachment IRV3-04** to this evaluation table. It is based on livestock metabolism studies reported in the DAR under section B.7 and on comparative metabolism studies reported in the DAR under section B.6.	RMS: 19:12:2008 See applicants case in the left hand column, which RMS considers addresses the point. Point of clarification addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Point of clarification addressed. (see also new open point 3.10).

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	proper comparison between livestock and rodent metabolism. See reporting table 3(8)	This attachment first includes a table detailing the metabolites of clofentezine and the matrices in which they are reported for ease of reference. To clarify, 3- & 4-hydroxy clofentezine were detected in the baboon, goat, cow, calf & hen. The 5-hydroxy clofentezine and the methyl thio metabolite were detected in the calf and goat. All the above were detected in the rat. Thus the scheme included in the Attachment IRV3-04 (reported as Fig 7.2.2, DAR p 236) correctly represents the metabolism in animals (rodent and livestock).		
	Open point:3.5 Residue definition for risk assessment in plant commodities to be discussed in expert meeting. See also comment 3(16) See reporting table 3(9)	**Clarification of existing studies:** As indicated above (see open point 2.5), clarifications from the notifier on the toxicological relevance of the plant metabolites are provided (see above mentioned **Attachment IRV2-02**, submitted with this Evaluation Table). The given clarifications further support the conclusion in the DAR that the residue definition for food and feed of plant origin should be clofentezine only. Since this clarification document is based on the existing studies already described in the DAR, it can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to EFSA document dated 15	RMS: 19:12:2008 The main residues in fruit crops are the parent clofentezine, and metabolite 2-chlorobenzonitrile. The levels of 2-chlorobenzonitrile found were <0.05 mg/kg, which was approximately a tenth of those of the parent residue. Based on a residue of 0.05 mg/kg and intakes figures for apples (which are the highest values of the proposed crops), potential consumer intakes of 2-chlorobenzonitrile would be < 0.0007 mg/kg bw/day (>4% of the ADI). Overall it is considered that 2-chlorobenzonitrile is of no toxicological significance at these levels, and should not be	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled. New data gap proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007.	included in the residue definition. Open point addressed.	
	New data gap 3.3 identified at PRAPeR 65 meeting: Notifier to address the toxicological relevance of 2-chlorobenzonitrile.			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Data gap open. Written procedure: Data gap still open
	Open point.3.6 Fat solubility of animal residues to be discussed in expert meeting on the basis of the residue definition. Note: The feeding study in lactating cow was conducted with a common moiety method (refer to comment 3.25) See reporting table 3(10)	See related open point 3.4 above. **Clarification of existing studies:** Using the physical chemical properties prediction software, EPIWIN V 3.12 the Log Kow (KOWWIN v 1.67 estimate) for clofentezine is 2.70 and for 4-hydroxy clofentezine 2.22. Experimentally derived Log Kow for clofentezine is 4.09 (DAR page 11). EPIWIN can also make an estimate of the adjustment in value of the parent by the addition of an OH fragment. This value is -0.48 giving a Log Kow for 4-OH clofentezine of 3.61. On this basis 4-OH would be expected to be fat-soluble. This is evidenced by the fact that it was the major residue in cow renal fat samples. However, there is no evidence to suggest that either clofentezine or the metabolite will bioaccumulate in fat	RMS: 19:12:2008 See applicants case in the left hand column, which RMS considers addresses the open point .Open point addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled. (see new open point 3.10 related to open point 3.3)

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		tissue. This is discussed in the **Attachment IRV3-03** attached to this table. The residue definition for foodstuffs of **animal** origin should be confirmed as stated in **Reg (EC) No 396/2005** as the **sum of all compounds containing the 2-chlorobenzoyl moiety expressed as clofentezine**		
	Open point.3.7 Applicant to clarify the representative uses so that the range of concentrations, the range of water amounts per ha and the range of active substance rates per ha are in accordance. See also comment 3(14) See reporting table 3(11)	**Clarification on intended uses:** In the list of intended uses in Europe presented in tabular form in the DAR, spray volume concentrations (kg a.s./hL) were only calculated for a water volume of 1000 L/ha: - In orchards, strawberries and ornamentals, the minimum and maximum rates are 0.1 and 0.2 kg a.s./ha, which correspond to 0.01 and 0.02 kg a.s./hL, respectively, with a water volume of 1000 L/ha. - In grapes, the rates range 0.1-0.15 kg a.s./ha corresponding to 0.01-0.015 kg a.s./hL when a water volume of 1000 L/ha is used. The notifier agrees that this option can have been made the reading of the GAP table confusing. However, the notifier totally supports the view of the RMS concerning residue trials evaluation. To clarify, at the maximum application	RMS: See applicants case in the left hand column, which RMS considers addresses the open point Open point addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled. New open point proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		rate of **0.2 kg a.s./ha** (orchards, strawberries, ornamentals), the concentration ranges are as follows: Orchards --> 0.013-0.05 kg a.s./hL (400–1500 L water/ha) Strawberries --> 0.013-0.04 kg a.s./hL (500–1500 L water/ha) Ornamentals --> 0.008-0.04 kg a.s/hL (500-2500 L water/ha) At the maximum application rate of **0.15 kg a.s./ha** (grapes), the concentration range is as follows: Grapes --> 0.015-0.05 kg a.s/hL (300-1000 L water/ha)		
	New open point 3.11 RMS to update the GAP in the list of endpoints taking into account the clarification concerning the dose rate.			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point open. RMS: 17.02.09 Information added to Addendum 3 and the endpoints have been updated. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled
	Data gap 3.1 Applicant to submit 4 trials on plums in Southern Europe and 8 trials on strawberries under glass. See also comment 3(13)	Strawberry data are available upon request. Plum use is not supported anymore.		PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Data gap still open: The data requested on plums in Southern EU and strawberries (indoor) remain open. Written procedure:

