03/05/2021

# Subject │ Minutes of the Second Working Group 4 Meeting of COST Action CA18221: “PEsticide RIsk AssessMent for Amphibians and Reptiles”

1. **Welcome and introduction of participants**

The participants (**Annex 1**) were welcomed by Silvia Pieper, WG4 Leader, Annette Aldrich, WG3 Leader, and Manuel Ortiz, Chair of the Action.

Given that the meeting is being held online, attendance review was done through a *tour de table* during which attendants introduced themselves.

1. **Adoption of agenda**

The agenda (**Annex 2**) for the meeting was adopted.

1. **Introduction to the meeting and presentation of the Action**

Manuel Ortiz explained that the meeting objective is to detect needs to progress in the elaboration of a risk assessment scheme for amphibians and reptiles. The output of this WG4 discussion will be presented to the other WGs of the Action in order to stimulate them to conduct activities focused on addressing the identified needs. It is explained that this should be a first meeting to brainstorm and identify general aspects of risk assessment in which progress is especially recommendable, and that a follow-up meeting will be called within the next 1 or 2 months to define the specific questions that WG4 wants to put to other PERIAMAR WGs. For a clearer identification of the aspects in which the different PERIAMAR groups are involved, the Chair reviewed the structure of the Action, enumerating the WGs, Tasks and objectives.

1. **General framework for pesticide risk assessment for amphibians and reptiles and main gaps**

Silvia Pieper reviewed the general framework of pesticide ERA for amphibians and reptiles, summarized the main findings of the EFSA Scientific Opinion published in February 2018 and listed the major data gaps. The conclusions from the WG4 discussion carried out during the 1st General Meeting of PERIAMAR (Ljubljana, March 2020) and the links between ongoing PERIAMAR activities and identified data gaps were provided.

1. **Tour de table to share views on general questions relative to risk assessment for amphibians and reptiles**

A Tour de Table was conducted during which the meeting participants provided their answers to the following four questions:

* Which are from your perspective the characteristics of a “good” PPP environmental risk assessment for amphibian and reptiles?
* Regarding amphibians and reptiles, what are the major gaps to be addressed in order to set up an ERA with such characteristics?
* What could be from your perspective the added value of including monitoring in ERA schemes?
* What are the requirements to derive an effective set of risk management options for amphibians and reptiles for the risk regulation of PPP?

Some of the most commonly occurring answers, views and opinions expressed by participants were:

* Which are from your perspective the characteristics of a “good” PPP environmental risk assessment for amphibian and reptiles?

*Protective, focused on long-term persistence of populations to fulfil Specific Protection Goals.*

*Simple, user friendly and practical.*

*Consider variability and uncertainty through the use of Assessment Factors.*

*Follow a tiered approach and focus on low tiers to avoid unnecessary complexity.*

*Low uncertainty, reliable, calibrated.*

* Regarding amphibians and reptiles, what are the major gaps to be addressed in order to set up an ERA with such characteristics?

*Determine exposure throughout the life cycle and multi-generation effects.*

*Work on relevant exposure models and scenarios.*

*Consider multiple stressors (not only other PPP) and mixture effects.*

*Effect of other stressors on populations in the field.*

*Identify sensitive chronic responses and critical life stages.*

*Work on surrogate species to reduce vertebrate testing.*

*Group PPP as a function of their properties to identify pattern of increased or reduced toxicity compared to other taxa.*

*Add data to the reptilian ecotoxicological knowledgebase and terrestrial sensitivity.*

*Translate laboratory effects on individuals to the population level by considering their life history.*

*Description and efficiency of management options.*

* What could be from your perspective the added value of including monitoring in ERA schemes?

*Contribute to knowledge for re-evaluation of PPP.*

*Provide feedback for population model validation or scenarios and calibrate ERA.*

*Identify real risks.*

*Determine the relative importance of PPP effects on populations compared to other factors (habitat loss, pathogens, ploughing, road kills etc.).*

*Identify uncertainty in the ERA and fill the blanks.*

*Uncertainty associated with monitoring should be well identified*.

