Helsinki, 23.06.2016

MISSION REPORT

Name: [redacted]	**Unit: D2**
Place and Date: 06 June 2016	**Mission Number: 15095**
Other participating ECHA staff: None	
Subject: Meeting of the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF Committee), Brussels, Belgium	

Main aspects of the mission:

The meeting of the PAFF Committee was held at 10.00 in the Centre Conference Albert Borschette, Rue Froissart, Brussels. ECHA was represented at the meeting because the focus of the meeting was on glyphosate, a proposal for the harmonised classification of which was the subject of an ongoing public consultation at ECHA.

A small number of demonstrators were present outside the building where the meeting was held.

The meeting had a single item on the agenda: Exchange of views and possible opinion of the Committee on a draft Commission Implementing Regulation amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 540/2011 as regards the extension of the approval period of the active substance glyphosate.

The meeting was chaired by [redacted] (DG SANTE; with [redacted] assisting). The Chairman outlined the history of the case, beginning with the first discussion in December 2015. The Chairman noted efforts had been made to achieve a qualified majority.

The text included the following recommendations, which were described by the chairman as consistent with the EU decision and the commitment made by Commissioner for Health and Food Safety, Vytenis Andriukaitis (1 June):

- That the use of the substance in public places (eg public parks, public playgrounds and gardens etc) be minimised
- That the co-formulant tallowamine be excluded from the products
- Pre-harvest use of glyphosate be minimised

During the discussion issues raised mainly focussed on the recommendations, for example the definition of public areas and whether 'pre-harvest use' takes into account climatic conditions (such as a wet summer). One MS queried whether, if approval was not granted, there would be time to find a suitable replacement (as they were not aware that any were available).

In response to a request from the representative from NL, the chair asked the ECHA representative to briefly outline the CLH process.

This was done; the following points were raised as follow-up:

- To a request to provide further information on the timelines I responded that after the end of the public consultation, the time given to the DS to respond to comments is normally 42 d but more time may be needed to respond to a large number of comments. Also stated that the legislated deadline is 18 months from the submission of a dossier which is in accordance, which means in this case that this deadline is at the end of November. Did not go further into possible timelines for discussion in RAC (but these were discussed with [redacted] and [redacted] after the meeting).

- UK responded that in light of these timelines, perhaps the proposed approval period is too short, given that COM also needs to deal with the opinion after adoption. The Chairman noted that COM will be in close communication with ECHA and can take a decision earlier than before the process has been completed eg based on an indicative opinion.

Following an indicative vote, a formal vote was taken. A qualified majority was not achieved. After the vote the chairman outlined the next steps in the process.

- Appeal committee within 2-6 weeks
- The process would be formalised as soon as possible
- New text would be circulated to delegates

The Chairman expressed his regret at not being able to find a compromise that would result in a qualified majority (despite all the discussions and changes to the text).

After the meeting informal discussions with DG SANTE colleagues touched on the availability to RAC of the original study reports and the offer from the Glyphosate Task Force concerning reading rooms as well as the timing of possible discussions of the dossier in RAC.

Conclusions, follow-up and implications for ECHA:

- Having a representative from ECHA present to personally explain the process and to be available to respond to questions was appreciated.
- Close communication with COM colleagues needs to continue as the dossier progresses towards consideration by RAC.
- The opportunity to make personal contact with colleagues from the COM and member states was useful and is likely to facilitate communication.

Name [redacted]

Signature

ENCLOSURES

1. Invitation and agenda
2. Draft text of proposed amendment to Implementing Regulation (EU) No 540/2011

cc: [redacted]
Unit D2