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	See reporting table 3(17)			Data gap still open New data gap proposed, see below.
	New data gap 3.4 identified at PRAPeR 65 meeting: The notifier is asked to provide a complete data base for plum, grape and apple in compliance with the intended GAP. In addition, the notifier should consider the analysis of the 2-chlorobenzonitrile in the new residue data package.			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Data gap open. Written procedure: Data gap still open
	Data gap 3.2 Applicant to submit 4 additional residue trials for the Northern Europe in grapes. See reporting table 3(18)	**Clarification on existing studies:** As stated in the DAR (p258*): "Observed residues in these trials fluctuate quite significantly"*. Deciding if the trials should be treated separately based on a comparison of the mean values is not valid when the data are scattered. The ranges of residues detected 0.12[1]-0.89 for NEU and 0.09-0.67 for SEU show considerable overlap, as do the statistical ranges when the standard deviation of the mean values is considered. When this is taken into account the NEU mean ± SD value is 0.48 ± 0.34 ppm (5 results[1]) and the SEU mean ± SD value is 0.28 ± 0.19 ppm (9 results). Thus statistically	RMS: 19:12:2008 Agrees with the data requirement for 4 further trials from Northern member states, as the mean residue and maximum residue are higher in the Northern member state trial samples. Data requirement.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Data gap closed. (see data gaps 3.1 and 3.4 above)

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		residues lie in the range (mean to one sigma limit) 0.14-0.82 ppm for NEU and 0.09-0.47 ppm for SEU and overlap. This method is recommended in SANCO 7525/VI/95-rev 2 section 2.2. Furthermore, the Rmax values are falling in neighbouring MRL categories (1 and 2 mg/kg), thus, meeting the second criteria of the guidance document. The overall MRL calculation takes this variation into account and as stated in the DAR the MRL of 1 ppm "*is in line with the current EU MRL and whilst this supports a GAP at 2 X application rate all residues were below the current MRL"*. In conclusion, the notifier agrees with the RMS handling of these trials as described in the DAR. [1] This value should not be disregarded: Trial Chaintré, France, 1991, NEU (DAR p 253) has residue 0.12 underlined in the DAR. Thus the LOEP is correct as the SMTR and the endpoints should not have been updated as indicated in the reporting table, comment 3(15).		

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Open point.3.8 The residue definition for risk assessment in processed commodities needs to be discussed in expert meeting. See also comment 3(20) See reporting table 3(19)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 Overall it is considered by the RMS that 2-chlorobenzonitrile or the degradation products of 2-chlorobenzonitrile are of no toxicological significance at these levels, and should not be included in the residue definition and further data are not required.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled. New open point proposed, see below. New data gaps proposed, see below.
	New data gap 3.5 identified at PRAPeR 65 meeting: Notifier to provide further clarification on the toxicological relevance of the 2-chlorobenzoic acid and 2-chlorobenzamide (Toxicological relevance of 2-chlorobenzonitrile requested under new data gap 3.3)			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Data gap open. Written procedure: Data gap still open
	New data gap 3.6 identified at PRAPeR 65 meeting: Notifier to provide new processing studies according to the new definition of residue for risk assessment established in processed commodities.			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Data gap open. Written procedure: Data gap still open

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	New open point 3.13 The proposal for a residue definition for risk assessment in the processed commodities has to be reconsidered with regard to the toxicological relevance of the metabolites (see new data gap 3.5) and the results of the processing studies requested under the new data gap 3.6			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point open. Written procedure: Open point still open
	Open point.3.9 MS to discuss the appropriateness of the feeding study (method of analysis) with regard to the residue definition in animal products. See reporting table 3(25)	**Clarification of existing studies:** The provided method of analysis is designed to determine clofentezine residues in animal products **as defined in Reg (EC) No. 396/2005** (= sum of all compounds containing the 2-chlorobenzoyl moiety expressed as clofentezine). Furthermore, as explained in the above mentioned **Attachment IRV1-01** provided with this evaluation table: • It has been proved that the method converts clofentezine and metabolites into the analyte (2-CBA) with a molar conversion ratio of 1:1. Any new method would still require an acid hydrolysis step to ensure conjugated metabolites were accounted for.	RMS: 19:12:2008 Residues in animal products based on the animal transfer study are expected to be below the limit of determination (LOD MRLs set), using a method which determines all compounds containing the 2-chlorobenzoyl moiety, which includes both parent clofentezine and 4-hydroxyclofentezine (residues definition). The problem with the method is that it is not specific to clofentezine, however for monitoring there is a validated HPLC method (See section B.5.4.1d) which determines parent clofentezine and 4-hydroxyclofentezine as the individual components, therefore this method should be used for monitoring. Open point addressed.	PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point fulfilled. New open point proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	New open point 3.14 The appropriateness of the feeding study has to be reconsidered when the residue definition for products of animal origin and the residue definition for the processed commodities are finalised (see new open point 3.10 and open point 3.8)			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point open. Written procedure: Open point still open
	New open point 3.12 RMS to amend the list of endpoints according to the discussions at PRAPeR 65 meeting (see discussion table).			PRAPeR 65 (22-23 January 2009): Open point open. RMS: 17.02.09 The endpoints have been updated. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled
	Message 1 to mammalian toxicology meeting (PRAPeR 64) regarding the toxicological relevance of clofentezine metabolites (2-chlorobenzoic acid (2-chlorobenzylidene) hydrazide, 2-chlorobenzonitrile, 2-chlorobenzamide): 1 - Are any of these degradation compounds of			Answer from PRAPeR 64 meeting (mammalian toxicology): Limited toxicological information on some metabolites (2-chlorobenzoic acid (2-chlorobenzylidene) hydrazide, 2-chlorobenzonitrile, 2- chlorobenzamide) was reported in the addendum 2 to the DAR. However, this was considered not sufficient to conclude on the toxicological relevance of the metabolites, as well as on

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	significant toxicological concern to be taken into account in the processed commodities? 2 - Are toxicological end-points available for these degradation compounds?			specific trigger values. Further, it has to be clarified in the residue section their amount after degradation when an eating step is included in the process
	Message 2 to mammalian toxicology meeting (PRAPeR 64) regarding the proportion of 4-hydroxyclofentezine in renal and subcutaneous fat: In the cattle metabolism study a discrepancy was observed in the TRR levels detected in the renal fat (0.26 mg/kg) and the subcutaneous fat (0.02 mg/kg). Considering that the residue mainly consists of 4-OH-clofentezine (70% TRR), (the parent compound being not observed), the explanation provided by the applicant is the following: “This difference reflects the proximity of the renal fat samples to the main organs of excretion. The only major residue in the renal fat was			Answer from PRAPeR 64 meeting (mammalian toxicology): It is not unexpected to find this metabolite present in renal fat. It is also expected that renal fat would contain slightly higher amount of the metabolite than in the epidermal fat because of the proximity to the kidneys.”