* What are the requirements to derive an effective set of risk management options for amphibians and reptiles for the risk regulation of PPP?

*Translate risk mitigation measures to farmers.*

*Specific to PPP authorisation and species or groups of species.*

*Local, applicable at the farm level.*

*Demonstrated effectivity on the population level.*

*Consider ecology of non-target species.*

1. **Identification and possible discussion of specific topics needed to advance the pesticide risk assessment for amphibians and reptiles**

Annette Aldrich elaborated a mind map compiling the different aspects coming up from the Tour de Table. An open discussion involving all meeting participants followed to further define the aspects to be considered in order to progress in pesticide risk assessment for amphibians and reptiles. Those aspects were highlighted in the mind map, which should be prioritised in their investigation by PERIAMAR WGs.

The resulting mind map and prioritisation of aspects (**Annex 3**) will be used as a starting point in a follow-up meeting, during which specific questions to address should be formulated.

1. **Planning of the next meeting to formulate specific research questions to the PERIAMAR group**

It is agreed that the follow-up meeting will take place in April or early May. The final date will be decided through a doodle survey. In the meantime, participants will review the generated mind map and their own notes to work on the formulation of specific questions for the relevant PERIAMAR WGs or Task group during that follow-up meeting.

1. **Any other business**

There were no other businesses.

1. **Closing**

The WG4 and WG3 Leaders and the Action Chair acknowledged the contributions from all meeting participants.

## LIST OF ANNEXES

**Annex 1 – Attendance List**

****

**Annex 2 – Agenda**

****

**Annex 3 – Mind map and priority issues**

****

09/04/2021

# Subject │ Minutes of the follow-up Second Working Group 4 Meeting of COST Action CA18221: “PEsticide RIsk AssessMent for Amphibians and Reptiles”

1. **Welcome and introduction of participants**

The participants (**Annex 1**) were welcomed by Silvia Pieper, WG4 Leader, Annette Aldrich, WG3 Leader, and Manuel Ortiz, Chair of the Action.

1. **Adoption of agenda**

The agenda (**Annex 2**) for the meeting was adopted.

1. **Conclusions from the last meeting (mindmap)**

The mindmap resulting from the first part of the meeting, held on March 5th, was revisited.

1. **Discussion of the first block of questions from the mindmap**

The questions relative to ERA scheme, risk management and monitoring were discussed to generate the final version of the first part of the mindmap.

1. **Discussion of the second block of questions from the mindmap**

The questions relative to exposure and effects were discussed to generate the final version of the second part of the mindmap. With this, the mindmap was finalised (Annex 3).

1. **Next steps**

The following steps to be taken in the near future are agreed:

* Present the meeting outcome at the MC meeting that will take place on 29th April.
* Distribute to other WGs the questions resulting from the analysis of the mindmap (Annex 4).
* Future events: the idea is to meet with other WGs for specific questions. This can be done as part of a physical meeting in October (if it can be organised). There could be a preparatory online or physical WG4 meeting ahead of that.
* Pesticide modelling in water is currently running, a WG2 is being dedicated to that.
* STSMs planned in summer, request for topics relevant to WG:
* Which are from your perspective the characteristics of a “good” PPP environmental risk assessment for amphibian and reptiles?
* Regarding amphibians and reptiles, what are the major gaps to be addressed in order to set up an ERA with such characteristics?
* What could be from your perspective the added value of including monitoring in ERA schemes?
* What are the requirements to derive an effective set of risk management options for amphibians and reptiles for the risk regulation of PPP?

1. **Closing**

The WG4 and WG3 Leaders and the Action Chair acknowledged the contributions from all meeting participants.

## LIST OF ANNEXES

**Annex 1 – Attendance List**

****

**Annex 2 – Agenda**

****

**Annex 3 – Mind map**

****

**Annex 4 – List of questions**

****