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	4-hydroxyclofentezine which is also the major product excreted in urine". Is it usual to observe such a difference and is this explanation acceptable?			

4. Environmental fate and behaviour

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Section 4 Open points: ***10*** Points for clarification: ***8*** Data gaps: ***1***			Section 4 Open points: ***3*** Points for clarification: ***0*** Data gaps: ***3***
4.1	Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to further address the photolysis metabolite 2-chlorobenzonitril with respect to potential GW contamination. (EFSA note: According to guidance document on assessment of metabolites in GW a metabolite with a max. 5.5 % at the end of a soil degradation study deserves further GW assessment. The photolysis study was performed with natural sunlight in UK (52 °N) between August and September. The study may not be considered to represent worst case EU conditions with respect to photolysis and higher levels could be expected to occur in	**Additional information on existing studies:** Information is provided in the **Attachment IRV4-01**. This additional information is based on existing studies already described in the DAR and consequently it can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to EFSA document dated 15 November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007.	RMS: 19:12:2008 The additional information supplied by the Notifier has been evaluated in Addendum 2. Although the RMS considered that there were a number of uncertainties associated with the approach taken by the Notifier, overall the RMS concluded that the point of clarification had been sufficiently addressed and no further information was considered necessary. The RMS considers that point is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification addressed. New data gap proposed, see below. Message sent to tox.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	many EU locations). See reporting table 4(3)			
	New data gap 4.2 identified at PRAPeR 62 meeting: Data gap to further address the photolysis metabolite 2-chlorobenzonitril with respect to potential GW contamination, in case it is relevant or if its toxicological relevance cannot be concluded. (data gap pending confirmation from tox section).			PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap open. Written procedure: Data gap open
	Open point 4.1 MS to discuss the reliability and the use of the aerobic soil degradation studies (Leake and Arnold, 1983a and 1983 b) in the fate and behaviour assessment. See also 4(2), 4(6), 4(8), 4(9), 4(13) and 4(19). See reporting table 4(7)	**Clarification of existing studies:** The notifier agrees with the answers to EFSA provided by the RMS in reporting table 4(7) and wants to add the following points: • The EFSA are incorrect to say that there was "*application of non labelled AE C522505 together with the test substance*". This was not the case. The EFSA have misinterpreted the explanation in the DAR for the formation of AE C52205 where AE C52205 was co-chromatographed with extracts of soil causing conversion on the TLC plate of clofentezine to AE C522505.	RMS: 19:12:2008 In addition to the information provided by the Notifier in Column B the RMS also wishes to reiterate the points made in the original Reporting Table comment – see 4(7). The RMS considers that this open point is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Continued: Open point 4.1 MS to discuss the reliability and the use of the aerobic soil degradation studies (Leake and Arnold, 1983a and 1983 b) in the fate and behaviour assessment. See also 4(2), 4(6), 4(8), 4(9), 4(13) and 4(19). See reporting table 4(7)	• As noted, the DT_{50} values were extrapolated a short time beyond the duration of the study. However it should be noted that there was a good linear fit of the data with r^2 values >0.94, thus, reducing the uncertainty in the values obtained. Comparing the pattern of extraction and mineralisation in this study with that of Leake & Arnold, 1983b, strongly suggests that the low recovery of radioactivity recorded for both soils at 67 DAT was due to inefficient trapping of $^{14}CO_2$ and not any loss of unchanged clofentezine. The question as to whether soxhlet extraction should be considered a "very harsh extraction" is debatable. Whilst using a hot solvent to percolate through the soil, it does not cause disruption to the soil matrix. However, the objective of any extraction is to maximise the extraction of the unchanged compound and its degradation products. The study clearly demonstrates that extraction method developed and applied by Leake & Arnold in this study maximises the extraction of intact clofentezine (0 DAT recovery of clofentezine was 97.2% AR in the loamy sand). The notifier agrees with the RMS that cold solvent extraction would have underestimated the DT_{50} values for clofentezine in soil.		

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		The notifier supports the view that this study is adequate for determination of the rate of degradation but provides only supporting information on the route of degradation which is more robustly characterised in Leake & Arnold, 1983b. The DT_{50} values should be retained for use with the other results in the groundwater risk assessment (DAR, Table B8.37 P 330).		
	Open point 4.2 MS experts to discuss the need for further assessment of soil metabolite 2-chlorobenzoic acid. (Guidance document in the relevance of metabolites in ground water indicates that the % triggers should be considered on a molar basis. Usually this coincides with the % TAR but not in this case. The theoretical maximum transformation of clofentezine in 2-chlorobenzoic acid is 200 % in molar basis but will result only in 100% in TAR. Therefore the observed %TAR values need to be multiplied by 2 in order to obtain the % in molar basis,	**Clarification of existing studies:** The open point 4.2 questions on the molar conversion ratio between clofentezine and 2-chlorobenzoic acid (2-CBA). This molar ratio conversion between clofentezine and 2-CBA is 1:1 as experimentally shown in the article[1] provided as appendix to the above mentioned **Attachment IRV1-01** submitted with this evaluation table: The authors clearly explain that "Given the symmetrical nature of this particular molecule, conversion of one mole of clofentezine to two moles of 2-CBA was theoretically possible, as suggested in Fig. 1. Laboratory testing, however, showed this not to be the case; **only one mole of 2-CBA was essentially being formed per mole of clofentezine,** as determined by gas chromatography with mass selective	RMS: 19:12:2008 The additional information supplied by the Notifier has been evaluated in Addendum 2. On the basis of the information provided, the RMS accepts that the theoretical maximum transformation of clofentezine into 2-chlorobenzoic acid of 200% on a molar basis outlined in Open point 4.2 would not occur in practice. The RMS considers that this open point is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. Message sent to ecotox. New data gap proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	this will result in exceedance of 10 % in molar basis) See also 4(2), 4(26), 4(57) and 4(58). See reporting table 4(11)	detection (CGC/MSD) following methylation of 2-CBA with diazomethane. A postulated mechanism is shown in Fig. 2." [1] P. J. Snowdon, R. J. Whiteoak and J. D. Manley, 1991, "The hydrolysis of clofentezine and related tetrazines as the basis of determination of residues in bovine tissues", Fresenius J Anal Chem (1991) **339**:444-447.		
	New data gap 4.3 identified at PRAPeR 62 meting: Data gap identified for groundwater and surface water exposure assessments for 2-chlorobenzoic acid.			PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap open. Written procedure: Data gap open.
	Open point 4.3 MS to discuss the adequacy of the input parameters used for FOCUS SW calculations that were derived from the water sediment study. See also 4(36), 4(42), 4(43), 4(48), 4(49), 4(50) and data requirement 4(45). See reporting table 4.(12)	Please note that reporting table 4(45) does not lead to a data requirement as indicated in Column A but to a point of clarification (see below point of clarification 4.7 and related **Attachment IRV4-04** to this evaluation table).	RMS: 19:12:2008 The RMS has included the response from the original Reporting Table in Addendum 2. The RMS considers the open point is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. New open points proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	New open point 4.11 RMS to remove separate water and sediment DT50 from the LoEP water sediment study box, and just include whole system values of 13.1 and 7.1 days.		RMS: 17.02.09 LoEP updated	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled LoEP updated
	New open point 4.12 RMS to calculate a water dissipation DT50 from the 2 experiments in an addendum (values should not be put in the LoEP).		RMS: 17.02.09 Information provided in Addendum 3.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point closed Information provided in Addendum 3.
	Open point 4.4 MS to discuss the goodness of fitting of the Speyer 2.2 soil data to first order kinetics. If adequate, also discuss the potential effect of the use of this value in the risk assessment and/or the value more appropriate for the list of end points and further assessments.	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 Additional information on the kinetic fitting for the Speyer 2.2 soil is provided in Addendum 2. The RMS considers the open point is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. New open point proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	See also 4(18). See reporting table 4 (17)			
	New open point 4.13 RMS to update the LoEP rate of degradation in soil (laboratory) in line with the discussion table conclusions for open points 4.1 and 4.4.		RMS: 17.02.09 LoEP updated	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled LoEP updated
4.2	Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to provide scientifically and consistent valid justification for not presenting a soil adsorption desorption study with clofentezine. See reporting table 4(24)	**Clarification of existing studies:** A justification for non-submission of a soil adsorption/desorption study is provided as an Attachment to this Evaluation Table (See **Attachment IRV4-02**). This document is based on existing studies and consequently it can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to EFSA document dated 15 November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007.	RMS: 19:12:2008 The additional information supplied by the Notifier has been evaluated in Addendum 2. Overall the UK RMS accepted that the estimated Koc value for clofentezine was sufficiently validated for use in the exposure assessments, particularly taking into account the low mobility demonstrated in at least 4 other laboratory experimental studies. The RMS considers that this point of clarification is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification addressed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Data gap 4.1 Data gap for a soil adsorption desorption study with clofentezine may be identified by the experts' meeting if no satisfactory clarification is provided. See also point of clarification in 4(29) See reporting table 4(24)	See above.	See above.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap closed.
4.3	Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to provide further information on the possible discrepancy between solubility in the various studies submitted. See also data requirement in 4(24) See reporting table 4(29)	**Clarification on existing studies:** In a preliminary experiment to the hydrolysis study (reported in Kelly, 1985a, Annex IIA 2.9.1/01 DAR pages 12 and 321), the water solubility of clofentezine was determined by adding clofentezine dissolved in acetone to buffer and shaking in a water bath for 16 hours at 22ºC. The solution was then centrifuged and filtered. The total radioactivity in the filtrate was measured and taken to be the actual solubility of clofentezine (0.029 mg/L). The hydrolysis study proceeded using concentrations of 48% and 88% of this value, 0.014 and 0.026 mg/L respectively. Later the water solubility was determined in a much more rigorous way, with shorter equilibration time, lower initial concentration and the	RMS: 19:12:2008 The RMS has no further information to add to the detailed response provided by the Notifier in Column B. The RMS considers that this point of clarification is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification addressed. New open point proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Continued: Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to provide further information on the possible discrepancy between solubility in the various studies submitted. See also data requirement in 4(24) See reporting table 4(29)	filtrate being analysed chromatographically (Smith & Kelly, 1985. Annex II A 2.6/01, DAR page 9). From this, the water solubility at pH 5 was determined to be 2.52 µg/L and <2 µg/L at pH 7 and 9. Thus, it has to be concluded that, in the hydrolysis study by Kelly, the clofentezine could not have been fully dissolved. Irrespective of this conclusion, it appears that the authors were able to determine rates of hydrolysis at different pH values and temperatures. As the study was conducted at a clofentezine concentration above its water solubility, the notifier can understand the concern of the EFSA regarding the validity of the rates of hydrolysis reported by Kelly. However, a second study conducted at below the water solubility, 2 µg/L (van der Gaauw, 2001, Annex II A 2.9.1/03, DAR Pages 13 and 322) in compliance with OECD 111 and GLP, has also been conducted and evaluated by RMS. The results from this study were completely in line with those from the Kelly study, with rates at pH 7 in the range of 0.2 days at 38°C to 1.4 days at 22°C. Thus, on this occasion, the solubilisation of clofentezine does not appear to have influenced the kinetics of the rate of		

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		degradation. Thus, as concluded in the DAR, both studies can be used to provide data on the rates of clofentezine hydrolysis with varying pH and temperature. For clarification, the DAR should be amended to further include concentration of the van der Gaauw study.		
	New open point 4.14 RMS is requested to confirm the concentrations used in the van der Gaauw study and to include the results of this study in the LoEP (with a footnote indicating the concentration tested).		RMS: 17.02.09 LoEP updated	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled LoEP updated
	Open point 4.5 RMS to amend the list of information, test and studies which are relied upon to include the missing references (Kelly, 1985a; Smith and Kelly, 1985b and van der Gaauw, 2001(c)) See reporting table 4(31)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 The study van der Gaauw, 2001c has been included in the 'List of Annex II studies which were considered as relied upon for the evaluation with a view to Annex I inclusion and for which the main submitter has claimed data protection, Version 2 – final (June 2008). The studies Kelly, 1985a, and Smith and Kelly, 1985b, have not been included in this final list as the Notifier, did not claim data protection for these studies.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to amend the list of information, test and studies which are relied upon to include the missing references Kelly, 1985a; Smith and Kelly, 1985b. Written procedure: Open point open. RMS to amend the list of information, test

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
			The RMS considers this open point is addressed. RMS: 17.02.09 Studies relied on added to list in Addendum 3.	and studies which are relied upon to include the missing references Kelly, 1985a; Smith and Kelly, 1985b.
	Open point 4.6 MS to discuss in an experts meeting the acceptability of the aqueous photolysis study and the need of further information. See also 4(33). See reporting table 4(32)	It should be noted that the notifier has independently decided to repeat this study following regulatory authorities' request and that the results of this study **do not alter the overall conclusions** made by the RMS in column 3, that photolysis was unlikely to be a significant route of dissipation in most natural surface waters. This new study (R-18905) includes work on clofentezine photolysis in both natural water (relevant to JMAFF guidelines) and in buffer (relevant to EU guidelines). This study was conducted to current guidelines and with clofentezine applied below its water solubility. It provides a better estimate of the rate of aqueous photolysis and the quantum yield for clofentezine. It also provides an experimentally derived quantum yield to current guidelines and a report (R-18905a) uses this data to estimate the real half lives of the molecule. Both reports (and a summary) have been sent to the RMS.	RMS: 19:12:2008 According to Regulation (EC) No. 1095/2007, the RMS has not evaluated the repeat aqueous photolysis study mentioned in Column B. The RMS has therefore reiterated their comments from the original Reporting Table (see 4(32)). *While we agree that the study design could be criticised for not being performed under controlled light and temperature conditions, the RMS considers that this study performed under natural conditions (i.e. outdoors in the UK) would be representative of the behaviour of clofentezine when exposed to light in the upper most surface water layers of a natural surface water body. Although the concentration tested was high, the significantly slower rate of degradation of clofentezine in the dark control tends*	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. New data gap proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		However according to Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007, these data are not supposed to be taken into consideration in the peer review.	*to indicate that loss in the light exposed samples was due to photolysis and not simply loss via precipitation on un-dissolved residues.* *Overall, due to the rapid dissipation of residues of the active substance from the water phase of the dark water:sediment study, the RMS concluded that photolysis was unlikely to be a significant route of dissipation in most natural surface waters. (see also response to 5(16) below). Therefore we do not think that additional useful information would be obtained by requesting a repeat photolysis study under controlled conditions*. The RMS considers this open point is addressed. However, if further assessment is required it is proposed that a full evaluation of new aqueous photolysis study be performed to ensure that the assessment is based on the most appropriate information.	
	New data gap 4.4 identified at PRAPeR 62 meeting: A new aqueous photolysis study is required. The experts agreed it was not essential to complete the EU level exposure assessment.			PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap open. Written procedure: Data gap open.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Open point 4.7 RMS to amend the list of information, test and studies which are relied upon to include the missing references (Kelly, 1985 b; Buerkle, 1999a and Maurer, 2000) See reporting table 4(34)	--	RMS: 19:12:2008 The studies Buerkle, 1999a and Maurer, 2000, have been included in the 'List of Annex II studies which were considered as relied upon for the evaluation with a view to Annex I inclusion and for which the main submitter has claimed data protection, Version 2 – final (June 2008). The study Kelly (1985b) has not been included in this final list as the Notifier, did not claim data protection for this study. The RMS considers this open point is addressed. RMS: 17.02.09 Study relied on added to list in Addendum 3	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to amend the list of information, test and studies which are relied upon to include the missing references Kelly, 1985 b. Written procedure: Open point open. RMS to amend the list of information, test and studies which are relied upon to include the missing references Kelly, 1985 b.
4.4	Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to provide further clarification on the low material balance reached in the water sediment studies.	**Clarification of existing studies:** Clarification on the low material balance reached in the water/sediment study is provided as part of the **Attachment IRV4-03** submitted with this evaluation table. The clarification refers to the raw data of the existing study and it can be taken	RMS: 19:12:2008 The additional information supplied by the Notifier has been evaluated in Addendum 2. Overall, the UK RMS accepted the possible reasons for low recovery and	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification addressed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	See reporting table 4 (35)	into consideration in the peer review according to the document prepared by EFSA in November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 dated 15 Nov. 2007.	concluded that the endpoints from the study could be relied upon for the purposes of the exposure assessment. The RMS considers that this point of clarification is addressed.	
	Open point 4.8 MS to discuss the acceptability of the water sediment study for the risk assessment. For the discussion MS also should take into account responses to data requirements in 4(29), 4(35) 4(40) and 4(41). See also 4(38) and 4(39). See reporting table 4(37)	See Points of clarification 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6.	RMS: 19:12:2008 The additional information supplied by the Notifier has been evaluated in Addendum 2. Overall the UK RMS considered that the experimental set-up in the water sediment study was likely to be acceptable and considered that no further information was required. The RMS considers that this open point is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. New open point proposed, see below.
	New open point 4.15 EFSA to indicate in the conclusion that member states that have acidic surface water bodies associated with agriculture may wish to request additional information to address this situation. (degradation might be expected to be slower than			PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point closed

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	estimated in the studies – refer to open point 4.8 of discussion table)			
4.5	Point of clarification for the applicant Further information on the appropriateness of the formulation used in the water sediment study (WP) to represent the intended SC formulation. See also open point in 4(37) See reporting table 4(40)	**Clarification of existing studies:** As requested, further information is provided in the **Attachment IRV4-03** to this evaluation table, to answer this point of clarification. The document is based on the existing study and can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to the document prepared by EFSA in November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 dated 15 Nov. 2007.	RMS: 19:12:2008 The additional information supplied by the Notifier has been evaluated in Addendum 2. In the opinion of the UK RMS the formulation is unlikely to have had a major adverse impact on the fate and behaviour of the active substance over the duration of the entire water sediment study, and therefore results from this study can be read across to other formulations as appropriate. No further information is considered necessary. The RMS considers that this point of clarification is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification addressed.
4.6	Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to provide further information on how CO_2 was determined in the water sediment study and separated results for the different volatiles traps if they are available in the raw data of the study.	**Clarification of existing studies:** As requested, further information is provided in the **Attachment IRV4-03** to this evaluation table, to answer this point of clarification. The document is based on the existing study and can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to the document prepared by EFSA in November 2007 on the	RMS: 19:12:2008 The additional information supplied by the Notifier has been evaluated in Addendum 2. The RMS considers that this point of clarification is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification addressed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	See also open point in 4(37) See reporting table 4(41)	common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 dated 15 Nov. 2007.		
4.7	Point of clarification for the applicant Applicant to provide further justification of the whole system DT50 calculations including goodness of fitting. (NOTE: difference between PSD and EFSA estimates may come or not from the consideration of the residue attached to the glass) See also open point in 4(12) and comments 4(43), 4(48), 4(49) and 4(50) See reporting table 4(45)	**Clarification of existing studies:** As requested, further information is provided in the **Attachment IRV4-04** to this evaluation table, to answer this point of clarification. The document is based on the existing study and can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to the document prepared by EFSA in November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 dated 15 Nov. 2007.	RMS: 19:12:2008 Additional information on the kinetic fitting of the whole water sediment systems has been provided in Addendum 2. The RMS considers that this point of clarification is addressed.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification addressed.
4.8	Point of clarification for the applicant. Risk assessment based on Step 3 calculations and Step 4 calculations with spray drift mitigation through spray drift buffer zones only should be provided for the EU risk assessment. (Justification: effect of vegetative buffer	**Clarification of existing studies:** A revised acute and chronic aquatic risk assessment to fish and invertebrates is presented by the RMS in the DAR addendum (See B 9.2.3, p 69). This concluded that ”the acute and chronic risk to fish, aquatic invertebrates and algae arising from all proposed uses of clofentezine in 'Apollo 50SC' applications is low and risk mitigation is	RMS: 19:12:2008 Additional information on the surface water exposure assessment has been provided in Addendum 2. Additional summary results of the Step 3 FOCUSsw assessments have been provided in the light of a re-assessment of the effects evaluation.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification addressed. New open point proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	zones on runoff mitigation is not as straightforward as originally proposed by FOCUS landscape according to the recent EFSA panel opinion). However, if justified, calculation taking into account run off mitigation may be reported as additional information for MS use. See reporting table 4(46)	not required". TERs were >10 with worst case Step 3 PECsw. The use of vegetative filter strips is not required for mitigation. Thus, the question if the mitigation and refined PECs used in the *original* risk assessment were performed correctly or not is not relevant anymore to the evaluation. Extract from DAR addendum: *"The fathead minnow chronic study is considered to be the more appropriate ELS study for use in the risk assessment since a suitably maintained dose range was employed. This study was preferred to the rainbow trout ELS study which used technical material at one low dose (NOEC = 0.007 mg a.s./L) to overcome solubility problems. Similarly, the D. magna chronic study using 'Apollo 50SC' in a more natural sediment:water system was selected for risk assessment".* The conclusions were: - *"All TERs are >10 for FOCUS step 1 PECsw indicate that there is a low chronic risk to fish from all the proposed uses of clofentezine.* - *Using FOCUS step 2 total load PECsws (see DAR B.8.5.2), TERs >10 were derived for aquatic invertebrates*	Overall the UK RMS concludes that this point of clarification has been adequately addressed.	

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		for all crop uses apart from early pome/stone fruit and ornamentals. However, with worse case FOCUS Step 3 PECsw scenarios, TERs >10 were obtained indicating low risk to aquatic invertebrates also for these uses."		
	New open point 4.16 New FOCUSsw simulations (at step 3 and if necessary step 4) are necessary if conclusions on RAC changes significantly. (refer to point of clarification 4.8 of the discussion table and open point 5.7 – ecotoxicological section)			PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point open No use with acceptable risk assessment according to current ectoxicological end points. Need for refinement of exposure assessment is therefore confirmed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Open point 4.9 MS experts to discuss the need of further assessment with respect to the air compartment. If considered necessary, the general approach to follow for clofentezine and related substances may need to be discussed as well. See reporting table 4(56)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 A response from the RMS has been included in Addendum 2. The RMS considers that this open point should be further discussed in an expert meeting to ensure that a consistent approach be taken.	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. New open point proposed, see below.
	New open point 4.17 EFSA to include the pertinent information in the conclusion and due to the atmospheric half-life of 5 days, EFSA shall indicate that clofentezine has the potential for long range atmospheric transport.			PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point closed
	Open point 4.10 MSs to discuss in an expert meeting whether the major photolytic metabolite is formed under natural conditions and in which amounts. The outcome of the discussion is required for the discussion in ecotox see open	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 In the original DAR, the RMS considered that the results of the water/sediment studies would be expected to be more representative of the behaviour expected in natural water bodies compared with the aqueous photolysis studies for this substance. Therefore the photolysis metabolites	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. New open point proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	point 5(6) See reporting table 4(59)		were considered unlikely to be formed in major amounts in natural water bodies due to the rapid dissipation out of the uppermost surface water layers where photolysis may occur and the subsequent partitioning to sediment. Therefore no further consideration of the metabolite 2-chlorobenzonitrile was considered necessary. It should also be noted that on the basis of acute ecotox effects data for the 2-chlorobenzonitrile metabolite, the metabolite would be considered to be less toxic than the parent by at least two orders of magnitude based on data for fish, daphnia and algae (see Table B.9.2.2, page 383 of the Ecotox section of the DAR). On this basis no further consideration of the metabolite 2-chlorobenzonitrile was considered necessary. The RMS considers this open point is addressed.	

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	New open point 4.18 RMS to provide the calculation for 2-chloro benzonitrile PEC in surface water including all assumptions used for its derivation in an addendum, and update the LoEP (fate section).		RMS: 17.02.09 LoEP updated	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled LoEP updated
	New open point 4.19 Definition of the residue for assessment by other sections or for which a groundwater exposure assessment is triggered: RMS to update the LoEP and add 2 chlorobenzoic acid (AE C500233) for soil and groundwater and surface water (via drainage and runoff), and to add 2-chlorobenzonitrile (formed in soil and water by photolysis) to the definition for groundwater and surface water.		RMS: 17.02.09 LoEP updated	PRAPeR 62 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: Open point fulfilled LoEP updated

5. Ecotoxicology

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Section 5 Open points: ***12*** Points of clarification: ***1*** Data gaps: ***1***			Section 5 Open points: ***0*** Points of clarification: ***0*** Data gaps: ***4***
	Data gap 5.1 Applicant to submit -Information to support the PD values for great tit in pome/stone fruit. -justification regarding the focal species in vineyards, PD refinement for cirl bunting and crested lark -justification regarding the focal species in strawberries, PD and PT refinement. -the risk to insectivorous birds in ornamentals needs to be addressed See reporting table 5(2)	**Clarification of existing studies:** Data to support risk assessment (survey study, radio tracking study…) were provided to the RMS and evaluated in the DAR addendum for orchard and strawberry uses. A new risk assessment based on these data is available in the DAR addendum which concludes that the long term risk to birds is acceptable. Ornamental and grape use can be addressed at MS level.	RMS: 19:12:2008 Refined risk assessment is presented in Addendum 1 and summarised in Addendum 2. For the use on strawberries data were provided on focal species and two species were deemed appropriate for the use – skylark and yellow wagtail. As regards PT 90th values of 0.95 and 0.99 were used for the yellow wagtail and skylark respectively; 50th percentile values of 0.6 and 0.86 were used for yellow wagtail and skylark. Data on FIR and PD were also factored in to the revised risk assessment and the corresponding TERlt for the yellow wagtail were 7.7 and 4.9 depending whether a 50th or 90th percentile was used for PT. As for the skylark, the TERlt were 10.1 and 8.74 depending whether a 50th or 90th percentile was used for PT. As regards use on pome fruit data were submitted on focal species and PD and as a result the TERlt was 6.0.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap still open. New open point proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
			No data were submitted to refine the risk to birds present in grapes.	
	New open point: 5.13 RMS to delete from the LoEP the higher tier risk assessment to birds based on PD and PT refinements.			PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. Written procedure: LoEP updated
	Open point 5.1 RMS to include in an addendum the risk assessment for birds from uptake of contaminated drinking water. See reporting table 5(3)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 The following is provided for illustrative purposes only: Assuming maximum application rate of 200 g/ha, an application volume of 200 L/ha, an acute oral LD50 of >3000 mg a.s./kg and a NOEC of 7.62 mg a.s./kg bw/day, a PECsw of 0.047 mg/l (FOCUS Step 1); the resulting exposure estimates are 53.9 mg a.s./kg bw for a 0.01 kg insectivorous bird. The resulting TERa and TERlt are >55.6 and 601 respectively. These indicate a low acute and long-term risk to birds.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to update the LoEP with the acute risk assessment from uptake of drinking water. Written procedure: LoEP updated
	Open point 5.2 RMS to include in an addendum the risk assessment for mammals	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 Assuming maximum application rate of 200 g/ha, an application volume of 200 L/ha, an acute oral LD50 of >5200 mg	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	from uptake of contaminated drinking water. See reporting table 5(8)		a.s./kg and a NOEC of 40 mg a.s./kg bw/day, a PECsw of 0.047 mg/l (FOCUS Step 1); the resulting exposure estimates are 53.9 mg a.s./kg bw for a 0.01 kg insectivorous mammal. The resulting TERa and TERlt are >165.7 and 5425 respectively. These indicate a low acute and long-term risk to mammals.	RMS to update the LoEP with the acute risk assessment from uptake of drinking water. Written procedure: LoEP updated
	Open point 5.3 RMS to include the aquatic TERs for all uses in the LoEP See reporting table 5(10)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 Endpoint sheet has been updated.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.
	Open point 5.4 RMS to include in an addendum all details on the studies with aquatic organisms which are required for a transparent and comprehensive evaluation of the endpoints derived from the studies. If the RMS does not wish to report water parameters, photoperiod, fish size/load it is agreed that it would be enough to state that this was assessed by the RMS as being in accordance with the	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 It should be noted that all studies were carried out to standard protocols and hence issues such as temperature, pH, fish loading were all met. It should however further be noted that few of these studies were considered appropriate for risk assessment purposes – see Table B.9.2.16 (a), (b) and (c) in the original DAR.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to provide the key information on the aquatics studies in an addendum. Written procedure: Open point closed. Information provided in Addendum 3.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	respective guideline. However, key information such as tested concentrations, observed mortality/effects at each concentration, observation of sublethal effects, statistical methods, confidence intervals, analytical methods, batch no., should always be reported in the study summaries for reasons of transparency and to facilitate the peer-review of the suggested endpoints. See also comment 5(17) See reporting table 5(11)			
	Open point 5.5 RMS to report in an addendum the observations/endpoint from the 21 d chronic daphnia study with the formulation (Barber and Barrett, 1990) and to clarify why the study was considered not acceptable. MSs to discuss in an expert meeting the setting of the	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 An assessment of the long-term/chronic *Daphnia magna* studies is provided in Addendum 2. As the water solubility of clofentezine is 0.00252 mg/L or 2.52 µg/L, difficulties were experienced in carrying out studies. As regards the chronic or long-term risk to *Daphnia magna*, it is proposed that one of two endpoints should be used depending upon the main route of exposure – for those where spray drift is the major route, it is	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to update the LoEP. Message sent to fate section. Written procedure: LoEP updated

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	NOEC for daphnids. (This may be necessary if the chronic endpoint for fish which is currently triggering the risk assessment is changed to a higher value - see open point 5(19) See reporting table 5(15)		proposed to use the endpoint based on the formulation (i.e. 0.25 mg/L), whereas when the route of exposure is due to either drainflow or runoff, an endpoint based on the active substance will be used (i.e. 0.05 mg a.s./L).	
	Open point 5.6 MSs to discuss in an expert meeting the necessity of an aquatic risk assessment taking into consideration the outcome of the fate meeting. Comment was also forwarded to the fate section see point 4(59) See reporting table 5(16)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 See Open point 4(10) above	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to update the LoEP using the highest PEC surface water for the parent from the FOCUS step 1. Written procedure: LoEP updated
	Open point 5.7 RMS to evaluate in an addendum the new fish ELS study with the formulation. See reporting table 5(19)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 Study has been submitted and evaluated and is presented in Addendum 1. The study was carried to OECD 210 and to GLP and used the formulation. The formulation was used to try to address concerns regarding solubility. The study was considered to be acceptable and the 28-day NOEC was determined to be 1000 µg/L	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to remove from the LoEP the endpoint derived from the new fish ELS study with the formulation, and to update the risk assessment in the LoEP with the endpoint 0.007 mg a.s./L.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
			equivalent to 1 mg/L. This was the highest concentration tested.	Note: the endpoint of 0.007 mg a.s./L becomes the endpoint driving the aquatic risk assessment (RAC=0.7µg a.s./L). New data gap proposed for formal reason, see below. Written procedure: LoEP updated
	New data gap 5.2 identified at PRAPeR 63 meeting: Applicant to provide a new fish ELS study with the formulation.			PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap open.
	Open point 5.8 It seems that it was not possible for the RMS to assess the field studies with *T. pyri*, since the study reports were either not complete and/or in German language only. Therefore it is suggested to delete the results of the field data from the LoEP. See also data requirement 5(23) and comment 5(29) See reporting table 5(20)	See below point of clarification 5.1.	RMS: 19:12:2008 See 5.1 point below.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	Open point 5.9 RMS to evaluate in an addendum the new studies with *C. septempunctata* and *A. bilineata* See reporting table 5(22)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 Two studies have been submitted on the toxicity of clofentezine as 'Apollo 50SC'. These studies were designed to determine whether there was any ovicidal or reproductive effect on *C. septempunctata* and *A. bilineata*. These studies indicate that the overall impact of clofentezine on these species was low. Full details are presented in Addendum 1.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to remove the endpoints derived from the new studies on *C.septempunctata* and *A. bilineata* from the LoEP. Written procedure: LoEP updated New data gap proposed, see below.
	New data gap 5.3 identified at PRAPeR 61 meeting: Notifier to complete the dossier for NTA based on the most sensitive life stages.			PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap open.
5.1	Point of clarification Applicant to submit an English translation of the semi-field and field studies with *T. pyri*. See open point 5(20) See reporting table 5(23)	**Clarification of existing studies:** English translation of the semi-field and field studies with *T. pyri* is provided in the **Attachment IRV5-01** submitted with this evaluation table. The document is based on the existing studies and consequently, it can be taken into consideration in the peer review according to the EFSA document dated 15 November 2007 on the common understanding to clarify	RMS: 19:12:2008 The Applicant has submitted English translations of these studies and these are presented in Addendum 2.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Point of clarification closed.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
		the difference between information that may be requested and a study that may not in the context of Regulation (EC) No 1095/2007 dated 15 Nov. 2007.		
	Open point 5.10 RMS to provide in an addendum a long-term risk assessment for earthworms based on concentrations of the a.s. in soil and not on application rates. The endpoint from the study of Rodger should be expressed as mg a.s./kg soil. Comparing the application rates used in the test and in the GAPs does not cover the maximum plateau PECsoil which is reached after 4-5 years. MSs to discuss the endpoint to be used in the long-term risk assessment for earthworms. In the study of Stäbler (2002)b effects on reproduction were observed at concentrations of 4-8 mg a.s./kg soil and the NOEC was set to 2 mg/kg soil while the NOEC of 5.5 kg	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 In the original DAR a low acute and chronic risk to earthworm from the proposed uses of clofentezine was determined. However, there was some concern regarding the long term risk assessment not being sufficiently addressed, primarily with respect to the selection of the chronic NOEC used in the risk assessment. In the DAR results from two chronic earthworm studies were considered acceptable: Staebler, 2002b and Rodgers, 2001. A NOEC of 1.5 kg a.s./ha (based on effects at 3.0 kg a.s./ha) using 'Apollo 50SC' was derived in the former study, whilst a NOEC of 5.5 kg a.s./ha, the only rate tested, using another SC formulation was derived from the latter. The Notifier has submitted a case where the effects endpoints have been converted from g a.s./ha in to mg/kg. On the basis of this it is concluded that the long-term risk to earthworms is acceptable.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open. RMS to correct the LoEP with the NOEC of 2.56 mg a.s/kg soil. Written procedure: LoEP updated

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	a.s./ha from the study of Rodgers (2001) was considered relevant by the RMS for the risk assessment. See reporting table 5(25)		The full assessment is presented in Addendum 1.	
	Open point 5.11 RMS to evaluate in an addendum the case to address the risk from metabolite AE C593600 to soil non-target organisms. See also comment 5(29) See reporting table 5(26)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 The Notifier has proposed that the risk to soil organisms is addressed by the risk assessment for the active substance, due to the following reasons: Similar structure of metabolite AEC593600 to clofentezine Low toxicity of clofentezine to soil organisms, Likely presence of the metabolite in studies that assess the toxicity of the active substance (DT50 of clofentezine = 71.3 days). The RMS is in agreement with this and the full case/reasoning is presented in Addendum 1.	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled.
	Open point 5.12 RMS to evaluate in an addendum the litter bag study. See reporting table 5(28)	-	RMS: 19:12:2008 The Notifier has submitted a litter bag study. This study has been conducted according to the latest guidance from EPFES and is considered to be acceptable. There were no significant effects on soil litter degradation over 12 months in soil treated with predicted	PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point fulfilled. New data gap proposed, see below.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
			maximum soil plateau clofentezine level followed by an annual maximum clofentezine application (worse case as no interception assumed). Therefore, the RMS is of the view that this study indicates a low risk to soil processes. An evaluation of this study is presented in Addendum 1.	
	New data gap 5.4 identified at PRAPeR 63 meeting: Applicant to provide a litter bag study.			PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Data gap open.
	Message from PRAPeR 62 meeting of experts (fate section): The experts agreed to inform the ecotoxicology experts' meeting that soil concentrations of 2-chlorobenzoic acid of up to 0.019 mg/kg needs to be assessed (0.268mg/kg x 0.136 x 156/303). (0.268mg/kg is a maximum accumulated soil PEC for clofentezine)			PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Answer: The experts agreed to calculate the TER for the soil metabolite 2-chlorobenzoic acid assuming a 10 times higher toxicity than the parent for this metabolite. New open point proposed, see below.
	New open point: 5.14 RMS to provide in the LoEP TER for the soil metabolite 2-			PRAPeR 63 (13-15 January 2009) Open point open.

No.	Column A Conclusions from the Reporting Table	Column B Comments from the notifier / applicant	Column C Rapporteur Member State comments on the notifier / applicant comments	Column D Recommendations of the PRAPeR Expert Meeting / Conclusions from the written procedure
	chlorobenzoic acid, assuming a 10 times higher toxicity than the parent for this metabolite.			Written procedure: LoEP updated